

STAGING MODERN STATEHOOD: WORLD EXHIBITIONS AND THE RHETORIC OF  
PUBLISHING IN LATE QING CHINA, 1851-1910

BY

HYUNGJU HUR

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in East Asian Languages and Cultures  
in the Graduate College of the  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2012

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Dan Shao, Chair  
Professor Kai-Wing Chow, Director of Research  
Professor Ronald P. Toby  
Professor Teemu Ruskola, Emory University

## **Abstract**

This dissertation examines how the objective of the Qing government to stage its modern statehood through participating in the world exhibitions and hosting the Nanyang Industrial Exposition of 1910, the first national / international exhibition of China, was challenged and transformed by various agents with different views and rhetorics regarding the representation of China at the exhibitions. The Imperial Maritime Customs, a product of European imperialist encroachment on China, echoed the imperialist discourse on an “uncivilized” China. Simultaneously, Japan strove to demonstrate its status as the only “modern” or “civilized” state in Asia at the world exhibitions and continuously attempted to overwhelm China with its more grandiose exhibits, including those from its colony, Taiwan. In the wake of the Hundred Days’ Reforms of 1898, Chinese intellectuals were becoming increasingly antagonistic toward the Qing government, whose incompetence and corruption were considered major reasons for the humiliating representations of China at world exhibitions, particularly those at the Osaka Exhibition of 1903 and the St. Louis Exposition of 1904. Furthermore, by taking advantage of a transnational network of publication operating beyond the control of the Qing government, the Chinese reformers and revolutionaries circulated rhetorical attacks on the Qing government, undermining its political legitimacy. They condemned the Qing government as the cause of “national humiliation.” Their coverage of the Chinese exhibit was often exaggerated, even fabricated. However, by the time the Nanyang Industrial Exposition was held in 1910, the Qing government had agreed to establish a cabinet and a parliament in order to transform China into a modern, constitutional state. As a result, the Chinese intellectuals adopted a supportive stance toward the exposition, thereby embodying the political reconciliation between the

Qing government and the Chinese intellectuals under the rhetoric of constitutionalism. This dissertation shows that the representations of China at the world exhibitions during the late Qing period bespeak, on the one hand, the obstacles China encountered in building a modern state worthy of participation in world exhibitions, and on the other, how their modernizing efforts contributed paradoxically to the undermining of its own legitimacy through transnational communication and the movement of populations in East Asia.

## **Acknowledgement**

I would like to give special thanks to all my dissertation committee members. I'm very grateful to Professor Kai-wing Chow for his academic inspiration and endless support as my advisor. I would like to thank Prof. Dan Shao, who always gives me thoughtful guidance and heartfelt encouragement. I was truly lucky to study with Professor Ronald Toby, the eminent scholar all his students, including myself, want to model themselves after. I also owe Professor Toby the opportunity to do research at Kansai University, without which I could not have completed this project. I cannot thank Professor Teemu Ruskola of Emory University enough for his generosity to be on my committee and for giving me insightful advice.

I appreciate Professor Brian Ruppert for all his support as the head of the department, without which I could not have finished this longtime project. It is ineffably regrettable that I did not finish this dissertation early enough to present it to the deceased Professor David Goodman, who taught me what a true mentor would be like.

This dissertation is the fruit of many years' research at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Beijing University, the Academia Sinica, and Kansai University, and I am indebted to many people at these institutions. I appreciate the librarians and staffers, particularly Ms. Mary Fryer, who helped smooth the process of completing my dissertation. I would like to thank Professor Tao Demin for generously letting me do research at Kansai University and inviting me to a symposium held in Shanghai, which was my first chance to present a paper at an international conference. I appreciate Mr. Ninomiya Ichirō, who allowed me to refer to his personal photocopies of the diplomatic documents of the Meiji government regarding the Osaka Exhibition. I'm very grateful to Tomoko, my old friend, for

everything she did to refresh me in Osaka and Kyoto.

My family in Korea, parents-in-law in Florida, and best friend, Hyeryon, have always bolstered me with their unconditional support. I would like to specially thank Chris, my husband, who has enriched my life with affection, trust, food, and shoes.

Lastly, I dedicate this dissertation to Lee Eulsoon, my grandmother, who, if alive, would have been proud of her granddaughter more than anyone else for this achievement. Remembering the moment when I, a ten-year old girl, was teaching my grandmother in her sixties the Korean alphabet, I will never take what is given to me for granted.

## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Chapter One: China and the World Exhibitions before 1903 .....	11
Chapter Two: China, the “Barbarian” Guest of Honor at the Osaka Exhibition of 1903 .....	47
Chapter Three: Recurrence of Trauma at the St. Louis Exposition of 1904.....	86
Chapter Four: The Nanyang Industrial Exposition of 1910, the Last Show of the Qing Dynasty .....	124
Conclusion .....	163
Bibliography .....	173

## Introduction

The Shanghai World Exposition of 2010, which enjoyed record numbers of participating countries (246) and visitors (73 million), was celebrated as another glorious event demonstrating the national prestige of China to the world after the 2008 Beijing Olympics. As it coincided with the centennial anniversary of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition of 1910, the first national exhibition of China, the Shanghai World Exhibition assumed greater historical gravity. At the time of the Shanghai Exposition, the mass media and the scholarly world of China constantly referred to Liang Qichao's political novel, *Xinzhongguo weilaiji* 新中國未來記 or *the Future of New China* (1902), which presented a Great Exhibition taking place in Shanghai in year 2062 in order to celebrate a new, or more exactly, world-dominant China, as if it were a prophecy of the Shanghai Exposition of 2010. Thus, associating Liang's *The Future of New China* with any projects related to China and the world exhibitions probably would sound like a cliché, at least to Chinese readers.

This dissertation was also partially inspired by Liang's novel, but it was more substantially motivated by the stark discrepancy between the Liang's hopeful picture of China as a future host-nation of the world exhibition and what China actually had experienced at the early world exhibitions during the late Qing period. Particularly, Japan's Osaka Exhibition of 1903 almost degraded China to the status of a "primitive" nation and even as a potential colonial subject, igniting critical reactions which were published in Chinese newspapers and journals, and which in turn influenced the reading publics of the Chinese community in Japan as well as mainland China. Thus, my project

came to engage two primary agents, Chinese publishing and Japan, in examining the Chinese experiences at the international exhibitions, particularly the Osaka Exhibition of 1903 and the St. Louis Exposition of 1904, and the Nanyang Industrial Exposition.

The existing, related scholarly works have tended to highlight China's participation in the world exhibitions at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in the light of its attempt to be a part of the modern world and the practical benefits of developing new knowledge and technology for the industrial development of China.<sup>1</sup> The Nanyang Industrial Exposition, the first and last exposition of the Qing dynasty, has also been approached in a similar vein, particularly from economic perspectives, for instance, its contribution to the development of early capitalism of China, or its manifestation of the burgeoning bourgeois class.<sup>2</sup> At this point, according to these scholarly works, it is a truism that China intended to stage its modern statehood by participating in the world exhibitions and holding its own exposition during the late Qing period.

It is undeniable that participation in the world exhibitions brought China new knowledge and technology, which would lead to industrial development, an index of a modern country. However, these scholarly works miss a significant point that there were

---

<sup>1</sup> Ma Min 馬敏, "Zhongguo zouxiang shijiede xinbufu – Qingmo shangpinsaihui huodong shuping 中國走向世界的新步幅--清末商品賽會活動述評," in *Jindaishi Yanjiu* 近代史研究, 1988-1: 115-130; Gu Weiyang 古偉瀛, "Cong 'Xuanqi' 'Saizhen' Dao 'Jiaoliu' 'Shangzhan' 從'銜奇' '賽珍'到'交流' '商戰'," in *Si Yu Yan* (思與言), Vol. 24, No.3 (1986), 1-18; Dai An'gang 戴鞍鋼, "Shibohuiyu Wanqing Jiangzhe Jingji 世博会与晚清江浙经济," in *Lishi Jiaoxue Wenti* 历史教学问题, January (2010).

<sup>2</sup> Wang Xiang 王翔, "Zhongguo Jindaihuade Yige Lichengbei 中國近代化的一個里程碑," in *Jianghai Xuekan* 江海學刊. No. 3 (1989). 131; Nozawa Yutaka 野澤豐, "Xinhai Gemingyu Chanye Wenti: 1910 Niande Nanyang Quanyehuiyu Rimei Shiyetuande Fanghua 辛亥革命與產業問題: 1910 年的南洋勸業會與日美實業團的訪華," in Zhonghua Shuji Bianjibu ed. *Jinian Xinhai Geming Qishinian Xueshutaolunhui Lunwenji* 紀念辛亥革命七十年學術討論會論文集 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1983), 2491-2492.



multiple participating agents with varying interests, visions, and rhetorics regarding the Chinese exhibit at the world exhibitions, thereby making the discourses on the Chinese presence in the world exhibitions much more complicated than are commonly assumed. By extension, the seemingly straightforward objective of the Qing government to stage its modern statehood by participating in the world exhibitions was frequently challenged and, furthermore, even its political legitimacy was thrown into question.

During the post-Boxer era, the Qing government manifested its objective of discarding its Sino-centrism, the traditional perception of Chinese status in the world, by participating in the world exhibitions, “the central politico-economic and cultural unit” of which was the nation state as a constituent part of international community.<sup>3</sup> When the imperial commissioners of the Qing government were dispatched to the Osaka Exhibition of 1903 and the St. Louis Exposition of 1904, they were treated as courteously as were those of other Euroamerican countries at the diplomatic level. For instance, the Chinese commissioners to the St. Louis Exposition of 1904 met influential figures of the U.S. government, including President Roosevelt, under the heated spotlight of local mass media. Thus, considered from the diplomatic perspective, the original objective of the Qing government to manifest its modern statehood through its participation in the world exhibitions seemed to be achieved. This was the perspective of the Qing government.

However, on the other hand, at the site of the early Euroamerican world exhibitions, where the rhetoric of imperialism struck the dominant tone, China was

---

<sup>3</sup> Penelope Harvey, *Hybrids of Modernity: Anthropology, the nation state and the universal exhibition* (London: Routledge, 1996), 50.

required to play a disagreeable role which the Qing government could not control. As Curtis M. Hinsley and Robert Rydell argue, the early world exhibitions were designed to celebrate the victory of civilized power and, thereby, to manifest the superiority of the Western world.<sup>4</sup> Thus, there was always a distinction drawn between the “civilized” and the “uncivilized” on display at the world exhibitions. In other words, the “uncivilized” others were presented as inferior beings in opposition to the superior Whites, or as exotic objects of voyeurism in the name of the science of anthropology, or as simple entertainment, often of the “freak show” variety. Thus, the Chinese people and artifacts on display served as objects of mockery and humiliation as representatives of the “lowest,” “uncivilized” people, alongside those of Africa, Native America, and the Ainu of Japan.

Worse still, in the case of China, the influences of imperialism were not only confined to the site of the world exhibitions, but also operated in the process of selecting and preparing the Chinese exhibits. The Imperial Maritime Customs had been organized by foreign consuls in 1854 as the replacement for the traditional Chinese administration of trade in the treaty port. Until its abolition in 1950, the position of the Inspector General had been unexceptionally occupied by foreigners, among whom Robert Hart enjoyed influential power, as evidenced by his longest term of office between 1863 and 1911.<sup>5</sup> By substantially controlling the trade and customs of China, the Imperial

---

<sup>4</sup> Curtis M. Hinsley, “The World as Marketplace: Commodification of the Exotic at the World’s Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893,” in Ivan Karp and Steven D. Levine eds. *Exhibiting Cultures: the Poetics and Politics of Museum Display* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1991); Robert Rydell, John Findling, and Kimberly Pelle eds., *Fair America: World’s Fairs in the United States* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000).

<sup>5</sup> The name of the Imperial Maritime Customs was changed into the Maritime Customs in 1912, when the Qing dynasty collapsed.

Maritime Customs became an index of the semi-colonial status of China. As the Imperial Maritime Customs had managed the Chinese exhibit at the world exhibitions since 1873, the selection of the Chinese items for the world exhibitions was in the hands of the foreign staff of the Imperial Maritime Customs, a product of the Western imperialism in China. Thus, the foreign staff of the Imperial Maritime Customs included items such as women's shoes for bound feet, which conformed to the imperialistic rhetoric of the early world exhibitions, but, on the other hand, enraged the Chinese people. Even after the Qing government directly engaged itself in the preparation of the Chinese exhibit at the world exhibitions, this practice continued, because the procurement of the Chinese items was still largely conducted by the foreign staff of the Imperial Maritime Customs. As a result, the Chinese exhibit including "humiliating" items provided the Chinese elites with a pretext to criticize the Qing government, thereby hindering the original objective of the Qing government to demonstrate its potential as the agent to achieve modern statehood for China through its participation in the world exhibitions.

The Chinese elites, whose relationship with the Qing government had been quite contentious since the suppression of the Hundred Days' Reforms in 1898, paid more attention to the treatment of Chinese people and items as objects of mockery than to the splendid diplomatic activities of the Qing government at the world exhibitions. In due course, this entailed the Chinese intellectuals' criticism of the overall performance of the Qing government at the world exhibitions, which thereby challenged the Qing government's original objective. Those Chinese intellectuals, including reformers, revolutionaries, and the Chinese students under their influence, could propagate their criticism among the Chinese reading publics effectively through the transnational

network of Chinese-language publications that had developed. The modern Chinese publishing industry, which had grown since the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, saw noticeable expansion with the emergence of a new wave of various journals and newspapers.<sup>6</sup> In the 1890s, reformers such as Kang Youwei 康有爲 started publishing periodicals to promote their ideas of reforms among the Chinese reading publics. When reformers involved in the Hundred Days' Reforms found themselves exiled overseas, they continued publishing journals in their host countries, which were circulated not only in the overseas Chinese community but among the reading publics in mainland China, thereby establishing an early transnational publishing network. It was soon joined by the Chinese students studying abroad, particularly those in Japan, who started publishing various students' journals.

In covering the Chinese exhibits and the performance of the Qing government at the world exhibitions, the Chinese intellectuals projected their anti-government sentiments by exaggerating, distorting, and fabricating problems. They often relied on the rhetoric of “national humiliation,” which targeted the Qing government as its cause. By doing so, they ultimately intended to undermine the legitimacy of the Qing government as the agent of transforming China into a modern state. However, by the time the Nanyang Industrial Exposition was held in 1910, the Qing government had agreed to establish a cabinet and a parliament in order to transform China into a modern, constitutional state. As a result, the Chinese intellectuals adopted a supportive stance

---

<sup>6</sup> Because of new printing technology, new modes of delivery of modern ideas, and modern management strategies, Chinese modern publishing is considered to have begun in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. Ye Zaisheng 葉再生. *Zhongguo Jindai Xiandai Chubantongshi* 中國近代現代出版通史 (Beijing: Huawen Chubanshe, 2002), 1-8.

toward the exposition, which served to embody the political reconciliation between the Qing government and the Chinese intellectuals under the rhetoric of constitutionalism.

Another agent that challenged the objective of the Qing government to manifest its modern statehood at the world exhibitions was Japan, because the latter took advantage of the world exhibitions as venues for displaying its status as the only “modern” state in Asia. Thus, Japan tried to affirm its hegemonic status in East Asia to the eyes of the fairgoers. The exact same rhetoric was applied to the Osaka Exhibition of 1903, the first international exhibition of Japan. In keeping with this rhetoric, Japan overwhelmed China with its more grandiose exhibit at the world exhibitions, creating an impression among Western viewers that a modernized and civilized Japan contrasted with a static China which remained lost in the glory of its past. Also, Japan utilized the exhibits of Taiwan, which became its colony after defeating China at the Sino-Japanese War, to demonstrate that its power surpassed that of China. Japan’s provocation at the world exhibitions aggravated the Chinese intellectuals, but, at the same time, the inevitable comparison between China and Japan provided the Chinese journals with grounds for criticizing the relative incompetence of the Qing government.

Br regarding the Chinese exhibit at the early world exhibitions, particularly the Osaka Exhibition of 1903, the St. Louis Exposition of 1904, and the Nanyang Industrial Exposition of 1910, and by examining the dynamics among, and the different rhetorics of, the Qing government, the Imperial Maritime Customs, Japan, and the Chinese intellectuals as the producers or the reading publics of the transnational Chinese-language publications, this dissertation will argue that the objective of the Qing government to stage its modern statehood through the exhibitions during the late Qing

period was differently received in accordance with the changing historical contexts.

Finally, this dissertation consists of four chapters. Chapter One, “China and the World Exhibitions before 1903,” examines the Chinese Imperial Maritime Customs (or the IMCS), Chinese travelogues and essays on the world exhibitions, and Japan’s experiences at the world exhibitions insofar as they shaped the Chinese experiences at and understanding of the world exhibitions in the West before the Osaka Exhibition of 1903. First, the IMCS under the direction of Robert Hart had been fully in charge of the Chinese exhibits at the world exhibitions since the Vienna Exhibition of 1873. This chapter will focus on how the foreign dominance of the IMCS in terms of administration and personnel influenced the way China was presented at the world exhibitions. Secondly, early Chinese travelogues and essays on the world exhibitions will show how the world exhibitions were perceived by Chinese intellectuals, and particularly by the reformers. Finally, by introducing a brief history of Japan’s experiences at the world exhibitions, I will examine the trajectory of the Meiji government’s engagement in the world exhibitions in comparison with that of the Qing government.

Chapter Two discusses the Osaka Exhibition of 1903, which became a turning point in Chinese experiences of the world exhibitions in that the Qing government, which was vigorously seeking diplomatic reconciliation with foreign powers after the Boxer Uprising, dispatched an official commission to the international exhibition for the first time. However, the malicious representations of China by the organizers of the Osaka Exhibition, the *Jinruikan* incident for instance, provoked critical responses among the Chinese reading publics which were expressed through the Chinese journals published in Japan, as well as in Chinese domestic journals. In the process, the journals published by

the exiled reformers, such as Liang Qichao and the Chinese students in Japan, projected their anti-Qing government sentiments by negatively biasing their coverage of the performance of the Qing government at the Osaka Exhibition.

Chapter Three, “Recurrence of Trauma at the St. Louis Exposition of 1904,” demonstrates that the legacies of the Osaka Exhibition of the previous year continued in the St. Louis Exposition, where China made an official debut in the world exhibitions of the West. The same kind of exhibits that enraged the Chinese people at the Osaka Exhibition, for instance, opium tools and shoes for women’s bound feet, appeared again at the St. Louis Exposition. Japan, which became more confident owing to its successful advances in the Russo-Japanese War at that time, continued to provoke China by showcasing colonial Taiwan and displaying a map of Japanese Empire that included the main cities of Northeast China and some Chinese coasts. At the entertainment quarter, some Chinese women with bound feet were displayed for a small admission fee, which infuriated the Chinese community consisting mainly of students and exiled reformers. Thus, the Chinese journals, both domestic and overseas, criticized the incompetence and corruption of the Qing government.

Chapter Four examines the Nanyang Industrial Exposition of 1910, the first and last national / international exposition of Qing China, through which the Qing government attempted to demonstrate its potential to achieve industrialization and modernization. Although the Nanyang Exposition was not as splendid as its Western counterparts, it served as a venue to bring together the overseas Chinese community of Southeast Asia as well as the Chinese people from all social standings and all parts of the country, thus displaying the integration of China. Moreover, the Qing government’s

agreement to adopt a constitutional government as the form of the modern Chinese state prevented the domestic Chinese press from associating the problems of the exposition with the government's incompetence. The Nanyang Industrial Exposition ultimately portended the possible transformation of the Qing dynasty into a modern, constitutional state, although such ambitions would be broken by the Xinhai Revolution one year later.



## **Chapter One: China and the World Exhibitions before 1903**

### **I. Chinese Imperial Maritime Customs and China's Participation in the Early World Exhibitions**

The Great Exhibition of 1851 in London was the first world exhibition of culture and industry, originating from a series of national exhibitions in Europe since the French Industrial Exposition of 1844 in Paris. In addition to twenty five countries including France, Denmark, and the United States, fifteen British colonies participated in order to demonstrate the power and glory of “the empire on which the sun never sets.” China, which had signed the Treaty of Nanjing with Britain as a result of the Opium War a decade previously, was encouraged to participate in the exhibition by the British diplomats in China. John Bowring, the British Consul at Canton, formed a committee to raise funds and recruit foreign as well as Chinese merchants for the exhibition. As a result, many artifacts and over \$8,000 were secured. Bowring, who was excited by this initial progress, asked Xu Jinyu 徐繼畲, the Governor of Fujian, for his co-operation at the Great Exhibition, expecting that, if all went well, almost every branch of Chinese art and manufacture would be presented. However, to Bowring's disappointment, Governor Xu declined to participate in the project.<sup>7</sup>

Rutherford Alcock, the British Consul in Shanghai, also attempted to introduce China and its resources at the London Exhibition. However, mirroring the indifference from the Qing government, even the Europeans in Shanghai were not so enthusiastic about the project.<sup>8</sup> Only a few Chinese compradors decided to participate in the London

---

<sup>7</sup> *The Chinese Repository*, Vol. 19 (July 1850), 404-406.

<sup>8</sup> Alexander Michie, *The Englishman in China during the Victorian era: as illustrated in the career of Sir Rutherford Alcock* (Edinburgh: W. Blackwood & Sons, 1900), Vol. 2, 102.

Exhibition individually with their silk, traditional mandarin gowns, tea and mineral products. For example, Yu Rongcun 余榮村, a Shanghai merchant, submitted his silk branded *Rongji husi* 榮記湖絲 and won an award, which was honorably recorded in the genealogy of Yu clan of Beiling 北嶺.<sup>9</sup> Alcock himself personally sent some Chinese handicrafts and artworks, for instance, inlaid wood, soapstone, and enamels, which enjoyed reputation among European and American dealers at that time.<sup>10</sup> After declining to participate in the next two world exhibitions -- the Exhibition of the Industry of All Nations in New York (1853) and the Exposition Universelle in Paris (1855)--, a few Chinese and foreign merchants from mainland China submitted their products such as vase, ivory carvings, silkworms and raw silk to the London Exhibition of 1862.<sup>11</sup>

It was the Vienna Exhibition of 1873 that the Chinese Imperial Maritime Customs began to manage the Chinese exhibits at the world exhibitions. The Imperial Maritime Customs, which will be abridged as “IMCS” from now on, was organized in 1854 to replace the traditional Chinese administration of trade, including management of customs in the treaty ports, which was badly disrupted in the wake of the Taiping Rebellion (1850-1864).<sup>12</sup> As the IMCS was initiated by foreign consuls in Shanghai, who wanted to establish a Western style customs service, it was largely staffed at senior levels by foreigners, including the position of Inspector General, although it was officially under the direction of *Zongli yamen* 總理衙門, or the Chinese Foreign

---

<sup>9</sup> Shanghai tushuguan ed. *Zhongguoyu Shibo: Lishi Jilu 1851-1940* 中國與世博：歷史記錄 1851-1940 (Shanghai: Shanghai Kexuejishu Wenxian Chupanshe, 2002), 107-109.

<sup>10</sup> Michie, Vol. 1, 201.

<sup>11</sup> London. *International Exhibition 1862: Reports by the Juries on the Subjects in the Thirty Classes into which the Exhibition was Divided* (London: William Clowes & Sons, 1863).

<sup>12</sup> Donna Brunero, *Britain's Imperial Cornerstone in China: The Chinese Maritime Customs Service, 1854-1949* (London: Routledge, 2006), 10-11.

Affairs Office, which had been instituted in 1861 in order to deal with foreign powers and related matters. In 1863, Robert Hart, the Assistant Commissioner at Guangzhou, succeeded Horatio Nelson Lay, the first General Inspector, who had been dismissed owing to his overreaching act of arrogation in arranging a British flotilla for the IMCS.<sup>13</sup> When the IMCS began to manage the Chinese exhibit at the world exhibitions, Hart made final decisions regarding the Chinese exhibits with the assistance from the IMCS staff and the *Haiguan jiandu* 海關監督, or Superintendent of Customs, of each province. In the case of the world exhibitions in Europe, James Duncan Campbell, the Non-Resident Secretary at the London Office of the IMCS, which happened to be established in 1873, the year of the Vienna Exhibition, played a considerable role.

Robert Hart's fundamental stance on China's participation in the world exhibition could be glimpsed in a circular from the IMCS about its preparations for the Vienna Exhibition of 1873, which Hart wrote on August 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1872:

I fear that, on the Chinese side, apathy, and, on the foreign, the difficulty of doing anything considerable will have severally tended to make a creditable display impossible. In order that China may not be wholly unrepresented on so interesting an occasion, and by the special invitation of the Austro-Hungarian Government, the Offices of the Inspectorate are to supply samples and specimens of articles of trade and commerce, with statistical tables exhibiting the movement of commerce and navigation at each port during the last ten years...each office (of each individual port) is to be regarded as an independent and complete collection, showing the commerce of each port separately. It is not what China takes or produces

---

<sup>13</sup> Lay's demand that the commander of the flotilla should be directly answerable to Lay and would not accept instruction from any other channel, including directives from the Emperor, agitated the Chinese leadership. Brunero, 14.

as a whole, with all duplicates shut out, that is wanted, but a complete set of specimens of the complete trade of each individual port.<sup>14</sup>

From Hart's perspective, the purpose of China's participation in the international exhibition was to introduce each port where the office of maritime customs was located and to demonstrate the capacity of each port regarding the international exchange of products, rather than presenting China as a whole, which might be impossible without the direction of the central government. At the same time, Hart himself didn't seem to welcome the involvement of the Chinese people in the affairs of his "turf." In his letter addressed to Campbell of the London Office, Hart wrote, "Some Chinese want to go (the Paris Exhibition of 1878), but I hesitate to ask the (Zongli) Yamen to put them on the Commission. *I do not want the foreign section to be swamped by the native element.*"<sup>15</sup>

By the mid 1870s, a decade after the launch of the self-strengthening movement by the Qing government, Prince Gong 恭親王, the reform-oriented leader of *Zongli yamen*, began to show interest in the world exhibitions. He provided basic guidelines about China's participation in the world exhibitions, such as designating budget allocations and sanctioning the commissioner's appointment. For instance, when the official invitation from the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition of 1876 was delivered to *Zongli yamen*, Prince Gong ordered both the Minister-superintendent of Trade in the South and the Minister-superintendent of Trade in the North to prepare the people

---

<sup>14</sup> Haiguan zong shui wu si shu ed., *Documents Illustrative of the Origin, Development, and Activities of the Chinese Customs Service* (Shanghai: Statistical Dept. of the Inspectorate general of customs, 1937-1940), Vol. 1, 273-275.

<sup>15</sup> John K. Fairbank ed., *The I. G. in Peking: letters of Robert Hart, Chinese Maritime Customs, 1868-1907* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), Vol. 1, 257. Italic and parentheses are mine.

interested in the exhibition for participation.<sup>16</sup> Then, Prince Gong told Hart to delegate staffers of the IMCS to manage the Chinese exhibit at the Philadelphia Exhibition on-site. This was a noteworthy change in the Qing government's attitude toward the world exhibition.

However, it was still foreign-dominated IMCS that continued to undertake the practical affairs of collecting and shipping Chinese articles to the world exhibitions. Robert Hart maintained his own views about the world exhibitions, which did not always coincide with those of the Qing government. For instance, although the preparation for the Chinese exhibit at the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition of 1876 proceeded as Prince Gong ordered, Hart was not so enthusiastic about China's participation in the exhibition because he believed that the Philadelphia Exhibition would be simply a "self-glorification" of the United States.<sup>17</sup> This indicates that Hart's personal or national (British) stance could be involved against China's interests.

On the other hand, the war of nerves among the European diplomats in China, who disliked the British dominance of the IMCS, challenged Hart. According to letters exchanged between Hart and Campbell, China's exhibit at the Paris Exposition of 1900 became rather a political matter in France, because the French government "didn't want an Englishman to represent China" when Campbell was appointed to be on China's Commission to the exposition.<sup>18</sup> Thus, France attempted to overshadow the British presence as such by magnifying their influence over the Chinese exhibit at the exposition

---

<sup>16</sup> "Meiguo bainian dahui jilue 美國百年大會記略" in *Gezhihuibian*, Year 2, Vol. 1 (1877).

<sup>17</sup> Jennifer Pitman, "China's Presence at the Centennial Exhibition, Philadelphia, 1876," in *Studies in the Decorative Arts*. Vol. X, No. 1 (Fall-Winter 2002-2003), 42-43; Robert Hart diaries, September 12, 1873 and Feb. 12, 1874.

<sup>18</sup> Fairbank, Vol. 2, 1176.

in their own way. Charles Vapereau, who had been a French teacher at *Tongwenguan* 同文館, was finally appointed to be the Commissioner General of China to the Paris Exposition in charge of both the Chinese exhibit and the construction of the Chinese Pavilion.<sup>19</sup> However, the Foreign Office of France was not satisfied and continued to exert pressure on the Qing government to the extent that a Chinese minister of *Zongli yamen* exclaimed, “Better not exhibit at all,” although the Chinese exhibit would be eventually displayed at the exposition.<sup>20</sup> As with all other matters related to the diplomatic activities of China at that time, the Qing government hardly led the initiative in organizing its participation in the world exhibition.

Another problem caused by the fact that affairs regarding the world exhibition were in the hands of the IMCS was that the presence of a Chinese presentation at the world exhibitions tended to be perceived as an exemplification of the competence of the foreign authority of the IMCS. By extension, it implicitly justified the “service” of foreigners, which was actually no less than the encroachment on China’s tariff autonomy. An article in *The Times* about the Chinese collection at the London Fishery Exhibition of 1883 claimed:

To the surprise of everyone, China has been the first nation to put in an appearance. But when it is known that Sir Robert Hart, the I.G. of Chinese Customs, acting under the instructions of the Chinese Government, undertook only in September last the preparation of the collection in China, and that Mr. Campbell, his representative in London, has made arrangements for its instalment (sic.). *Here only*

---

<sup>19</sup> Regarding Vapereau’s performance, Hart opined, “Vapereau seems to be running his title of Commissaire General for all it is worth.” Fairbank, Vol. 2, 1155.

<sup>20</sup> Fairbank, Vol. 2, 1176.

*one more proof is afforded of the efficiency of the European Customs Service as a department of the Chinese government.*<sup>21</sup>

In this sense, the IMCS tended to highlight the successful aspects of the Chinese exhibit. For instance, regarding the Chinese exhibit at the Vienna Exhibition, Hart wrote in his diary: “At Vienna [Exhibition] everything going on splendidly... [The] Chinese collection surprises all by the richness and completeness, and ... it is a decided success. Hurrah!”<sup>22</sup> When China participated in the three London Exhibitions of Fisheries (1883), Health (1884), and Inventions (1885), Campbell, the Non-Resident Secretary at the London Office of the IMCS, remarked, “The ignorance of most Englishmen about China and everything Chinese had been simply colossal, but these three exhibitions, at any rate in the case of those who were fortunate enough to see them, did something to remove this ignorance, and Englishmen began to look upon China with greater appreciation and with more friendly eyes.”<sup>23</sup>

China’s presence at the world exhibitions probably evoked positive responses as Hart and Campbell claimed, but there were also more sinister aspects of the way China was presented at the exhibitions. China’s exhibit at the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1867, which centered on decorative arts, hardly drew attention other than criticism that the Chinese items simply demonstrated old techniques and inferior standards.<sup>24</sup> At the London Exhibition of Inventions (1885), a British newspaper evaluated China’s exhibit in highly unfavorable terms: “So far as modern mechanical inventions were concerned,

---

<sup>21</sup> Robert Ronald Campbell. *James Duncan Campbell: A Memoir by his son* (Cambridge: East Asian Research Center, Harvard University, 1970), 53. Italic is mine.

<sup>22</sup> Pitman, 41-42; Robert Hart diaries, July 22, 1873.

<sup>23</sup> Campbell, 56-57.

<sup>24</sup> Pitman, 40.

China of course had little or nothing to show; her great inventions had related to the past.”<sup>25</sup> As it will be discussed in the following chapters, China’s presence at the world exhibitions was always associated with the Celestial Empire’s past glory. Considering the developmental stage of Chinese industry at the time, this association may have been inevitable aspect and, of course, China was not the only non-European country that had the same problem. For instance, regarding the Japanese exhibit at the Philadelphia Exhibition of 1876, Kikuchi Takeo 菊池武夫, a Japanese student studying in the United States at that time, commented, “I couldn’t help but blush among the handiwork from the island country.”<sup>26</sup> However, the fundamental problem was that the “backwardness” of China’s exhibit at the world exhibitions was not a matter of concern for the IMCS, which had no responsibility for the industrial development of China, let alone China’s national pride.

Moreover, the rhetoric of power embedded in the early world exhibitions forced China to play the role of “inferior” other. According to Tony Bennett, the rhetoric of power, which manifested “by its ability to organize an order of things and to produce a place for the people in relation to that order,” distinguished the subjects and the objects of power in the exhibition. Moreover, as this rhetoric of power was associated with that of imperialism, the distinction occurred not within the national body, but between that body and the uncivilized other on whose body the effects of power were exerted.<sup>27</sup> By extension, such distinctions propagated the notion of the racial superiority of the Anglo-

---

<sup>25</sup> Campbell, 56.

<sup>26</sup> Kuni Takeyuki 國雄行, *Hakurankai to Meiji no Nihon* 博覧会と明治の日本 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2010), 79-80.

<sup>27</sup> Bennett, 67.



Saxons, the subject of imperial power, as a way to unite Whites, regardless of social class, at the expense of racially determined “others.”<sup>28</sup> Thus, at the site of the early world exhibitions of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the “uncivilized” others were displayed as inferior beings in opposition to White superiority, or as the exotic objects of voyeurism in the name of the science of anthropology, or simply entertainment, often of “freak show” variety.

Thus, at the Colonial and Indian Exhibition held in London in 1886, some Hong Kong Chinese were displayed alongside other British colonial subjects, such as the Indians and the Burmese.<sup>29</sup> More generally, Chinese people were displayed as exotic objects in the entertainment sections of the exhibitions. For instance, at the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1867, a Chinese pavilion was created by a local promoter to serve Chinese food and present Chinese music, both of which were altered to suit the taste of Europeans. Three teenaged Chinese girls served alcohol at the pavilion and had their photographs taken for the visitors.<sup>30</sup> As a part of the freak show, a Chinese giant and a decapitated head were displayed.<sup>31</sup> In addition, Li Shilian and Xie Damin, two Chinese men from Nanjing, were hired for a “race” show, alongside the performances of a Cantonese performance troupe at the entertainment quarter. A request for the withdrawal of these two men by a Chinese official was not accepted by the authority of

---

<sup>28</sup> Robert Rydell, John Findling, and Kimberly Pelle eds., *Fair America: World's Fairs in the United States* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000), 19.

<sup>29</sup> Burton Benedict, “The Anthropology of World’s Fairs,” in Burton Benedict ed. *The Anthropology of World’s Fairs: San Francisco’s Panama Pacific International Exposition of 1915* (Berkeley: Lowie Museum of Anthropology, 1983), 46.

<sup>30</sup> Shibusawa Eiichi 澁澤榮一. *Kōsei nikki* 航西日記 (Tokyo: Taikan Dōsha, 1871), 93-94.

<sup>31</sup> Benedict, 56.

the exposition.<sup>32</sup> Similarly, The Trans-Mississippi and International Exposition of 1898 held in Omaha included a Chinese Village. Although it was originally advertised to show “sly tricks of the heathen Chinese,” it turned out to be nothing but a souvenir shop because the Chinese people brought from mainland China had disappeared into the immigrant labor force.<sup>33</sup>

The existence of the Chinese people as exotic and, often, humiliating objects became a regular part of the entertainment sections at the early world exhibitions. However, the foreign staffers of the IMCS dispatched to the world exhibitions did not problematize this phenomenon. They probably thought that it was beyond the purview of their responsibility, because the entertainment sections, often arranged by individual promoters, were not part of the official exhibitions. Besides, they were likely to view the problem from a European perspective, which would never understand the lament of a Chinese visitor about the performance of a troupe from Shanghai at the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1900: “It is quite grotesque and disgraceful. If we Chinese people had paid attention to industry even a little bit, how could we have reached such a hopeless situation as this?”<sup>34</sup>

To make it worse, the Orientalist taste of the foreign staffers of the IMCS influenced the selection of articles for the official Chinese exhibit, which resulted in the inclusion of problematic objects, from the perspective of the Chinese people. According to Circular No. 5 of 1872 regarding the preparation for the Vienna Exhibition of 1873, Hart instructed, “In addition to specimens of the commerce of the port, I think it may be

---

<sup>32</sup> *Qingguo Liuxuesheng Huiguan di 2 ci Baogao* 清國留學生會館第2次報告, 15.

<sup>33</sup> Rydell et al., 46-47.

<sup>34</sup> *Waijiaobao*, Vol. 39 (January, 1903).

possible to send for exhibition various articles *peculiar to the locality*: e.g. Agricultural implements, Tools, Models of Junks, etc.”<sup>35</sup> Accordingly, a category of exhibits named “Class D” including “miscellaneous specimens of articles used in or peculiar to the locality” was created, and articles appropriate to this category were selected by the foreign commissioners of the local offices of the IMCS. As a result, some articles in Class D, which simply looked “peculiar to the locality of China” to the eyes of the IMCS commissioners, for instance, women’s shoes for bound feet and opium tools, would become humiliating eyesores to the Chinese people. Later, these articles would provoke severe criticism of the IMCS and, furthermore, the Qing government, as will be discussed in the following chapters.

## **II. Early Chinese Travelogues and Essays on the World Exhibitions**

### **1) The 1860s: Bin Chun and Wang Tao**

After the Second Opium War and the following Anglo-French Invasion of 1860, China was forced to open up to the Western powers, first with the establishment of foreign legations in Beijing. Under such circumstances, the Qing government reluctantly began to perceive the necessity of securing information about the Western world. Thus, the 1860s saw the beginning of Chinese missions to Europe, both official and unofficial, which resulted in the publication of various travelogues about European society and culture.

When Robert Hart proposed to take some Chinese students of *Tongwenguan*, a

---

<sup>35</sup> Hai guan zong shui wu si shu , Vol. 1, 276. Italic is mine.

government school for teaching Western languages which was founded in Beijing in 1862, to Europe by taking advantage of his return to Ireland on his furlough, the Qing government allowed it on the condition that their trip would be strictly informal without any diplomatic significance. Bin Chun 斌椿, a 63 year old Manchu Bannerman, was appointed to lead this first Chinese mission to the West in 1866, which consisted of three Chinese students of *Tongwenguan*, two foreign staffers of the Maritime Customs, Bin Chun's son, and six servants.<sup>36</sup> While staying in London, Bin Chun had a chance to visit the Crystal Palace, thereby becoming the first Chinese official to observe the site of the London Exhibition of 1851. However, he simply described the appearance of the Crystal Palace in his travelogue, *Chengchabiji* 乘槎筆記, without associating it with the exhibition, which implied his ignorance of the world exhibition.<sup>37</sup> This was also true of Zhang Deyi, a member of Bin's mission as a student in the English department of *Tongwenguan*, who also wrote a travelogue, *Oumei huanyouji* 歐美環游記.<sup>38</sup>

Wang Tao 王韜, an influential translator, journalist, and thinker during the late Qing period, had an opportunity to visit the site of the Exposition Universelle of 1867 in Paris en route to Scotland, where he was supposed to assist James Legge in the

---

<sup>36</sup> Knight Biggerstaff, "The Chinese Mission of Investigation Sent to Europe" in *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 6, No.4 (Dec., 1937), 310-311. The three Chinese students were Feng Yi 鳳儀, Zhang Deyi 張德彝, and Yan Hui 彥慧 and the staffers of the Maritime Customs were Edward Charles Bowra (English) and E. de Champs (French).

<sup>37</sup> Bin Chun 斌椿, *Chengchabiji* 乘槎筆記 in Zhong Shuhe 鍾叔河 ed. *Zou xiang shi jie cong shu* 走向世界叢書 Vol. 1 (Changsha: Hunan ren min chu ban she, 1980), 25.

<sup>38</sup> Zhang Deyi 張德彝, *Oumei huanyouji* 歐美環游記 in Zhong Shuhe 鍾叔河 ed. *Zou xiang shi jie cong shu* 走向世界叢書 Vol. 12 (Changsha: Hunan ren min chu ban she, 1980). Zhang Deyi accompanied Guo Songtao to Europe as an English interpreter in 1867, and this journey was recorded in his travelogue *Suishi riji* 隨使日記. Zhang himself became the Chinese Minister to England (1901-1905).

translation of Chinese classics into English.<sup>39</sup> However, when Tao arrived at Paris in January, 1868, he couldn't observe the exposition, which closed about two months previously. Thus, later in his travelogue about this European travel, Wang simply wrote a brief description of the exposition site.<sup>40</sup> If he had observed the exposition in person, the introduction of the world exhibition to the Chinese reading publics might have been advanced through *Xunhuan ribao* 循環日報, which Wang Tao founded in Hong Kong in 1874.

## 2) The 1870s: Li Gui, *Gezhihuibian*, Guo Songtao, Li Shuchang, and Zeng Jize

Almost a decade after Bin Chun and Wang Tao's visit to the site of exhibitions in Europe, Li Gui 李圭, who had worked as a secretary at Ningbo Customs Office, was personally asked to attend the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition by Gustav Detring, then Chefoo Customs Commissioner.<sup>41</sup> As Li's major responsibility was to document the event, the first chapter of his travelogue, *Huanyoudiqiuxinlu* 環游地球新錄, which recorded his entire journey from May, 1876 through January, 1877, provides a detailed description of the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition.<sup>42</sup> *Huanyoudiqiuxinlu* was not only carried in *Shenbao* 申報, a Shanghai daily newspaper, in 1877, but also published in book form, the first printing of which was underwritten by *Zongli yamen*, or the

---

<sup>39</sup> Paul Cohen, *Between Tradition and Modernity: Wang T'ao and Reform in Late Ch'ing China* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974), 67-70.

<sup>40</sup> The original title of the travelogue is *Manyoushui lu* 漫游随录, which was published in 1890.

<sup>41</sup> The Maritime Customs commissioners to the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition were Gustav Detring, James Hart (Robert Hart's brother), Alfred Huber, Edward Drew, and J. L. Hammond.

<sup>42</sup> The title of the first chapter is "Meijuijilüe 美國紀略." Li Gui, *Huanyoudiqiuxinlu* 環游地球新錄 (Changsha: Hunan renmin chubanshe, 1980): 1-43.

Chinese Foreign Affairs Office.<sup>43</sup> As indicated by the fact that Li Hongzhang 李鴻章, the spearhead of *Yangwu yundong* 洋務運動, or the Self-Strengthening movement, wrote the foreword for Li's book, *Huanyoudiqiuxinlu* exerted an influence among reform-oriented Chinese people.<sup>44</sup> In the same year, *Gezhihuibian* 格致彙編, or *The Chinese Scientific*, whose chief editor was John Fryer, an English translator and missionary, also carried an article about the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition based on a report and pictures from Fryer's friend in the United States.<sup>45</sup> Thus, the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition of 1876 became the first world exhibition to be introduced to the Chinese reading publics in general.

In his travelogue, which described the main pavilions of the Centennial Exhibition in detail (Main Building, Machinery Hall, Art Gallery, Agricultural Hall, Horticultural Hall, the American Government Building, and the Women's Pavilion), Li Gui remarked on his changed view of the exhibition:

At first I thought it was meaningless for the U.S. to hold this exhibition, but now I came to understand the purposes of the exhibition: cultivating friendship between nations, improving human talent, and promoting the spread of products. Linking those who lack with those who have is advantageous to a country. The thirty seven countries that participated in this exhibition also would gain benefits worth their

---

<sup>43</sup> Li Gui. *A Journey to the East: Li Gui's New Account of a Trip around the Globe*. trans. Charles Desnoyers. (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2004), 46.

<sup>44</sup> The Self-Strengthening Movement advocated for a series of reforms ranging from the adoption of Western firearms to the promotion of industry, which the Qing government sought in the wake of the Taiping Rebellion.

<sup>45</sup> "Meiguo bainian dahui jilue 美國百年大會記略" in *Gezhihuibian*, Year 2, Vol. 1 (1877), 1. Interestingly, *Gezhihuibian* associated the publication of the article with its wish to establish a museum in Shanghai: "The establishment of a museum in Shanghai has been long planned. If we could emulate the system of the Centennial Exhibition, it would be great."

expenses. Thus, this exhibition is not meaningless at all.<sup>46</sup>

Regarding the Chinese exhibit at the Main Building, where exhibits from thirty-seven countries were arranged on racial and geographical lines, Li wrote quite positively that the Chinese exhibits on display were beautifully designed and evoked admiration and exclamation among the visitors, although spatial constraints rendered the display somewhat cluttered.<sup>47</sup> The article of *Gezhihuibian* also wrote that all the Chinese exhibits at the Main Building were so unique and elegant that visitors from different countries uniformly exalted them.”<sup>48</sup> However, as a matter of fact, the opinions of the local fairgoers about the Chinese exhibit were not as positive as the article *Gezhihuibian* asserted, which will be discussed in more detail in the latter part of this chapter. From the perspective of Fryer’s friend, who sent a report about the Centennial Exhibition to *Gezhihuibian*, it would be indiscreet for him to make any critical comments no matter how he actually felt. In the same way, it would be difficult for Li Gui, who joined the Chinese commissioners to the exhibition through personal connection, to mention any controversial matters directly.

On the other hand, regarding the way the Chinese people were treated at the exhibition, Li Gui mentioned a couple of incidents which could be more critically interpreted. Li wrote, “As the Chinese people the foreigners usually saw at the exhibition were wearing working clothes, crowds persisted in approaching one (like myself) dressed nicely in order to take a close look. All the people talked to me kindly and showed

---

<sup>46</sup> Li Gui, 203-204.

<sup>47</sup> Li Gui, 206-207.

<sup>48</sup> *Gezhihuibian*, Year 2, Vol. 1 (1877), 7.

respect with their good wishes. Nevertheless, I could not help feeling there is no way of escape whenever surrounded by crowds.<sup>49</sup> Li's elaborate dress probably provoked a more cautious response from the crowd, but this still indicates the racism common among American people at that time: "After the opening ceremony, Turks, Egyptians, Japanese, and Chinese were followed by American crowds, who shouted at them as if they had been animals of a strange species."<sup>50</sup>

The Paris Exposition Universelle of 1878 eventually saw the appearance of the Chinese high officials at the site of exhibition, although they were not dispatched as commissioners. The Chefoo Convention of 1876, a treaty between the Qing and Britain, which was arranged to resolve "Margary Affair," resulted in the official mission of apology to Britain.<sup>51</sup> Guo Songtao 郭嵩燾, who led the mission leaving Shanghai in December, 1876, became the first permanent representative of China in Europe, as he was appointed to be the Minister to Britain and, later, France. However, Guo's outspoken advocacy of European civilization and modernization, which circulated in China through his journal and letters, caused strong indignation among conservatives to the extent that Guo's impeachment and punishment were demanded. Guo was eventually recalled to China in 1878, where influential figures of the Self-Strengthening Movement, such as Li Hongzhang and Zeng Jize 曾紀澤, the eldest son of Zeng Guofan 曾國藩 were barely

---

<sup>49</sup> Li Gui, 205.

<sup>50</sup> Robert Rydell, *All the World's a Fair: visions of empire at American international expositions, 1876-1916* (Chicago: the University of Chicago Press, 1984), 14.

<sup>51</sup> "Margary Affairs" refers to the incident in which Augustus R. Margary, a British diplomat, and his staff were murdered on his return from Burma in 1875, where they explored trade routes between British India and China.



able to protect him.<sup>52</sup> Before his return to China, Guo had an opportunity to visit the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1878. His observation of the exposition was recorded in his diary about his experiences in London and Paris.

Before Guo's visit to the Exposition Universelle in 1878, he had a certain degree of knowledge about the world exhibitions. When he talked to Mr. Payne, a British scholar, about establishing a museum in Shanghai, Payne remarked, "The London Exhibition of 1851, which had displayed exhibits from various countries, brought enormous benefits to Britain. Thus, if a museum to be built in Shanghai emulates the London Exhibition, it would improve knowledge among the Chinese people and bring benefits to China."<sup>53</sup> As British authorities began to discuss the particulars of the project of establishing a museum in Shanghai, Guo happened to consult Ueno Kagenori 上野景範, then Japanese Minister to Britain, to attain brief outlines of the exhibitions of both Japan and the West.<sup>54</sup> Thus, Guo had basic knowledge about world exhibitions when he visited the Exposition Universelle. However, Guo didn't write much about the exposition in his diary other than describing the opening ceremony he attended on May 1<sup>st</sup>. Actually, the most noticeable anecdote took place at a museum of *Les Invalides*, or The National Residence of the Invalids, where Gu bitterly lamented Chinese, Japanese, and Indian figures among those of native or "barbarian" peoples from various areas, being half

---

<sup>52</sup> J.D. Frodsham, *The First Chinese Embassy to the West: The Journals of Kuo sung-t'ao, Liu hsi-hung and Chang te-yi* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), lviii-lxi. Guo Songtao became a friend of Zeng Guofan at Yuelu 嶽麓 academy in Hunan.

<sup>53</sup> Guo Songtao 郭嵩燾. *Guo Songtaodeng shixiji liuzhong* 郭嵩燾等使西記六種 (Beijing: Jingxiao xinhua shudian, 1998), 101.

<sup>54</sup> In his conversation with Sir M. Stephenson and Mr. Payne, Guo was told that for that project China could borrow 20,000 pounds from Britain at 6% interest. All the materials necessary for building the museum would be shipped from Britain without intervention from China. Guo, 122.

naked and covered with ethnic ornaments or tattoos.<sup>55</sup> Li Shuchang 黎庶昌, who accompanied Guo Songtao as a third councilor, at least recorded his observation of the Exposition Universelle in his travelogue, *Xiyangzazhi* 西洋雜誌.<sup>56</sup> However, Li simply described the surroundings and the external appearance of the exhibition site, enumerating the exhibits, including Chinese ones, without any critical opinions of his own. From his narrative tone, particularly his appreciation of electric lights and balloons, he seemed to perceive the exposition simply as an exciting and marvelous event without any greater significance.

Marquis Zeng Jize was appointed to be the Minister to London and Paris as Guo Songtao's successor. Marquis Zeng also visited the site of the Exposition Universelle of 1878, Chinese exhibit of which he strongly criticized in his travelogue, *Shixiriji* 使西日記:

The Chinese exhibit lacks its core. It doesn't even include representative products of China such as silk and tea. Neither porcelain nor Suzhou's embroidery is exquisite. Nothing is worthwhile. Dignified China doesn't even match the island people of Japan. How did China commit the error of entrusting the Chinese exhibit to Westerners, whereas the native Japanese people are in charge of their own exhibit? This is certainly because of Chinese people's lack of knowledge. I am told that there are supervisors of the Chinese exhibit, but I dare not overstep someone's bounds. How can I explain the reason in detail here?<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Guo, 180.

<sup>56</sup> Li Shuchang 黎庶昌, *Xiyang zazhi* 西洋雜誌 (Changsha: Hunan renmin chubanshe, 1981).

<sup>57</sup> Zeng Jize 曾紀澤, *Shixi Riji* 使西日記 (Changsha: Hunan renmin chubanshe, 1981), 14.

Unlike his predecessors, who wrote travelogues about the Chinese exhibit at the Western exhibitions, Marquis Zeng exceptionally pointed out two fundamental problems of the Chinese exhibit: entrusting the IMCS with the affairs of the Chinese exhibit, and the poor quality of the Chinese products. These would be constantly criticized by the Chinese journals less than thirty years later. However, it was unlikely that his criticism had immediate repercussions among the Chinese elites, because his travelogue was not published in China until 1890s, as were Guo Songtao's and Li Shuchang's travelogues.<sup>58</sup>

### **3) Before the Osaka Exhibition of 1903: Reformers' Ideas on the World Exhibitions**

In addition to the publication of travelogues of Zeng Jize, Guo Songtao, and Li Shuchang, the 1890s became a turning point with the appearance of a different kind of rhetoric about the world exhibitions, which associated the world exhibitions with the reformation of China. In other words, whereas the previous writings about the world exhibition were mostly simple descriptions of the world exhibitions by those who visited in person, the new discourses about the world exhibition were led by the Chinese elites, who understood the significance of the world exhibitions in the context of reformation. It was Zheng Guanying 鄭觀應, who ushered in such a change. Zheng, who studied English at *Yinghua xuetaang* 英華學堂, or the Anglo-Chinese School, and managed the Shanghai Cotton Cloth Mill and the China Merchants' Steamship Navigation Company, represented the merchant-reformer, a new type of Chinese intellectual arising in modern

---

<sup>58</sup> *Shixiriji* was first published by Kiangnan Arsenal in 1893, and reprinted the following year.

Chinese urbanization during the late Qing period.<sup>59</sup> He discussed the world exhibition in an essay titled *Saihui* 賽會, which was included in his book *Shengshiweiyan* 盛世危言, or *Words of Warning in a Flourishing*.

As one of the earliest figures who insisted on “commercial warfare” against Western economic imperialism for economic nationalism of China and who paid attention to the status of China in the new world order, Zheng in this essay analyzed the world exhibitions in the context of the economic development of the West, in addition to providing a detailed introduction of the Chicago World’s Columbia Exposition of 1893: “The Western countries are based on commerce, whose promotion consisted of exhibitions, companies, and taxation, because commerce is oriented, managed, and maintained by these three elements respectively.”<sup>60</sup> After enumerating various advantages brought by exhibitions to a nation and its people, Zheng argued China should hold its own exhibitions as well:

Every year the commerce of China is deteriorating, the energy of people is exhausted, and national finance is declining. However, we still claim that we are a big nation and others are small countries, thereby ignoring a way of being a rich and strong nation. Is indifference to the sufferings of people the true mindset of our sages? In order to strengthen China, we must promote commerce. To promote commerce, we must hold exhibitions, the site of which should be

---

<sup>59</sup> Guo Wu, *Zheng Guanying: merchant reformer of late Qing China and his influence on economics, politics, and society* (Amherst: Cambria Press, 2010). The Anglo-Chinese School in Shanghai was established by the Church Missionary Society in 1865. Its first president was John Fryer.

<sup>60</sup> Zheng Guanying 鄭觀應, *Shengshiweiyan zengding xinbian* 盛世危言增訂新編 (Taipei: Taiwan xuesheng shuju, 1965), 785.

Shanghai because of its confluence of China and the West and convenience of traffic and communication.<sup>61</sup>

Zheng's proposal of holding exhibits in China was anything but a simple rhetorical statement in that it touched on specific matters such as the conditions of exhibition site, budget distribution, invitation of foreign nations, involvement of the Chinese officials in the affairs of the exhibition, domestic advertisement through newspapers, creation of general regulations of exhibitions and so on. Furthermore, Zheng showed his confidence about China's future exhibition by claiming, "China's national exhibition, which would be held after the practice of several small local exhibitions for ten years, could surpass that of the East and even compete with those of the West."<sup>62</sup> Thus, Zheng can be considered the first advocate of holding exhibitions in China. Furthermore, considering the fact that *Words of Warning in a Flourishing* was reprinted more than 20 times after the Sino-Japanese War, Zheng's discussion about the exhibition must have been quite influential among the Chinese reading publics at that time.<sup>63</sup>

Chen Chi 陳熾, another reformist thinker, who supervised Zheng Guanying's *Shengshiweiyan* and wrote its preface, also inserted a short article titled *Saihui* 賽會 in his book, *Yongshu* 庸書. Although Chen's article was mainly in line with Zheng's argument that China must hold its own exhibition to promote Chinese economy, it made one distinctive point by associating the recent development of Japan with exhibitions:

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 780-790.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., 791.

<sup>63</sup> Therefore, *Words of Warning in a Flourishing* came to have the most editions in Chinese publishing history. Guo Wu, 143; Xia Dongyuan 夏東元, *Zheng Guanying* 鄭觀應 (Guangzhou: Guangdong renmin chubanshe, 1995), 88.

“By emulating the Western exhibitions, Japan has been holding various exhibitions, which thorough research led to the growth of national power and wealth.”<sup>64</sup> Furthermore, after describing the deteriorating Chinese economy at that time, Chen self-mockingly asked, “Why do you think Great Nation (China) is now laughed at by Japan?” This remark reveals the Chinese elite’s anxiety over the rapid growth of Japan overwhelming China even before the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War.<sup>65</sup>

Another noteworthy point is that Chen Chi was a founding member of *Qiangxuehui* 強學會, or the Society for National Strengthening, which was organized by Kang Youwei in 1895 with the platform of reformation and establishment of the national assembly. Before Kang organized the Society for National Strengthening, he had submitted his famous petition to the Emperor against the Treaty of Shimonoseki after the Sino-Japanese War. In this petition, Kang also mentioned the exhibition, although briefly, as an instrument of enlightening people and promoting superior products over inferior ones through comparison with the West.<sup>66</sup> When the Qing government rejected Kang’s petition, which was co-signed by *jinshi* candidates who gathered in Beijing for the civil service examination in the spring of 1895, a protest movement of thousands of people, historically known as the *Gongche Shangshu* 公車上書, occurred, but failed in achieving its goals. Also, the Society for National Strengthening was dissolved in January, 1896, by the Empress Dowager, who strictly

---

<sup>64</sup> Chen Chi 陳熾, *Yongshu* 庸書 in Zhongyang yanjiuyuan 中央研究院 ed., *Jindai zhongguo dui xifang ji lieqiang renshi ziliao huibian* 近代中國對西方及列強認識資料彙編 (Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo, 1972-1990), 452-453.

<sup>65</sup> Chen’s book, *Yongshu*, was completed in 1893, a year before the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War.

<sup>66</sup> Kang Youwei 康有為, *Shangqingdi diershu* 上清帝第二書.

prohibited its political activities, thereby marking the prelude of the animosity between the Empress Dowager and the reformers led by Kang Youwei.

However, Kang Youwei and his followers did not give up and continued to promote reform ideas through various journals, one of which was *Zhixinbao* 知新報 published in Macao in 1897. In *Zhixinbao*, Liu Zhenlin 劉楨麟, another reformist figure, contributed an article titled “China Should Hold an Exhibition to Enhance its Commerce.”<sup>67</sup> As the title of his article indicated, Liu’s argument was basically the same as Zheng Guanying’s and Chen Chi’s. However, Liu’s article is still noteworthy in that it testifies to a constant interest in exhibitions as an effective means to promote the economy of China among the reformists in the 1890s. When Kang Youwei and his followers eventually commanded the Hundred Days’ Reforms with the sponsorship of the Emperor Guangxu 光緒 in 1898, holding an exhibition in China seemed distinctly possible. For instance, Pan Shengnian 潘盛年, a Chinese official of the Board of Works, submitted a memorial to the Qing courts to propose holding an exhibition in Beijing. However, the memorial was submitted exactly a week before Empress Cixi’s coup to terminate the Hundred Days’ Reforms, and thus it received no consideration.

After the Hundred Days’s Reforms fell through, the survived leaders continued their political activities in exile. While Kang Youwei organized *Baohuanghui* 保皇會, or the Protect the Emperor Society, in Canada in 1899, Liang Qichao 梁啟超, Kang’s prominent disciple, propagated reformist ideas in Yokohama, Japan. In that vein, Liang

---

<sup>67</sup> Zhongyang yanjiuyuan 中央研究院 ed., *Jindai zhongguo dui xifang ji lieqiang renshi ziliao huibian* 近代中國對西方及列強認識資料彙編 (Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo, 1972-1990): 709-714. The original title of the article is *Lun Zhongguo yi kai saihui yi xing shangwu* 論中國宜開賽會以興商務.

published a ten-day report, *Qingyibao* 清議報, in December, 1898, although the nominal chief-editor was Feng Jingru 馮鏡如 owing to Liang's status of a political exile. As one of the earliest Chinese journals published abroad, alongside *Tiannanxinbao* 天南新報 of Singapore and *Dongyabao* 東亞報 of Kobe, *Qingyibao* circulated not only in Japan but also in mainland China through the overseas Chinese community in Japan.<sup>68</sup> In addition to reformist ideas, *Qingyibao* served to introduce the Chinese reading publics to news and affairs of the West, among which were the world exhibitions. For instance, it carried the opening address of the Exposition Universelle of 1900 by the French president, Émile Loubet, which was soon followed by an article describing the exposition in detail.<sup>69</sup> The article enumerated and evaluated the exhibits of approximately twenty nations from Italy to Bosnia positively in general, except for those of Japan: "Japan displays many exhibits, but all of them are artworks, which are laughed at by the Europeans. Also, as the Japanese merchants can't speak French, their sales are insignificant. The only nations worse than Japan are Finland and Iran."<sup>70</sup> Interestingly, although China also displayed exhibits at the exposition and, as mentioned earlier, a troupe from Shanghai was performing, this article didn't mention them at all.<sup>71</sup>

Furthermore, Liang Qichao incorporated the world exhibition in his political novel, *Xinzhongguo weilaiji* or *The Future of New China* (1902) both as a setting and a

<sup>68</sup> Particularly, *Tiannanxinbao* aimed to propagandize Kang Youwei's ideas in South Asia.

<sup>69</sup> *Qingyibao*, "Wanguo Bolanhui Kaihui Yanshuo 萬國博覽會開會演說," No. 50 (July, 1900): 14; *Qingyibao*, "Faguo Bolanhui Xiangji 法國博覽會詳紀," No. 55 (September, 1900): 11-14.

<sup>70</sup> *Qingyibao*, "Faguo Bolanhui Xiangji 法國博覽會詳紀," No. 55 (September, 1900), 11.

<sup>71</sup> Another article regarding the world exhibitions concerned the International World Exhibition in Tonkin (now Hanoi) of 1902. *Qingyibao*, "Henei Faya Bolanhui 河內法亞博覽會," No. 97 (November, 1901), 15-16.



primary theme, alongside constitutionalism and peace.<sup>72</sup> *The Future of New China* begins with an international peace conference in Nanjing in year 2062, when new China is celebrating the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of its *Weixin* 維新 or reformation, which spontaneously reminded contemporary readers of the failed reformation of 1898. In the conference, the representatives of all of the world's nations ratify the Pact of Great Peace under the leadership of China. Meanwhile, a Great Exhibition takes place in Shanghai. Obviously, here, the peace conference and the exhibition signify the leading political and economic status of future China as accepted by the world.<sup>73</sup>

In the same year of 1902, *Shangwuyinshuguan* 商務印書館 or the Shanghai Commercial Press, which was organized by the active reformists such as Zhang Yuanpei 張元培 and Zhang Yuanji 張元濟, published *Waijiaobao* 外交報, the first Chinese journal specializing in foreign affairs and international issues. The 10<sup>th</sup> issue carried a translated article about the history and effects of the world exhibitions and, more importantly, a story on the following year's Osaka Exhibition from a Japanese journal.<sup>74</sup> The Chinese reading publics, which had accumulated knowledge about the world exhibitions through various travelogues as well as writings by the reformer thinkers, probably paid attention to this article to the extent that they would consider visiting the

---

<sup>72</sup> *The Future of New China* was carried in *Xinxiaoshuo* 新小說, a literary journal founded by Liang himself in 1902. Although unfinished, this novel was the first modern political novel of China, which was influenced by the political novels of Meiji Japan. Regarding the influences of Meiji Japan's literature on Liang's political novel, see Hiroko Willcock, "Japanese Modernization and the Emergence of New Fiction in Early Twentieth Century China: A Study of Liang Qichao," in *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 4 (Oct., 1995): 817-840.

<sup>73</sup> Another example of this sort is Wu Jianren 吳趸人's late Qing novel, *The New Story of the Stone* 新石頭記 (1905), which describes both an International Peace Convention in Beijing with the Chinese emperor as the chairman and a Great International Exhibition in Shanghai.

<sup>74</sup> *Waijiaobao*, "Lun Bolanhuizhi Yanghe Gongxiao 論博覽會之沿革功效," No. 10 (April, 1902).

event in a neighboring country. In addition, the enhanced interest in Japan among the Chinese elites after the Sino-Japanese War, which handed China a shocking loss, would contribute to creating such an atmosphere. However, the future Chinese visitors to the Osaka Exhibition were not actually ready for the embarrassment they would experience at the Osaka Exhibition at all, because their knowledge about the world exhibition was incomplete. Like the travelogues, even the writings by reformist thinkers, none of whom had observed the world exhibition in person, depicted the world exhibitions as a wondrous event promoting national industry wealth and power without stating the imperialistic and racist practices of the world exhibitions at all. In other words, they were unable to anticipate how Japan's ambition to surpass China as the supreme power in Asia would lead it to present China at the Osaka Exhibition by utilizing imperialistic practices similar to those of the world exhibitions of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

### **III. Japan and the World Exhibitions**

Japan's first participation in the world exhibition was also related to Rutherford Alcock, who, as discussed earlier, had submitted some Chinese articles to the London Exhibition of 1851. Alcock, who had been serving as the British Consul-General in Japan since 1858, encouraged the Tokugawa government to participate in the London Exhibition of 1862. However, as the Qing government did, the Tokugawa shogunate, which had known about the London Exhibition of 1851 through *fusetsugaki* 風説書 submitted by the Dutch at Deshima, Nagasaki, declined to participate, because, Alcock claimed, "the most earnest desire of Japan's ruling class was to preserve as far as possible the long-cherished isolation of the country from foreign influences and

interests.”<sup>75</sup> Thus, without any co-operation from Japanese merchants or foreign merchants in the treaty ports, Alcock personally submitted Japanese artistic objects such as lacquer wares, color woodblock prints, and cloisonné ware to the London Exhibition of 1862.<sup>76</sup> This Japanese exhibit at the London Exhibition is believed to have initiated *Japonism*, or the influence of Japanese arts in Europe in the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>77</sup>

On the other hand, although the Japanese exhibit was not arranged by the government of Tokugawa Japan, the London Exhibition saw the appearance of the members of the Japanese Embassy, who happened to be in Europe to negotiate the postponement of opening some ports of Japan such as Hyōgo and Niigata to foreign trade.<sup>78</sup> Among the members of this Japanese Embassy, Fuchinobe Tokuzō 淵辺徳藏 made critical comments about the event: “Although the purpose of the World Exhibition is to display the products each country is proud of, Japan’s collection consists of sundries like an antique store. It is too embarrassing to see.”<sup>79</sup> Fuchinobe’s remark as such was

---

<sup>75</sup> Rutherford Alcock, *Art and Art Industries in Japan* (London: Virtue and Co., 1878), 1. Each newly arriving Dutch captain was obliged to submit an account of what had occurred in the world since the last ship’s arrival. This account called オランダ *fusetsugaki* in Japanese served as the primary source of information about the outside world for the Tokugawa shogunate. For more detailed information, see Matsukata Fuyuko 松方冬子, *Oranda fusetsugaki : "sakoku" Nihon ni katarareta "sekai" オランダ風説書 : 「鎖国」日本に語られた「世界」* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Shinsha, 2010).

<sup>76</sup> This experience inspired his writing of the book, *Art and Art Industry of Japan*. As the British Consul-General, Rutherford Alcock served in Japan from 1858 to 1864 and, then, in China from 1865 to 1869.

<sup>77</sup> Kuni (2010), 18.

<sup>78</sup> It was the first Japanese Embassy sent to Europe by the Tokugawa shogunate in 1862. The thirty eight members of the mission headed by Takenouchi Yasunori 竹内保徳 visited France, England, Holland, Prussia, Russia, and Portugal for five-and-a-half months. Andrew Cobbing, *The Japanese Discovery of Victorian Britain: Early Travel Encounters in the Far West* (Japan library, 1998), 19.

<sup>79</sup> Kuni (2010), 18-19; Fuchinobe Tokuzō 淵辺徳藏, “Ōkō nikki 欧行日記,” in Ōtsuka Takematsu 大塚武松 ed. *Kengai shisetsu nikki sanshū* 遣外使節日記纂輯 Vol. 3 (Tokyo: Nihon Shiseki Kyōkai, 1930), 49-50.

more or less similar to the criticism the Chinese elites later would make about the Chinese exhibits at the world exhibitions.

Fukuzawa Yukichi 福澤諭吉, who was also a member of the Japanese Embassy, briefly introduced the concept of the world exhibition in his books, *Seiyō Jijō* 西洋事情 or *Things Western* published in 1866: “The Western cities establish exhibitions every few years, in which renowned products, convenient machines, and exquisite arts and antiques from many countries are displayed to the world. This is called *Hakurankai* 博覽會.”<sup>80</sup> Actually, in 1862, the *Kampan Batabiya shimbun* 官版バタビヤ新聞, a translated edition of a Dutch government newspaper, which was launched by the Tokugawa Shogunate that year, had already carried an article about the London Exhibition of 1862.<sup>81</sup> However, considering the limited circulation of the *Kampan Batabiya shimbun* and the popularity of Fukuzawa’s *Things Western*, it was through the latter that the Japanese reading publics first came to know about world exhibitions.

Later, in response to the request of Léon Roches, the French Minister to Japan, Tokugawa Akitake 徳川昭武, the 14-year-old younger brother of shogun Tokugawa Yoshinobu 徳川慶喜, was dispatched to the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1867, thereby making Japan’s debut at a world exhibition.<sup>82</sup> The Tokugawa shogunate, which was then confronting the crisis of its collapse, decided to participate in the exposition,

---

<sup>80</sup> Nagai Michio ed. *Fukuzawa Yukichi* 福澤諭吉 (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1969), 377-378. Fukuzawa joined Takenouchi Mission as a translator with extra duties of investigating and report on the countries they visited.

<sup>81</sup> Yoshida Mitsukuni 吉田光邦, *Bankoku Hakurankai: Gijutsu Bunmeishitekini* 万国博覽会: 技術文明史的に (Tokyo : Nihon Hoso Shuppan Kyokai, 1985), 1. The original Dutch article was written in 1861 in order to introduce the opening of the London Exhibition in the following year.

<sup>82</sup> Regarding the Japanese term, *Hakurankai* 博覽會 for exhibition or exposition, it is usually believed that Kurimoto Joun 栗本鋤雲, a *bakufu* official, coined it when he was having conversation with Léon Roches about the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1867.

because it wanted to affirm its political legitimacy to the world and, eventually, to maintain its power. Also, its participation could manifest Japan's objective to institute an open policy toward the international community after the Treaty of Amity and Commerce was signed between Japan and the United States in July 1858. In due course, Tokugawa Akitake, the Imperial Commissioner, made efforts to influence the opinions of the international community in favor of the Tokugawa shogunate by eagerly socializing with the influential figures of each country, for instance, Napoleon III.<sup>83</sup>

Alongside two other Asian countries, China and Thailand, the Japanese exhibit centered on traditional artifacts was assigned to the smallest area in the Main Building.<sup>84</sup> Also, much like the Chinese Pavilion where Chinese girls served customers with food or alcohol, the Japanese Tea House also hired three geisha girls, who, being dressed in traditional Japanese costumes, sat at the Japanese traditional *tatami* room to please the fairgoers. Thus, in terms of the scale and kind of the exhibits, there was little difference between China and Japan at the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1867. The Japanese travelogues regarding the exposition, for instance, *Kōsei nikki* 航西日記 written by Shibusawa Eiichi 渋沢栄一 and *Seiyō bunkenroku* 西洋聞見録 by Murata Fumio 村田文夫, didn't yet show any sense of comparison or competition between Japan's exhibit and that of China.<sup>85</sup> Also, from the perspective of the Tokugawa *bakufu* facing the urgent pressure of anti-*bakufu* movements, checking internal competitors, the Saga

---

<sup>83</sup> Kuni (2010), 29-30.

<sup>84</sup> According to Shibusawa Eiichi's travelogue, the area of Japanese exhibit occupied 1/64 of the Main Building.

<sup>85</sup> Shibusawa Eiichi 渋沢栄一, who is now known as the "father of Japanese capitalism," accompanied Tokugawa Akitake's delegation to the exposition. Murata Fumio 村田文夫 is also known as Nomura Fumio. After illegally leaving Japan without the permission of the Tokugawa government, Murata studied in Aberdeen, Scotland from 1865 to 1868.

domain and the Satsuma domain, which had organized the Japanese exhibit together with the *bakufu*, was more imperative than confronting an external rival such as China. The Tokugawa *bakufu* were overthrown through the Meiji Restoration of the following year, 1868, to which both the Satsuma domain and the Saga domain significantly contributed. Thus, the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1867 became the first and last international exhibition in which Tokugawa Japan participated, although Tokugawa Akitake's presence and some grand-prize-winning articles, such as lacquers, impressed the European fairgoers to a certain degree.

In spite of its relatively successful debut at the Paris Exposition of 1867, the decision to participate in the Vienna World Exposition of 1873 was not easily made, because the nascent Meiji government was busy with other urgent issues. The persistent persuasion of Heinrich von Calice, the Austrian Minister to Japan, however, convinced the Meiji government of the advantages of participation in the exposition. Thus, the Japanese Commission to the Vienna World Exposition, which consisted of 72 members under the leadership of Sano Tsunetami 佐野常民, was finally appointed in 1872. From the perspective of the Meiji government, the main purpose of participation was to present Meiji Japan to the world in a similar vein to that by which Tokugawa Japan had attempted to affirm its legitimacy through the participation in Paris Exposition Universelle of 1867.

While Meiji Japan continued a similar strategy of depicting the tradition and history of Japan through the exquisite artwork at the exhibition, a noticeable difference appeared in that Japan came to focus on its rivalry with China at the world exhibition. Hirayama Narinobu 平山成信, who visited the Vienna Exposition, wrote, "As most of

Europeans think that Japan is just a subject state of China, they whisper each other, ‘it’s Chinese’ whenever they see Japanese.” Thus, demonstrating the fact that Japan was an independent state had to be given priority over the original purpose of enhancing the national prestige of Japan at the exposition.<sup>86</sup> From this perspective, when Japan outshined China by receiving more awards at the exhibition, it was expected to impress upon the participating countries of the exposition the national identity of Japan as distinct from China.<sup>87</sup>

The Vienna Exposition also served as a cornerstone for launching Japan’s domestic exhibitions in the near future by providing some influential leaders of the Meiji government with an opportunity to observe the world exhibition in person. Sano Tsunetami, the Japanese Commissioner to the Vienna Exposition, who also had visited the Paris Exposition of 1867, made use of his experiences at both expositions by committing himself to the launch of the domestic exhibitions in Japan. The Iwakura Embassy, the most famous diplomatic mission organized by the early Meiji government, also visited the Vienna Exposition while traveling in Europe. Some members of the Embassy, who later became powerful figures in the Meiji government (for instance, Itō Hirobumi 伊藤博文 and Ōkubo Toshimichi 大久保利通), were greatly inspired by the exposition, and contributed to promoting the domestic exhibitions when they returned to Japan. As a result, four years later in 1877, Japan held its first Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibition in Tokyo. Thus, it can be argued that leaders of

---

<sup>86</sup> Kuni (2010), 69-70. Hirayama’s travelogue, *Sakumuroku* 昨夢録, original manuscript of which had been circulated among his friends, was published in 1925.

<sup>87</sup> Kuni Takeyuki 國雄行, *Hakurankai no jida: Meiji seifu no hakurankai seisaku* 博覧会の時代: 明治政府の博覧会政策 (Tokyo: Iwata Shoin, 2005), 35-36; Kuni (2010), 70.

the Meiji government derived their enthusiasm about and commitment to the exhibition from their experiences at the Vienna Exposition.

While developing a blueprint for its domestic exhibitions, the Meiji government adopted a more active approach toward the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition of 1876. Soon after Japan officially accepted its invitation at the end of 1874, Japanese carpenters were sent to Philadelphia to build the national pavilion of Japan. Tokugawa Akitake and Marquis Saigō Tsugumichi 西郷従道 were appointed to lead the Japanese Commission. Japan's exhibit filled a large area in the main building, not only with traditional artwork, but also articles representing the mining industry, manufacturing, education, and mechanics. In terms of the scale of the exhibit in the main building, only a few countries such as the United States surpassed Japan.<sup>88</sup> Japan's expansion of the range of the exhibits was partially due to the fact that, after the Vienna Exposition of 1873, twenty four people selected from the Japanese Commission to the exposition were left behind in Europe in order to study various Western technologies from baking to shipbuilding. After their return to Japan, they greatly contributed to the development of Japan's industry.

Therefore, Japan's exhibit highly impressed the fairgoers, as a New York newspaper noted: "It is Japan's exhibit that shows the most noticeable progress among the exhibits in the Main Building."<sup>89</sup> Li Gui, who described the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition in his travelogue, *Huanyoudiqiuxinlu*, also mentioned his astonishment at the

---

<sup>88</sup> Neil Harris, "All the World a Melting Pot? Japan at American Fairs, 1876-1904," in Akira Iriye ed. *Mutual Images: Essays in American-Japanese Relations* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), 28.

<sup>89</sup> Koni (2010), 77.



Japanese exhibit, which was located near that of China in the Main Building: “The Japanese exhibit was impressively organized, doubling the size of the Chinese exhibit. Also, their display was designed after the Western style, and furnishings were manufactured with Western techniques. Without their black hair and yellow faces, it would be hardly possible to distinguish East from West...I could see that this country determined to solve the secrets of the West by emulating Western institutions, technology, and manufacture.”<sup>90</sup>

Japan’s exhibit apparently overwhelmed that of China in terms of both quantity and quality: whereas 6,628 square feet was assigned for the Chinese exhibits in the Main Building, Japan secured 17,831 square feet, nearly tripling that of China; Japan sent 7,112 packages of articles while China, in comparison, sent 477 packages.<sup>91</sup> Consequently, as the two nations of Asia represented at the exhibition, Japan’s exhibit and that of China were compared by the local mass media and fairgoers, often to the advantage of Japan. For instance, Edward Bruce, the author of the book, *The Century: Its Fruits and Its Festival, Being a History of the Centennial Exhibition*, wrote, “If Japan was China’s student, the pupil has surpassed the teacher.”<sup>92</sup> In public exhibition literature, China’s participation per se was described as progressive, but its decorative arts were not evaluated as such. By contrast, Japan was regarded as more progressive than China, politically and artistically.<sup>93</sup> A Philadelphia newspaper reported, “We relegate the Chinese to the half-civilized class without hesitation...this fact shows what

---

<sup>90</sup> Li Gui, 208-209.

<sup>91</sup> Jennifer Pitman. “China’s Presence at the Centennial Exhibition, Philadelphia, 1876,” in *Studies in the Decorative Arts*. Vol. X, No. 1 (Fall-Winter 2002-2003), 48.

<sup>92</sup> Harris, 35.

<sup>93</sup> Pitman, 52.

an important difference there is between Japanese and Chinese civilization.”<sup>94</sup> Thus, it can be argued that, from the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition, Japan began to surpass China in terms of the overall quantity, quality, and diversity of exhibits, which was noticed and discussed by the local fairgoers.

About two decades later, at Chicago’s World’s Columbian Exposition of 1893, Japan further expanded the scale and variety of its exhibits. The Japanese Pavilion, which cost over 100,000 US dollars, was the seventh largest national pavilion at the exposition. The Japanese exhibits, totalling 1,750 tons, were displayed in the Japanese Pavilion; the Palace of Manufactures and Liberal Arts; the Fine Arts Palace; Agriculture, Horticulture, Forestry, Mines and Fisheries; and the Women’s Building. Particularly, Japan’s exhibit at the Women’s Building was achieved by active support from the Meiji Empress and Princess Yasumori, who were alleged to have funded the project from their private assets.<sup>95</sup> On the other hand, China exhibited only at the General Building without its own pavilion, and a previously positive response from Lord Li Hongzhang and his wife failed to produce an official Chinese exhibit at the Women’s Building.<sup>96</sup>

Under such circumstances, the local fairgoers’ evaluations of China and Japan at the exposition went beyond their exhibits, comparing the perceived national characters of the Chinese and the Japanese. A female fairgoer even wrote that, “Japan was quite different, the suave, smiling Japanese just the opposite of the pigtailed, avaricious

---

<sup>94</sup> Harris, 35.

<sup>95</sup> Jeanne M. Weimann. *The Fair Women: The Story of The Woman’s Building, World’s Columbian Exposition Chicago 1893* (Chicago: Academia Chicago, 1981), 138; 274.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid., 138. At the Chicago Exhibition of 1893, Peng Guangyu 彭光譽, the First Secretary of the Chinese Legation in Washington D.C., attended the World Religious Conference as the representative of Confucianism.

Chinese.”<sup>97</sup> Another fairgoer noticed the Japanese people’s effort to demonstrate that they were different from the Chinese as they joined Western civilization. He understood such efforts as part of Japan’s preparation for an imminent struggle against China by obtaining the sympathy of the West.<sup>98</sup> It was exactly this image of Japan as a guardian of the new order and civilization in Asia confronting the old China that the Meiji government would eagerly promote at the international exhibitions.

As we have seen, the full support of the Meiji government enabled the enhanced status of Japan at the world exhibitions, and succeeded in presenting the modernization of Meiji Japan through its domestic exhibitions. On the other hand, the Qing government had not achieved any significant progress in organizing China’s exhibits at the international exhibitions for a couple of reasons. First, apart from the fact that the affairs regarding the Chinese exhibit at the world exhibitions were entrusted to foreign-dominated IMCS, there was no engagement of influential, high-ranking officials, whose observation of and inspiration by the world exhibitions could lead to the formation of related government policies. As mentioned earlier, Guo Songtao, who had visited the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1878, barely escaped death, let alone making a comeback to officialdom, when he returned to China from Europe. Marquis Zeng Jize, who had observed the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1878, returned to China in 1886 with the new appointment of serving at *Zongli yamen*. Considering his critical perception of the quality of the Chinese exhibit at the Paris Exposition of 1878, he could have contributed to innovation on the Chinese exhibit at the world exhibitions if not for his unexpected

---

<sup>97</sup> Harris, 43.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., 45.

death four years after his return. As a result, the Qing government didn't follow the trajectory of Meiji Japan, whose influential government leaders took advantage of their experiences at the world exhibitions to improve the Japanese exhibits..

Secondly, as the imperialist expansion of the foreign powers such as Germany, Britain, France, Russia, and Japan had constantly intensified to “carve up China like a melon,” the Qing government hardly could afford to pay attention to the matters such as the world exhibitions. Moreover, the outbreak of the Boxer Uprising, an anti-foreigner movement, the resultant armed clash with foreign powers, and the evacuation of the Qing court to Xi'an brought about a polity vacuum in China from 1898 through 1901. Under such circumstances, reformers such as Kang Youwei and his followers had the initiative in the discourses on the world exhibitions as discussed earlier. However, as the Qing court returned to Beijing in early 1902 and resumed governing, this situation changed.

## Chapter Two: China, the “Barbarian” Guest of Honor at the Osaka Exhibition of 1903

### I. The Fifth Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibition of Osaka

As examined in the previous chapter, consecutive participation in both the Vienna Exhibition (1873) and the Philadelphia Exposition (1876) inspired the Meiji government with the motivation to hold an International Fair in Japan. As a result, the project of *Naikoku kangyō hakurankai* 内國勸業博覽會 or the Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibition, the first of which took place in Tokyo in 1877, was launched as a “sprout” of a future *Bankoku hakurankai* 万国博覽會 or World Exhibition in Japan.<sup>99</sup> In 1895, when the fourth Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibition took place in Kyoto, the Meiji government started planning the fifth exhibition. As the unequal treaties with the Western powers were supposed to be rectified by 1902, the fifth exhibition aimed at demonstrating Japan’s new status on a par with that of the West.<sup>100</sup> Thus, the Osaka Exhibition of 1903 (Meiji 36), the fifth and last Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibition, became a *semi-international* exhibition, heralding that “the day is not far distant when Japan will be able to boast of a large World Exhibition, which will compare favorably with those held in other parts of the world.”<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup> Regarding the significances of the Osaka Exhibition as a cornerstone for hosting a World Exposition in Japan, see Ito Mamiko 伊藤真実子, “*Daigokai Naikokukangyo Hankurankai to Manhaku Kaisaieno Mosaku—Taiwanto Jinruikan* 第五回内国勸業博覽會と万博開催への模索--台湾館と人類館,” *Nihhon Rekishi* 日本歴史, no. 686 (July, 2005): 69-84. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibition in Tokyo (1881); the 3rd Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibition in Tokyo (1890); the 4th Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibition in Kyoto (1895).

<sup>100</sup> Kuni (2010), 175.

<sup>101</sup> Osakafu ed. *The Souvenir Guide to Osaka* (Osaka: Hakurankai Kyosankai, 1903), 116-118.

The Osaka Exhibition, which took place in the area of Tennoji 天王寺, in southern part of Osaka, distinguished itself from the previous four exhibitions in several ways. Its size 100,000 *tsubo* 坪 or 82 acres was twice as large as the 4<sup>th</sup> Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibition of Kyoto (1895), and three times as large as the 1<sup>st</sup> Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibition of Tokyo (1877). The exhibition displayed not only domestic products but foreign ones submitted by foreigners residing in Japan, as well as representatives from fourteen countries, including the United States, Canada, Australia, Germany, and China, whose exhibits were displayed at *Sankōkan* 参考館, or the Foreign Samples Building. In addition to official exhibits, individual sponsors provided various performances and entertainments by emulating those of the Western world fairs.<sup>102</sup> As a result, the Osaka Exhibition successfully drew over 4.3 million visitors, almost four times as many as those of the fourth exhibition of Kyoto. The Osaka Exhibition was impressive enough, at least to the Japanese people, to serve as an initiation ceremony for Japan into the Euroamerica-centered international community: “By now our empire has surprised the world with our superior military power and can compare with the Western Powers by occupying a superior position like them. Thus, it is time to compete with world in terms of industrial production.”<sup>103</sup>

However, in order to avoid blowing its own horn, it was absolutely necessary to have visitors from outside Japan at the side of the exhibition. Accordingly, the Japanese

---

<sup>102</sup> Doi Michio 土居通夫, the first chairman of the Association for the Support of the Osaka Exhibition, which consisted of the local leaders of the Kansai area, went to the Paris Exposition of 1900 to observe its entertainment quarters. Kuni (2010), 177.

<sup>103</sup> Yoshimi Shunya 吉見俊哉, *Hakurankaino Seijigaku* 博覧會の政治學 (Tokyo: Chūshinsho, 1992), 212. The quoted article is “Ronsetsu: Daigokai Naikoku Kangyō Hakurankai 論説:第五回内国勸業博覧會” from *Fūzoku Gaho* 風俗畫報, No. 269 (June, 1903): 1.

government sent out approximately 10,000 invitations abroad. Also, a welcoming society for V.I.P.s called *Kihinkai* 貴賓会, the head office of which was operating in Tokyo for foreign travelers in Japan, newly opened an Osaka branch to afford convenience to foreign visitors to Osaka during the exhibition.<sup>104</sup> For Western visitors, even English guidebooks for the Osaka Exhibition such as *The Osaka Exhibition-Guidebook for Tourists in Japan* and *The Souvenir Guide to Osaka* were published by both a private publishing company and the local government of Osaka respectively. As a result, during the five months of the exhibition, from March 1st to July 31, it attracted 22,600 foreign visitors, representing 5.2 % of the total visitors. Among those foreign visitors were 14,000 Western visitors and around 8,600 Chinese and Korean ones.<sup>105</sup>

In terms of foreign visitors, Japan most coveted those from China, with which the Meiji government had sought a closer relationship, both economically and politically, after the Sino-Japanese War. The Department of Foreign Affairs of Japan eagerly invited Chinese officials and gentry-merchants by sending them complimentary tickets. Non-governmental societies related to interactions with China were also eager to attract the Chinese visitors to the Osaka Exhibition. For instance, Konoe Atsumaro 近衛篤磨, the chairman of *Tōadōbunkai* 東亞同文會, or the East Asia Common Culture Society, which was one of the most prominent non-governmental organizations related to China, petitioned the Japanese government for financial support to invite the high officials of the Qing government to the exhibition.<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> Osakafu ed., 161-162.

<sup>105</sup> Osakashi Yakusho, 46-47; 144-146.

<sup>106</sup> Gen Ansei 嚴安生, *Nihon Ryūgaku Seishinshi: Kindai Chūgoku Chishikijin no Kiseki* 日本留学精神史: 近代中国知識人の軌跡 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1991), 100.

The ostensible reason for these invitations was to promote a friendly relationship with China, but the following quotation from *Nihon* 日本, a Japanese daily newspaper, indicates where the more the practical objectives of Japan lay.

If the officials and gentry of each province of China come to see the exhibition this time, they would be greatly awakened regarding the reformation of their own country...Chinese people encounter modern materials in Hong Kong, Shanghai, and Tianjin, but most of them are Western products. Although China sends students to Japan, invites teachers from Japan, and reads translated books of Japanese politics, law, and education, the cultural level of Japanese residents in China is lower than that of the Westerners in China, and the Japanese goods are nothing but an imitation of the Western ones. Thus, how can the Chinese people imagine the material progress of Japan? In this sense, shouldn't we make Chinese officials and common people understand Japan better by taking advantage of this exhibition? Although an exhibition is usually good for nothing but for displaying domestic and foreign products, it would prove highly useful for Chinese people.<sup>107</sup>

According to this article, through the Osaka Exhibition, Japan hoped to enhance among Chinese people its image as a civilized country after which the reformation or modernization of China would be modeled. Japan's wish to be the mentor of Chinese reformation is more directly stated in another article, "Discussing what the Osaka Exhibition would instructs the Qing Chinese people" in the same newspaper. This article, the beginning of which pointed out the geographical proximity of the two nations as well as the ethnic and cultural similarities -- "*Dōshudōbun* 同種同文 or same race and same

---

<sup>107</sup> *Nihon*, "*Hakurankaito Shinajin* 博覧会と支那人" (The Exhibition and Chinese People), March 4, 1903.



letter” -- between China and Japan, certainly targeted Chinese reading publics in that it was written in Chinese.

What Japan is to China is what the U.S. used to be to Japan, in that China can seek (reformation) by relying on Japan. After the defeat in the Sino-Japanese War, China became afraid of Japan more than Japan had been afraid of America. However, the relationship between China and Japan recovered soon, entailing more interaction between two countries. As China understood Japan better, they realized that the “action” (of the Sino-Japanese War) was actually initiated for the development of China, and, thus, it was never anything to be blamed for. This bears analogy with the fact that Japan later came to understand the true meaning of the Perry’s coming. At the beginning, we Japanese took Perry’s coming just as a threat and didn’t understand his objective. However, we eventually came to appreciate his meritorious deeds and even erected a statue to pay a tribute to him. If China goes on like this for 20, 30 years, and becomes a country of civilization and development, who knows that another Admiral Perry for China won’t have been Japanese?<sup>108</sup>

Thus, by claiming Japan as the potential promoter for the modernization of China, this article even justified the previous provocation of a war with China through the analogy of Perry’s coming, which is quite farfetched in that the reasons for the Sino-Japanese War were quite different than a desire to open the ports of China. As was the case in the previous article of March 4<sup>th</sup>, this article also emphasizes the role of Japan as the ideal mentor for the reformation of China by concluding, “Moreover, as an Asian

---

<sup>108</sup> *Nihon*, “*Ron Osaka Hakurankai Koku Shinjin* 論大阪博覽會告清人” (Discussing What the Osaka Exhibition Instructs the Qing Chinese People), March 9, 1903. () is my interpretation based on the context.

country, there are things you should learn (from the West) and should not. However, Japan has accepted both, which resulted in both success and failure. China, please learn from the success and take precautions against the failure (of Japan). We know that Japanese experiences as such play a role as *Yushi* 餘師 or another good teacher. What do you, Chinese people, think about this?”<sup>109</sup> Meiji Japan, which had tried hard to distinguish itself from China in the eyes of the Europeans at the world exhibitions only 30 years ago, came to brag about its competence to “teach” China through its first international exhibition.

Luckily for Japan, their aggressive attempt to engage China in the Osaka Exhibition coincided with a period when the Qing government was anxious to recover its diplomatic relationship with foreign powers after the Boxer Uprising. While the capital was destroyed and looted by both the Boxers and the Forces of the Eight-Nation Alliance (Japan, Russia, Britain, France, the United States, Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy), the Empress Dowager and the Emperor Guangxu took refuge in Xi'an, from which they could not return to Beijing until early January, 1902. The Empress Dowager had been blamed for supporting the Boxers' attacks on the foreigners, for which the foreign ministers in China allegedly discussed a possibility of deposing her. Being aware of the crisis in her political life, the Empress Dowager manifested her desperate wish for the reconciliation with the foreign powers by issuing an edict to invite the foreign ministers and their wives to an audience at the palace even before her return to Beijing.<sup>110</sup> Also, in

---

<sup>109</sup> Ibid. () is my interpretation based on the context.

<sup>110</sup> Upon her return to Beijing, the Empress Dowager kept her words by having audiences with the foreign diplomats and their family, which would frequently occur since then. For more details about the return of the Qing court to Beijing in 1902, refer to Chapter XVII, “The Return to Peking,” from Philip W. Sergeant, *The Great Empress Dowager of China* (London: Hutchinson, 1910): 250-265.

accordance with the Boxer Protocol, or the Peace Agreement between the Eight-Nation Alliance and China signed in September, 1901, *Waiwubu* 外務部, or the Department of Foreign Affairs, which had been elevated to the ministerial rank, replaced *Zongli yamen* to handle foreign affairs. By launching *Xinzheng* 新政, or the New Policies, the Empress Dowager reactivated a program of far-reaching administrative reforms, which had been suspended since the miscarriage of the Hundred Days' Reforms. In a word, reforms and diplomatic activities became the uppermost agenda for the post-Boxer Uprising Qing government.

Thus, when the Japanese government requested the Qing government's participation in the Osaka Exhibition, the latter not only accepted, but took an unprecedented action to dispatch the official Chinese Commission led by Lord Zaizhen 載振, the eldest son of the Prince Qing, thereby putting an end to the existing practice that matters regarding foreign exhibitions had been fully entrusted to the IMCS.<sup>111</sup> Lord Zaizhen's infamous reputation, that of being a corrupted and lavish member of the Manchu imperial family, might have made his appointment look like an inadvisable selection. However, it was actually not an inappropriate decision in that Lord Zaizhen had knowledge about the world exhibitions through his travel to Western countries such as Great Britain, Belgium, France, and the United States on his mission to attend the coronation of Edward VII in 1902. In his work, *Yingyaoriji* 英軺日記, which recorded

---

<sup>111</sup> Regarding China's participation in the Osaka Exhibition, the Japanese government first contacted the Qing government through the Japanese consular stationed in Hangzhou in March, 1902. The Qing government sent its official response to the Japanese government in January, 1903. For the documents exchanged between China and Japan about the Osaka Exhibition, refer to Zhongguo di 1 lishi dang'anguan 中國第一歷史檔案館 ed. *Qinggong Wanguo Bolanhui Dang'an* 清宮萬國博覽會檔案 (Beijing: Guangling Shushe, 1907), Vol. 2 and Vol. 3. (959-1200).

his journey, he discussed how exhibitions contributed to the commercial development of France and, furthermore, how China should prepare for the two future exhibitions, the Osaka Exhibition of 1903 and the St. Louis Exposition of 1904. After enumerating specific ways to promote participation in overseas exhibitions, for instance, instituting exemptions on tax and freight rates, he concluded that China eventually would establish its own exhibitions.<sup>112</sup>

The Osaka Exhibition, which became the first foreign exhibition to be honored with the presence of an imperial commissioner of China, also marked the entrance of the Qing government into the discursive arena of the international exhibitions, and it had been led to do so by reform thinkers utilizing the rhetoric of growth of national economy and power. Moreover, those reformers' ideas about the world exhibitions had been circulated and shared by the general reading publics through newspapers and journals. However, the Qing government regarded the international exhibition mainly as a diplomatic affair for which, as a member of the international community, the Qing government was expected to register as a matter of course. Thus, from the perspective of the Qing government, there was no reason to take into account public opinion when it arranged the Chinese exhibit at the Osaka Exhibition. Moreover, reform figures such as Kang Youwei, who had propagated the discourses on the world exhibitions, were an eyesore to the Qing court under the leadership of the Empress Dowager.<sup>113</sup> Therefore, at

---

<sup>112</sup> Zaizhen, *Jindai Zhongguo Shiliao Congkan* Vol. 734: *Yingyao Riji* (Taipei: Wenhai Chubanshe, 1972), 244-245; 351-354. After Zaizhen came back from Japan in 1903, he actively engaged in implementing the New Policies of the Qing government and, in 1906, became the first Minister of Agriculture and Industry.

<sup>113</sup> For instance, a reward of 10,000 silver taels was offered for the arrest of Kang Youwei and Liang Qichao in the imperial edict of February 14, 1900. Lee-hsia Hsu Ting, *Government Control of the Press in Modern China 1900-1949* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974), 28.

the Osaka Exhibition, the different rhetorics used by the Qing government and the Chinese reading publics in portraying the international exhibitions first clashed in the reformers' critique of the government.

## II. The “Barbarian” Guest of Honor: China and *Jinruikan* 人類館

Lord Zaizhen, who was accompanied by officials from the Department of Foreign Affairs such as Natong 那桐 and Duan Liang 端良, and a couple of governor-generals, arrived at Kobe on April 29 amidst the heated interest and coverage of Japanese newspapers and journals such as *Asahi shimbun* 朝日新聞, *Mainichi shimbun* 毎日新聞, *Nihon* 日本, *Yorozuchōhō* 萬朝報, and *Taiyō* 太陽. He visited the Osaka Exhibition a couple of times in early May, and left for China on May 28<sup>th</sup> after observing various industrial sites and meeting the Japanese emperor and empress.<sup>114</sup> In addition to the assignment of the imperial commissioners, the Qing government also directly ordered nine provinces (Zhili, Shandong, Jiangnan, Zhejiang, Fujian, Guangdong, Sichuan, Hubei, and Hunan) to send staff and exhibits to the Osaka Exhibition. China staged a grand-scale exhibition at the Foreign Samples Building, which consisted of natural resources and traditional crafts such as porcelains, bronze vessels, lacquer ware, and stationery.<sup>115</sup> Furthermore, the eager invitation from the side of Japan, as well as the geographical proximity, led an unprecedented number of Chinese people to visit the

---

<sup>114</sup> *Taiyō*, “Zaizhen Heikano Laichō 載振陛下の來朝” (Lord Zaizhen’s Visit to Japan), Vol. 9, No. 6 (June 1<sup>st</sup>, 1903), 32.

<sup>115</sup> *Osaka Asahi Shimbun*, “Sankōkanno Shinkoku Shuppin 参考官の清國出品” (Exhibition of China in the Foreign Samples Building), March 16, 1903. The Chinese exhibit also included a personal collection of curios submitted by Duan Fang 端方, the Governor of Hubei Province, who later would play a major role in organizing the Nanyang Exhibition of 1910, the first and last national exhibition of the Qing dynasty.

Osaka Exhibition. The Chinese visitors, particularly those who had read about the world exhibitions, were probably quite excited about observing an international exhibition in person. However, their excitement would be replaced with dismay because of the way Japan presented China at the Osaka Exhibition.

As mentioned earlier, another feature of the Osaka Exhibition was its entertainment displays centering on *misemono* 見世物, or visual attractions, which became a trend in various exhibitions in Japan since the 1900s.<sup>116</sup> A special entertainment quarter including a theater for Lama Dance and a tour of the Pavilion of the World was established outside the main gates of the formal exhibition site for this purpose.<sup>117</sup> *Jinruikan* 人類館 or the World's Natives Building, which was designed for the display of “native” people and their customs in the flesh, was located next to a zoo in that entertainment quarter.<sup>118</sup> As was the case with the other programs of the entertainment quarter, *Jinruikan* was not officially organized by the committee of the Osaka Exhibition. It is said that Nishida Masatoshi 西田正俊, a former lawyer and businessman of Osaka, proposed *Jinruikan* personally, when he became a member of a subordinate organization of the Osaka Exhibition committee: “When Nishida became a committee member of the Osaka Exhibition, he wanted to make a contribution by taking advantage of that opportunity. Thus, he came up with the idea of *Jinruikan*, which was

---

<sup>116</sup> Yoshimi, 146.

<sup>117</sup> *Fuzoku Gaho*, “*Ronsetsu: Daigokai Naikoku Kangyō Hakurankai* 論説:第五回内國勸業博覽會” (Editorial: The 5<sup>th</sup> Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibition), No. 269 (June, 1903), 37-38.

<sup>118</sup> *Jinruikan* 人類館 is read *renleiguan* in Chinese. Literally, *jinrui* means humankind and *kan* means building or hall in Japanese. English materials issued by the organization of the Osaka Exhibition, for instance, tickets, translated it into “World’s Natives Building.” Western scholars such as Paula Harrell, Rebecca Karl, and Frank Dokötter use “Races of *Man* (蠻 or barbarian) Pavilion” for *Jinruikan*. In this paper, I will use *Jinruikan* in order to avoid any possible preconceptions.

materialized under the direction of Tsuboi Shōgorō 坪井正五郎, the highest authority of the day in the field (of anthropology).”<sup>119</sup>

Being known as the founder of anthropology of Japan by establishing the department of anthropology at the Tokyo Imperial University in 1893, Tsuboi Shōgorō had studied in France and Britain and accepted the Europe-centered perspective of 19<sup>th</sup> century anthropology. The combination of 19<sup>th</sup> century anthropological precepts and the progressivist ideology of the exhibition of the West, which, as Curtis M. Hinsley argues, functioned to celebrate the victory of civilized power over nature and primitives, ideologically legitimated the display of “uncivilized” and, often, colonized people in the flesh as an attraction since the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1878.<sup>120</sup> As a student of anthropology, Dr. Tsuboi had visited the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1889, which included a Negro Village for live displays of the colonized indigenous peoples of Africa.<sup>121</sup> Later, when he wrote the prospectus for the establishment of *Jinruikan* in the Osaka Exhibition in *Tokyo jinruigakkai zasshi* 東京人類學會雜誌 or *the Journal of the Anthropological Society of Tokyo*, it was clear that he uncritically accepted the imperialistic practice of the Western exhibitions at face value: “In the exhibitions of civilized countries, *Jinruikan* is an indispensable part. From this perspective, it will be regrettable not to have one in the Osaka Exhibition, which is an unprecedented exhibition

---

<sup>119</sup> Ninomiya Ichirō 二宮一郎, “Jinruikan Hokkinin, Nishida Masatoshinitsuite 人類館発起人・西田正俊について” (Regarding Nishida Masatoshi, the Proponent of *Jinruikan*), in Engeki 「Jinruikan」 Jōenwo Jiggensasetaikai ed. *Jinruikan: Fūinsareta Tobira* 人類館: 封印された扉 (Tokyo: Atto Wokusu, 2005), 125-126.

<sup>120</sup> Curtis M. Hinsley, “The World as Marketplace: Commodification of the Exotic at the World’s Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893,” in Ivan Karp and Steven D. Levine eds. *Exhibiting Cultures: the Poetics and Politics of Museum Display* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1991), 17.

<sup>121</sup> Matsuda Kyōko 松田京子, *Teikoku no Shisen: Hakurankai to Ibunka Hyōshō* 帝国の視線: 博覧会と異文化表象 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2003), 138-139.

of our country.”<sup>122</sup>

Further evidence that *Jinruikan* adopted the same European colonial perspective can be found in the location of *Jinruikan* next to the zoo. Nomura Kōya 山野浩也 points out the analogy between the display of the animals and that of the aborigine in the colonial practice of Europe by quoting Ghassan Hage’s argument in his book, *White Nation*;

In Europe, the aborigine used to be displayed next to the zoo since the collection of the former was an extension of the latter. As the exotic animals, the exotic aborigine was considered as a part of the *conquered nature* and an indigenous product of the colony. By taming and rearing those exotic people, the prestige and power of the (European) nation was manifested.<sup>123</sup>

In this sense, as Kinjō Yū argues, it was hardly a coincidence that in the Osaka Exhibition *Jinruikan* and the zoo were located side by side.<sup>124</sup> Actually, when the original plan of *Jinruikan* to include China as an object of display was known to the public, a Chinese viewer sharply responded, “It is obvious that we Chinese would be watched like animals.”<sup>125</sup>

In addition to China, the *Jinruikan* of the Osaka Exhibition was originally

---

<sup>122</sup> *Tokyo Jinruigakkai Zasshi*, No. 203 (Feb. 1903), 209.

<sup>123</sup> Nomura Kōya 山野浩也, “Jinruikan Jikento Dōkaneno Yūwaku 人類館事件と同化への誘惑” (The *Jinruikan* Incident and the Temptation of Assimilation), in Engeki 「Jinruikan」 Jōenwo Jiggensasetaikai ed. *Jinruikan: Fūinsareta Tobira* 人類館: 封印された扉 (Tokyo: Atto Wokusu, 2005), 23-24.

<sup>124</sup> Kinjō Yū 金城勇, “GakujutsuJinruikan Jikento Okinawa 學術人類館事件と沖縄” (The Academic *Jinruikan* Incident and Okinawa), in Engeki 「Jinruikan」 Jōenwo Jiggensasetaikai ed. *Jinruikan: Fūinsareta Tobira* 人類館: 封印された扉 (Tokyo: Atto Wokusu, 2005), 31.

<sup>125</sup> *Zhejiangchao*, No. 2 (March 1903), 134-135.



planned to include the Ainu of Hokkaido, the aborigines of Taiwan or *Shengfan* 生蕃, and the peoples of Ryukyu, Korea, India, Java, Turkey, and Africa in the flesh to show their “unique” customs, tools, and everyday lives in re-created environments. This plan was first reported in *Nihon*, a Japanese daily newspaper on February 10<sup>th</sup>, approximately three weeks before the opening of the exhibition. The news that China would be also displayed in *Jinruikan* immediately outraged the Chinese community in Japan, which mostly consisted of Chinese merchants and students. Among the Chinese journals published in Japan at that time, it was none other than *Xinmin congbao* 新民叢報, a journal founded by Liang Qichao in Yokohama in February, 1902, that first carried an article criticizing *Jinruikan* and Japan: “Japan is going to open the exhibition in Osaka in March. There is a show organized by the association of anthropology, in which one person for each *Yeman renzhong* 野蠻人種, or barbarian race, in this world will be hired for display. Japan intends to represent our entire nation by displaying a Chinese person and simulating old corrupted practices. Alas! How excessive is Japan’s insult of us!”<sup>126</sup>

This article ends by encouraging Chinese students to protest strongly against Japan’s decision to include China in *Jinruikan*, while reminding them of the incompetence of the Qing government:

If our government has any competence and a sense of shame, they would vehemently protest. However, because there is nothing to expect from the government, I cannot but reply on something other than the government. I heard that in the Chicago Exhibition of America, Japan had been treated as they treat us now. A Japanese man was hired to pull a rickshaw, which

---

<sup>126</sup> *Xinmin congbao*, “*Riren Wuwo Taishen* 日人侮我太甚” (How Excessive Japan’s Insult of Us Is), No. 25 (February 1903), 81.

was supposed to represent Japanese culture. One hundred Japanese students who lived in Chicago then strongly protested and succeeded in having the show withdrawn. Now there are a thousand Chinese students in Tokyo. If we do not express our rage and fight for our national entity, how could we live here preserving our honor? Students, are you listening to this? Are you thinking about this?<sup>127</sup>

This incitement, which might have ended up being a mere gesture, incited effective response owing to two factors. First, the Chinese student population, which had first taken root in 1896, at the end of the Sino-Japanese War, with the arrival in Tokyo of thirteen students, had progressively swollen to number over 800 people, and it had become more organized through *Zhongguo liuxuesheng huiguan* 中國遊學生會館, or the Chinese Student Union, which was founded in Tokyo in 1902.<sup>128</sup> Secondly, the publication of this editorial coincided with the nascent period of the publication of Chinese student journals in Japan. For instance, *Youxue yibian* 遊學譯編 was first published in Dec. 1902, *Hubei xueshengjie* 湖北學生界 in January 1903, *Zhejiangchao* 浙江潮 in Feb. 1903, and *Jiangsu* 江蘇 April 1903. This profusion of media outlets served to echo and intensify student outrage over *Jinruikan*. For instance, after the Chinese Student Union released a public statement criticizing the inclusion of Chinese people in *Jinruikan*, *Hubei xueshengjie*, the journal of the Chinese students from Hubei

---

<sup>127</sup> Ibid.

<sup>128</sup> The Chinese Student Union included people other than Chinese students themselves. Chair and vice chair positions were assumed by the General Student Supervisor and Provincial Student Supervisor, who were appointed by the central government of China and the provincial government of China respectively. Besides, there were Honorary Members who supported Chinese students in various ways. For instance, Lord Zaizhen was listed as an Honorary Member. Regarding the Honorary Members of the Chinese Student Union, see Ryo Shunchan, “*Shinmatsuno Ryūichi Gakusei Kankoku*,” in *Sekkō Daigaku Nihon Bunka Kenkyūjo* 浙江大学日本文化研究所 ed. *Edo • Meijikino Nicchū Bunka Kōryū*, 江戸明治期の日中文化交流 (Tokyo: Nōsangyoson Bunka Kyōkai, 2000), 138-140.

Province, first carried an article on *Jinruikan*:

As already exterminated countries, India and Ryukyu are the slaves of Britain and Japan. Korea, which used to be a subject state of China, is a protectorate of Russia and Japan. Java, Ainu and Taiwan belong to the lowest races and are almost beasts. No matter how we Chinese have been degraded, how can we be on a par with these six races?<sup>129</sup>

The article in question quite emotionally expressed rage over the fact that Japan treated China like other “inferior” races; the tenor of this response has drawn attention from Japanese scholars focusing on the racism underlying the Chinese students’ indignation. For instance, Sakamoto Hiroko argues, “The revolutionary Chinese students held a discriminatory stance of social Darwinism, which they were willing to apply to other nations, but which they rejected when applied to themselves.”<sup>130</sup>

However, her argument seems to overlook the racial hierarchy that had been constantly configured by China in given historical contexts. Thus, I argue that the seemingly racist attitude expressed in this article could be better understood through the lens of conventional Sino-centrism, rather than the Western or Hegelian racism whose major premise of the superiority of white race doesn’t provide the framework to distinguish China from other non-white races mentioned in the article in question. In other words, at play here is the traditional *zhonghua* 中華, or Sino-centric ideology, which had graduated and ranked the neighboring countries of China in accordance with

---

<sup>129</sup> *Hubei xueshengjie*, “*Minghu Zhina, Minghu Zhinaren* 嗚呼支那, 嗚呼支那人”(Alas, China, Alas, Chinese People), No. 2 (February 1903), 119.

<sup>130</sup> Sakamoto Hiroko 坂元ひろ子, *Chugoku Minzokushugino Shinwa: Jinshu, Shintai, Zenda* 中国民族主義の神話: 人種・身体・ジェンダー (Tokyo: Iwanami, 2004), 72-73.

dual standards: culturally, the degree of Sinicization, and politically, relative status in the tribute system. This makes clear why, among the peoples to be displayed in *Jinruikan*, those that had not been considered in the traditional Sino-centric world, for instance, Turkey and Zanzibar, were not mentioned. Thus, in a certain sense, the above-quoted passage reveals embarrassment about the deprivation of China's supreme status under the traditional Sino-centric order.

In addition to the emotional tone, the article in question attempted to incite readers to protest against the plan to include China in *Jinruikan* through objectiveal “mistranslation.” The original article in *Nihon*, which first covered *Jinruikan* among Japanese newspapers, stated: “The purpose of *Jinruikan* is to show the level and class of [each nation's] distinctive and unique habitation and *human nature and custom*. Thus, models of residence, decoration, tools, behavior, and performance will be provided for display.”<sup>131</sup> However, when the Japanese article was directly quoted in the above-mentioned Chinese article from *Hubei xueshengjie*, *ninjō* 人情, or human nature, and *fūzoku* 風俗, or custom in the original Japanese article of *Nihon* were replaced with *efeng* 惡風, or vicious manners, and *manxi* 蠻習, or barbarian custom, although the original Japanese terms, *ninjō* and *fūzoku*, were written in Chinese characters, which thereby could be used in the Chinese article without any change. Thus, obviously it was not a correct or literal translation. However, from the perspective of the Chinese students, it could be a more accurate translation because “vicious manners and barbarian customs” were what *Jinruikan* actually meant to present, although administrators never admitted

---

<sup>131</sup> *Nihon*, “Hakurankai Ihō 博覽會彙報” (Exhibition Bulletin), February 10, 1903. Italic is mine.

this. The second issue of *Zhejiangchao*, another Chinese student journal, also carried the article in question from *Hubei xueshengjie* without correcting the “mistranslated” terms demonstrating that the editors of the Chinese student journals chose what they perceived to be correct over the literal correctness.

When the decision to withdraw China from *Jinruikan* was announced, Chinese student journals such as *Youxue yibian*, *Hubei xueshengjie*, and *Zhejiangchao* covered it, emphasizing the success of the efforts and activities of the Chinese students and merchants. The second issue of *Zhejiangchao* published a letter from Sun Shifu 孫實甫, a Chinese merchant of Osaka, saying that “if the plan to include China in *Jinruikan* is not withdrawn, the Chinese merchants will hang a mourning flag on the first day of the exhibition,” and implied that later Japan could not but cancel the plan.<sup>132</sup> The third issue of *Hubei xueshengjie* carried more detailed coverage on Sun Shifu’s devotion: “At students’ request, Sun Shifu, as the representative of the Chinese merchants, attempted to meet Nishida, the organizer of *Jinruikan*, but Nishida didn’t respond. Therefore, Sun reported to the police. Two weeks later, the display of Chinese people at *Jinruikan* was suspended thanks to Sun’s efforts.”<sup>133</sup> The 6<sup>th</sup> issue of *Youxue yibian* wrote, “Chinese students, who read the articles of Japanese newspapers about *Jinruikan*, were enraged and decided to send letters to the gentry of mainland China in order to prevent them from visiting the exhibition. Also, by cooperating with the Chinese merchants of the Osaka area, the Chinese students sought means to realize their protest. They claimed that if any

---

<sup>132</sup> *Zhejiangchao*, “*Minghu Zhina, Minghu Zhinaren* 嗚呼支那, 嗚呼支那人” (Alas, China, Alas, Chinese People), No. 2 (March 1903), 135. Sun Shifu is also known as Sun Gan 孫淦.

<sup>133</sup> *Hubei xueshengjie*, “*Renleiguanzhi Tingba* 人類館之停罷” (The Suspension of *Jinruikan*), No. 3 (March 1903), 106-107.

Chinese responds to the invitation of Japan, they will deal with him by using the appropriate authority. When they were about to take action, the Japanese government already ordered the authority of *Jinruikan* to cancel the plan to include China.”<sup>134</sup>

All these Chinese student journals implicitly and explicitly associated the efforts of the Chinese students and merchants in Japan with the final withdrawal of China from *Jinruikan*. None of them mentioned how the Qing government or officials were involved in settling the matters related to *Jinruikan*. Thus, scholars such as Paula Harrell, whose research was only based on student journals, too generously followed the students’ emphasis upon efforts made by the Chinese students and merchants.<sup>135</sup>

However, scholarly works that refer to Japanese diplomatic documents demonstrate that, as a matter of fact, the Chinese diplomatic officials in Japan also took action to press the Japanese government to withdraw the plan to include China in *Jinruikan*.<sup>136</sup> On February 24<sup>th</sup>, Cai Jun 蔡鈞, the Chinese Minister in Japan, dispatched a translator to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan in order to criticize the plan of including China in *Jinruikan* and to demand its withdrawal. On the same day, Chinda Sutemi 珍田捨巳, the General Manager of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs inquired of Yasuhiro Ban’ichiro 安広伴一郎, the Secretary-General of the Osaka Exhibition Committee, about the fact. Two days later, Yasuhiro replied that he passed on the inquiry

---

<sup>134</sup> Youxue yibian, “Hunan Tongxianghui Diaocha Daban Bolanhui Renleiguan Taiwan Nüzi Shijian 湖南同鄉會調查大阪博覽會人類館大灣女子事件” (The Association of Hunan Students Inspected the Taiwanese Woman at *Jinruikan* of the Osaka Exhibition,” No. 6 (May 1903), 1.

<sup>135</sup> Paula Harrell, *Sowing the Seeds of Change: Chinese Students, Japanese Teachers, 1895-1905* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992), 127-128.

<sup>136</sup> See Lü Shunchang 呂順長, “Osaka Jinruikan Jikenniokeru Chūgokugawano Taiōnitsuite 大阪人類館事件における中國側の対応について” (Regarding the Reactions of the Chinese Students to the Osaka Exhibition *Jinruikan* Incident), in Engeki 「Jinruikan」 Jōenwo Jiggensasetaikai ed. *Jinruikan: Fūinsareta Tobira* 人類館: 封印された扉 (Tokyo: Atto Wokusu, 2005).

to the Prefect of the Osaka Prefecture because the latter was in charge of that matter. On March 4<sup>th</sup>, the Prefect of the Osaka Prefecture officially reported that the plan to display Chinese people at *Jinruikan* had been suspended. *Jinruikan* revised its name by adding *gakujuts* 學術, or academic, as a modifier and finally opened on March 10<sup>th</sup> without the display of China.

Considering the fact that Cai Jun sent his translator to the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the same day when the Chinese students visited him to discuss the matter of *Jinruikan*, I argue it is quite unlikely that Chinese student journals didn't mention Cai Jun's involvement simply because they didn't know about it. Rather, this omission might reflect the ill feelings of the students toward the minister Cai, who was attempting to exert a heavy hand over the Chinese students in Japan, and to contain their potential political activities since the beginning of 1902. For instance, in August 1902, as a means to prevent the uncontrolled rush of self-supporting students to Japan, Cai willfully neglected issuing recommendations to nine students who sought admission to the Seijō 成城 School, a military preparatory school in Tokyo. This caused a strong protest from the Chinese students, who boldly confronted him at the legation; finally, the intervention of Japanese police led to the deportation of two leaders of the protest.<sup>137</sup> Thus, the minister Cai had been in conflict with the Chinese students and political exiles such as Liang Qichao. This also explains not only why Liang Qichao's *Xinmin congbao* didn't mention the minister Cai's involvement in settling the matter of *Jinruikan* but even harshly criticized the general competence of Chinese diplomats and process of their

---

<sup>137</sup> For a more detailed explanation about the Seijō Incident, refer to Paula Harrell's book, footnote 38, chapter five, 107-126.

appointment.<sup>138</sup>

Focusing on those Chinese journals published in Japan, the existing scholarly works have approached the matter of *Jinruikan* within the limited context of the patriotic movements of the Chinese community in Japan. However, I argue that the *Jinruikan* affair had a broader impact on Chinese society. Although the final decision to withdraw the Chinese display from *Jinruikan* was made in early March, the repercussions of the incident extended to mainland China through Chinese domestic newspapers. On March 2<sup>nd</sup>, *Dagongbao* 大公報 first carried the coverage of *Jinruikan*, which was later quoted in *Zhongwai ribao* 中外日報, a Shanghai newspaper: “China would be included in *Jinruikan* which Dr. Tsuboi established to display barbarians...Doesn’t anyone that heard about it feel shamed?”<sup>139</sup> *Dagongbao* discussed this matter further in an editorial written in a dispassionate tone of self-reflection: “We don’t need to criticize Japan for its plan to display an opium smoker and a Chinese woman with bound-feet in *Jinruikan*. It is useless to shift the blame on others. Smoking opium is a serious illness of China. No country in this world other than China has the vicious custom of foot-binding. Thus, we just should swear to stop opium-smoking and foot-binding by all means. We don’t need to criticize Japan for insulting us. If we take Japan’s insult as an opportunity for self-reflection, China could establish a distinctive status in the new world of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.”<sup>140</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup> *Xinmin congbao*, “*Bolanhui Renleixueguan Shijian* 博覽會人類學館事件” (The Incident of *Jinruikan* of the Osaka Exhibition,” No. 26 (March 1903), 85.

<sup>139</sup> *Zhongwai ribao*, “*Ji Riben Daban Bolanhuishi* 記日本大阪博覽會事”(Reporting the Osaka Exhibition of Japan), March 5, 1903.

<sup>140</sup> *Dagongbao*, “*Lun Riben Renleiguan Kehua Zhongguoren Xiyan Chanzu Qingzhuang Shi* 論日本人類館刻畫中國人吸煙纏足情狀事” (On the Affairs of the Display of Opium-Smoker and Footbinding in *Jinruikan*), March 10, 1903.



However, another newspaper, *Zhongwai ribao*, carried an article, which revealed intensive resentment against Japan's contradictory and indiscreet conduct as did the Chinese journals published in Japan:

By selecting the inferior customs as means to increase profits, Japan made its neighboring countries laughingstocks, taking no thought of their humiliation. According to Japan, they invited China to display our exhibits for the purpose of promoting the friendship between China and Japan. However, by taking advantage of this event, Japanese merchants maliciously plotted to insult both China and Japan and its enraged people.<sup>141</sup>

Apparently some of Chinese reading public reacted to the news that China, the guest of honor eagerly invited by Japan, was actually treated as a nation of barbarians. For instance, some Bannermen in Beijing read the newspaper articles regarding *Jinruikan* and the protest of the Chinese merchants in Osaka, and concluded that Manchu Bannermen would be regarded as a barbarian race. They therefore promptly asked Natong, a high official of the Foreign Office, who was supposed to accompany Prince Zaizhen to visit the Osaka Exhibition in April, to submit a joint petition to the Qing court. Furthermore, they invited leading Manchu and Mongolian figures to discuss the issue of *Jinruikan*, and finally decided to send a public letter to the Chinese students in Japan in order to encourage the latter to continue protesting.<sup>142</sup> Here, it is interesting to notice that those Bannermen took the display of China at *Jinruikan* as an attempt to insult the

---

<sup>141</sup> *Zhongwai ribao*, "Dongyou Wenjianlu 東遊聞見錄" (Japan Travelogue), March 12, 1903. This article was carried on *Hong Kong Huazi Ribao*, a Chinese daily newspaper issued in Hong Kong on March 19<sup>th</sup>.

<sup>142</sup> *Zhongwai ribao*, March 20, 1903.

Manchu race, showing their unquestionable belief that Manchu was a homonym of China, although the Manchu themselves were non-Han people. Also, from the fact that they decided to send a letter to the Chinese students, they seemed to assume that the Chinese students in Japan at that time were also fighting for their specific cause.

Another article from *Zhongwai ribao* reported that interest in visiting the Osaka Exhibition among the Chinese gentry-officials in response to the eager invitation of the Japanese Consul had quite subsided because of the news that the *Jinruikan* for the display of the vestiges of barbarians would include a haggard opium smoker and a woman with bound feet. This article concluded, “We expect that not all the people would go to Osaka simply because they could afford the travel expense.”<sup>143</sup> As the negative responses expanded among the Chinese people in tandem with the critical coverage of Chinese newspapers, the Japanese diplomatic body in China realized the seriousness of the situation. Meanwhile, at the request of those Bannerman, whose activities had been covered in the *Zhongwai ribao* of March 20, Natong of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs officially contacted Uchida Kōsai 内田康哉, the Japanese Minister to China in order to demand the investigation of the Japanese government on the matter of *Jinruikan*. Also, according to *Yorozuchōhō* 萬朝報, a leading newspaper in Tokyo, Uchida admonished the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs when it became known that the Chinese students’ petition demanding the cancelation of Prince Zaizhen’s visit to Japan was submitted to the Qing court.<sup>144</sup>

Under such pressures from both public opinion and the Qing government,

---

<sup>143</sup> *Zhongwai ribao*, March 22, 1903.

<sup>144</sup> *Yorozuchōhō*, March 26, 1903.

Komura Jutarō 小村寿太郎, the Foreign Minister of Japan, instructed Odagiri Masunosuke 小田切万寿, the Japanese Consul General in Shanghai, to clear away the misunderstandings caused by the coverage of *Zhongwai ribao*.<sup>145</sup> As a result, a statement of explanation was published on *Zhongwai ribao* of March 29<sup>th</sup> in the name of Odagiri, the Japanese Consul General in Shanghai.

According to the reply from the home government, *Jinruikan* is originally unrelated to the Osaka Exhibition. As *Jinruikan* was established in the area near the site of exhibition upon the opening of the exhibition, people mistook the relationship. As a matter of fact, it is not unusual in Europe that the exhibitions gather *ikokujin* 異國人 or “people from different countries” and display their customs, food and clothing, and habitat for the viewers. However, we are aware that it is unacceptable to display people of a friendly nation for public inspection. Upon becoming aware of this matter, the Prefect of Osaka strictly prohibited the display of China at *Jinruikan*. It is quite undesirable that such misunderstanding hurts the friendship of Chinese people with Japan. Therefore, by articulating the circumstances in *Zhongwai ribao*, we would like to refute the misinformation.<sup>146</sup>

The release of such a statement evinced that the public reaction formed from reaction to the newspapers’ coverage had already reached the point where it could play a role as an influential pressure on China at that time, although there is no way of knowing

---

<sup>145</sup> Secret Information No. 15 (March 19<sup>th</sup>) of Diplomatic Documents of Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs. “*Osakaniokeru Jinruikannikansuru Chūgainippōno Kiji Seigohō Kunji* 大阪ニ於ケル人類館ニ関スル中外日報ノ記事正誤方訓示” (Official Instruction on How to Correct the Article of *Chūgainippō* (C: *Zhongwai ribao*) regarding *Jinruikan* in Osaka).

<sup>146</sup> *Zhongwai ribao*, “*Zhaolu Riben Zhuhuzonglingshi Xiaotianqiejun Laihan* 照錄日本駐滬總領事小田切君來函” (A Letter from Odagiri, the Japanese Consul General in Shanghai), March 29, 1903.

how successfully this statement appeased the Chinese people, in that it didn't express any apology, even as a formal gesture. Clearly it was only directly addressed the damage of "friendship" of two countries, which would be likely to negate the efforts of the Japanese government to have as many Chinese visitors as possible and to impress them through the exhibition. Apart from the lack of an official apology, as a formal gesture, this statement focuses on denying the direct involvement of the Japanese government and even the authority of the Osaka exhibition by emphasizing that *Jinruikan* was located "outside" the site of the exhibition.

Furthermore, it attempted to justify the purpose of *Jinruikan* by prevaricating that it was simply a common practice in the Western exhibitions. In a word, the Japanese government was not responsible for the controversies related to *Jinruikan*. Based on the exactly same reasons as given in Odagiri's statement, Ito Mamiko, a Japanese scholar, also argues that the Meiji government didn't have such an imperialistic stance as when participating in the world exhibitions of the West.<sup>147</sup> However, was Odagiri, or the Japanese government whose stance was represented by Odagiri's statement, not aware of the problematic significance of the "common" practice in the European exhibitions to display "colored races" in the flesh? If not, Odagiri's statement would not necessarily have used the race-neutral term, *ikokujin* 異國人, or "people from different country," instead of *ishu* 異種 or "different race," which was commonly used in other Japanese sources such as newspapers, to designate the objects of display at *Jinruikan*. Thus, I argue that whether or not the Meiji government was directly involved in the establishment of *Jinruikan*, it did at least understand what *Jinruikan* represented.

---

<sup>147</sup> Ito, 80.

In the same vein, from the beginning, the authority of the Osaka Exhibition was aware of the possible controversy over *Jinruikan*. The Osaka *Asahi shimbun* published on March 20, which covered the protest of Korean people against the display of *kisaeng*, or traditional Korean female entertainers, at *Jinruikan*, wrote, “According to the police, at first there were various debates over the establishment of *Jinruikan*. Therefore, the police eventually issued a license on the condition that the permit would be invalidated if the home country of people displayed at *Jinruikan* raised an objection.”<sup>148</sup> Obviously, the establishment of *Jinruikan* was the result of deliberation by the authority of the Osaka Exhibition rather than a random copy of the “common practice” of exhibitions in Europe.

When protest from China, as well as from Korea and Okinawa, against *Jinruikan* became an issue and eventually resulted in the withdrawal of objects related to those three areas, Dr. Tsuboi, who supervised the organization of the *Jinruikan* display, took part in a series of press interviews. According to the *Asahi shimbun* of March 28th, Dr. Tsuboi asserted that future *Jinruikan* should be expanded as a project of government because a small-scale display like the *Jinruikan* of the Osaka Exhibition, mounted as a part of private profit-making enterprise, would likely cause public gossip.<sup>149</sup> On the same day, *Mainichi shimbun* 毎日新聞 also carried an article about Dr. Tsuboi and *Jinruikan*, in which he claimed, “When various races are congregated together in a small place, it would make them look like *misemono* or an entertaining show, causing loathing

---

<sup>148</sup> *Asahi shimbun* (Osaka), “*Jinruikanto* Ninkashō 人類館と認可證”(Jinruikan and its License), March 20, 1903.

<sup>149</sup> *Asahi shimbun* (Osaka), “*Tsuboi Hakushito Jinruikan* 坪井博士と人類館” (Dr. Tsuboi and Jinruikan), March 28, 1903.

of racial discrimination. Therefore, at a next exhibition in Japan, different races and their pavilions should be scattered around on the site of the exhibition as in other foreign exhibitions.”<sup>150</sup>

Clearly, the only concern Dr. Tsuboi expressed in those interviews was about how to maximize the effects of *Jinruikan*; he took the validity of the exhibit for granted without adopting any apologetic tone toward peoples displayed in *Jinruikan*, in so doing following the rhetorical example of the Japanese government. Japanese newspapers also seemed to side with Dr. Tsuboi’s stance: for instance, *Mainichi shimbun* dated April 23 claimed, “*Jinruikan* is different from common entertaining shows and obviously provides not a few academic benefits.”<sup>151</sup> Overall, the *Jinruikan* of the Osaka Exhibition represents, as Matsuda Kyōko argues, Japan’s self-definition as a model of *bunmeikoku* 文明國, or civilized society, for its neighboring countries, which were supposed to be marked as the objects of Japan’s mission of civilization.<sup>152</sup> On the other hand, for the Chinese people, the *Jinruikan* incident caused an awakening about the rhetoric of imperialism embedded in the world exhibitions. Before the Osaka Exhibition, the world exhibitions were generally perceived as an ideal means to promote the national economy among the Chinese reading publics through the writings of early reformers, who had not observed the world exhibitions by themselves. Although, as discussed in Chapter One, the Chinese people had been constantly used as the objects of entertainment or colonial display since the early World Exhibitions, this fact was not circulated by the Chinese

---

<sup>150</sup> *Mainichi Shimbun* (Osaka), “*Hakurankaito Jinruikgaku-Tsuboi Hakushino Dan* 博覽會人類學-坪井博士の談”(Exhibition and Anthropology-Dr. Tsuboi’s Talk), March 28, 1903.

<sup>151</sup> *Mainichi shimbun*, “*Jinruikan* 人類館,” April 23, 1903.

<sup>152</sup> Matsuda, 136.

mass media, which lacked their own overseas news sources. The memory of *Jinruikan* became a kind of “trauma of exhibition” that recurred in the St. Louis Exposition in the following year, 1904, which will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

### III. Taiwanese Girls with Bound Feet: Deepening Conflicts

Even before the repercussions of *Jinruikan* completely subsided, other conflicts regarding Taiwan ensued. The Osaka Exhibition of 1903 was the first exhibition that held a pavilion devoted to Taiwan, which Japan had colonized for 7 years since its victory in the Sino-Japanese War in 1895. The Japanese government-general in Taiwan played a leading role in organizing the Taiwan Pavilion under the pretext that it aimed to introduce authentic customs, culture, and industry of Taiwan to the Japanese people, and to promote the development of colonial Taiwan in general.<sup>153</sup> The Taiwan Pavilion consisted of 15 sections displaying various items related to both Han-Taiwanese and Taiwanese aborigines, in addition to industrial and agricultural products.<sup>154</sup> Since the Osaka Exhibition, the Taiwan Pavilion became a staple in the repertoire in Japanese domestic exhibitions, as well as in joint international exhibits such as the Japan-British Exhibition, which took place in London in 1910.<sup>155</sup> As a specific indicator of the status and power of Japan, the Taiwan Pavilion of the Osaka Exhibition was received quite positively among the Japanese viewers. The display of the Taiwan Pavilion probably

---

<sup>153</sup> Ito, 71~73. According to Ito, the establishment of the Taiwan Pavilion was inspired by the colonial exhibitions of the Exposition Universelle of 1900 in Paris.

<sup>154</sup> Yoshimi, 213.

<sup>155</sup> Hu Jiayu 胡家瑜, “*Bolanhui Yu Taiwan Yuanzhumin: Zhiminshiqide Zhanshi Zhengzhi Yu Tazhe Yixiang* 博覽會與臺灣原住民：植民時期的展示政治與他者意象,” in *Kaogurenleixuekan* 考古人類學刊 (Feb. 2005), 7-9.

impressed some Chinese viewers as well. Qiandan Shili, wife of a Chinese diplomat, wrote in her travelogue that the development of Taiwan for the previous six or seven years was quite impressive, and Taiwan certainly would be the great source of wealth for Japan in 20 or 30 years.<sup>156</sup>

From the perspective of the Japanese colonial government of Taiwan, the establishment of the Taiwan Pavilion was integral to their ultimate goal of propagating the development of Japan among the Taiwanese people through the Osaka Exhibition. Thus, the leading figures and gentry of Taiwan were eagerly invited to the exhibition on group tours. After their tour of the exhibition and other attractions of Japan, their attitude toward the policies of the Japanese colonial government in Taiwan seemed to change in a positive fashion. For instance, when they went back to Taiwan, they agreed to recommend the cutting off of the queue, to abolish bound feet, and to enhance sanitary standards: they also supported the direction of industrial development dictated by the colonial government. This led to the justification of the Japanese colonial dominion over Taiwan.<sup>157</sup>

However, the representation of Taiwan in the Osaka Exhibition was seemingly uncomfortable for most of the mainland Chinese viewers in that it made them keenly feel

---

<sup>156</sup> Qiandan Shili 錢單士厘, *Guimao Lǔxingji* 癸卯旅行記 (Changsha: Hunan Renmin Chubanshe, 1981), 26. The author's husband was Qian Xun 錢恂, who later became the Chinese Minister to the Netherlands and Italy. She visited the Osaka Exhibition with her family. Her travelogue, *Guimao Lǔxingji*, might be one of the few records of the exhibition written by a Chinese woman.

<sup>157</sup> Lü Shaoli 呂紹理, "Zhanshi Taiwan: 1903Nian Daban Neiguo Quanyebolanhui Taiwanguanzhi Yanjiu 展示臺灣: 1903年大版內國勸業博覽會臺灣館之研究," in *Taiwanshi Yanjiu* 臺灣史研究, Vol. 9, No. 2 (Dec., 2002), 137. All the responses of elite Taiwanese viewers introduced in Lu's article commonly associated the adoption of new industrial and cultural policies of the Japanese colonial government with the development of Taiwan. Furthermore, they didn't seem to consider such development as a means to return to China, their homeland, or to become "complete" Chinese.



the loss of Chinese territory and dignity. Under such circumstances, Chinese students from Tokyo noticed that the Taiwan Pavilion included exhibits from the Fujian Province of China. According to *Waijiaobao* 外交報, the exhibits from Fujian Province arrived so late that there was no remaining space in Foreign Samples Building, where they were originally supposed to be displayed. Therefore, a Chinese official of *Yangwuju* 洋務局, or Bureau for Foreign Matters, allowed these exhibits to be displayed in the Taiwan Pavilion, because, first, the Fujian province was geographically close to Taiwan and, secondly, they could lease space in the Taiwan Pavilion gratis.<sup>158</sup> The Chinese students wondered why the exhibits from Fujian Province, which unquestionably belonged to China, were displayed in the Taiwan Pavilion, and warned that they would take away the Fujian exhibits from the site if the Taiwan Pavilion discontinued displaying them; additionally, they contacted the Chinese Consul in Kobe and the Chinese Minister in Tokyo to request their official intervention. Finally, the exhibits of Fujian Province were transferred to Foreign Samples Building on March 22<sup>nd</sup>.

For the Chinese viewers, another concern was the Taiwanese women who were serving at three annexes of the Taiwan Pavilion: the Taiwan Tea House, the Taiwan Restaurant, and a souvenir store. *Mainichi shimbun* reported: “Yesterday opened the Taiwan Restaurant, where two Taiwanese women were serving as waitresses. Among these two waitresses, one called Baojin is so winsome that everyday the Taiwanese Restaurant and the Tea House are crowded with the excited customers.”<sup>159</sup> Another article followed, noting that the Taiwan Tea House added an interesting touch by hiring

---

<sup>158</sup> *Waijiaobao*, “*Saihui Jinshi* 賽會近事” (Exhibition News), No. 40 (June, 1903).

<sup>159</sup> *Mainichi shimbun* (Osaka), “*Taiwan Ryōritenno Kaigyō* 臺灣料理店の開業” (Opening of the Taiwan Restaurant), March 6, 1903.

three Taiwanese girls -- ages 11, 14, and 15 years -- as waitresses.<sup>160</sup> As a result, the Taiwan Pavilion became one of the most popular spots at the Pavilion, attracting over 5,300,000 viewers in the five months from March to July. Lü Shaoli rightfully argues that such popularity derived from exoticism and the glorification of Japanese colonialism represented by the Taiwan Pavilion.<sup>161</sup>

The Chinese students also noticed the relations between those Taiwanese girls and the popularity of the Taiwan Pavilion and expressed their lament: “In the Taiwan Restaurant (*namely, a tavern*) and Tea House, over 20 girls wearing Chinese clothing were serving customers. Alas, this is the picture of people from a part of China that has already fallen out...Here, the Taiwanese people are smiling happily as if they were Japanese.”<sup>162</sup> Whether or not the Taiwan Restaurant actually served alcohol, what matters is that the Chinese student author of this article chose term “tavern” to interpret this part of the exhibit. Combined with the “smiling” of those Taiwanese girls, the image of serving alcohol at a tavern could be associated with the potential for prostitution, an association through which male elites’ anxiety about their national crisis was reflected on to the female body.

However, what turned the students’ lament and anxiety into an actual protest was the presentation of a Taiwanese woman at *Jinruikan*. Although the authority controlling *Jinruikan* agreed not to have a Chinese display, Chinese viewers noticed a woman whose

---

<sup>160</sup> *Mainichi shimbun* (Osaka), “*Hakurankai Zakki* 博覽會雜記”(Exhibition Miscellanea), March 10, 1903.

<sup>161</sup> Lü (2002), 125-126.

<sup>162</sup> *Zhejiangchao*, “*Riben Diwuhui Neiguoquanyebolanhui Guanlanji* 日本第五回內國勸業博覽會觀覽記”(Report on the 5<sup>th</sup> Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibition of Japan), No.3 (April, 1903), 191. Italics are mine. The Chinese word for tavern in the original text is *Jiusi* 酒肆.

clothing and bound feet seemingly identified her as Chinese. Upon the inquiry about her national identity, the authority of *Jinruikan* responded that she was from Taiwan, but this didn't convince the Chinese viewers. Thus, a Chinese official, who visited *Jinruikan*, reported the incident to both the Chinese Consul in Kobe and the Chinese Minister to Japan in Tokyo, but their tepid responses led him to contact the Association of Students from Hunan Province.<sup>163</sup> On March 26<sup>th</sup>, the Hunan students submitted a joint petition to the Chinese Consul in Kobe in order to request the withdrawal of the woman in question from *Jinruikan*. The intervention of the Chinese Consul made the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs instruct the Osaka Prefect to withdraw the “Chinese” woman.<sup>164</sup>

Meanwhile, the Association of Students from Hunan Province sent Zhou Hongye 周宏業, a Hunan student, to investigate the identity of the “Chinese” woman in *Jinruikan*. Through Zhou's interviews with the authority of *Jinruikan* and the “Chinese” woman in question herself, it turned out that she was Li Baoyu, a 20-year-old woman from Taiwan. She was introduced to *Jinruikan* by the president of *Taiwan riri xinbao* 臺灣日日新報, which was a government organ with the biggest circulation in Taiwan during the Japanese colonial period. In *Jinruikan*, she was in charge of reception, especially for the visitors with complimentary tickets, to whom she served tea. Although she was not an official exhibit, as were the two aborigines of Taiwan in *Jinruikan*, her exotic figure, bound feet, and traditional Chinese dress was sufficient to mislead viewers to regard her as an exhibit to represent China. Thus, the protest of the Chinese viewers

---

<sup>163</sup> Lü (2002), 106.

<sup>164</sup> Secret Information No. 20 (March 31) of Diplomatic Documents of Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs. “*Taiwankannaini Tenretsuseru Shinkoku Fujin Jokyono Ken*” (臺灣館内ニ展列セル清國婦人除去ノ件: Regarding the Withdrawal of a Chinese Woman from the Taiwan Pavilion).

against her existence in *Jinruikan* was quite justifiable. However, when Zhou was convinced that the woman was certainly from Taiwan, he consented that she would be removed from *Jinruikan* and transferred to a decent tea house in Osaka, thereby putting the issue to rest. His negotiation as such resulted from his judgment that Taiwan officially belonged to Japan as its colony, and thus the further problematization of this issue could lead to an international conflict.<sup>165</sup>

The Chinese students' efforts to settle the problems of the exhibits from Fujian province in the Taiwan Pavilion and the Taiwanese woman in *Jinruikan* won applause from Chinese journals. For instance, *Waijiaobao* wrote, "The action of our Chinese students truly preserved our national entity. How admirable it is!"<sup>166</sup> On the other hand, the incompetence of the officials of the Qing government was contrasted with students' exploits. Covering the Chinese students' protest against the exhibits of Fujian province in the Taiwan Pavilion, *Zhongwai ribao* criticized the negligence of Chinese officials as well as the Western staff of the Bureau of Foreign Matters, while proclaiming that the students' deeds should not be considered an overreaction or meaningless.<sup>167</sup> Through their journals, Chinese students themselves also highlighted their own patriotic activities and expressed their discontent with the Qing government, which didn't take issue with the Japanese government more aggressively. They also criticized Chinese officials, who seemed to visit the Osaka Exhibition simply for the purpose of social relationships, showing no interest in the disgraceful fact that China would have been displayed with

---

<sup>165</sup> *Youxue yibian*, "Hunan Tongxianghui Diaocha Daban Bolanhui Renleiguan Taiwan Nüzi Shijian 湖南同鄉會調查大阪博覽會人類館大灣女子事件" (The Association of Hunan Students Inspected the Taiwanese Woman at *Jinruikan* of the Osaka Exhibition), No. 6 (May 1903), 1-12.

<sup>166</sup> *Waijiaobao*, "Saihui Jinshi 賽會近事" (Exhibition News), No. 40 (June 1903).

<sup>167</sup> *Zhongwai ribao*, "Ribei Jinshi Jiwen 日本近事紀聞" (Recent Report on Japan), March 26, 1903.

other “barbarians” in *Jinruikan*. Furthermore, Zhou Hongye, who met with Japanese authorities to discuss a matter related to the Taiwanese woman in *Jinruikan*, even wrote that the Japanese officials were better than their Chinese counterparts because the former at least listened to him attentively and never showed an aloof attitude toward him, even though he was a mere student.<sup>168</sup>

As mentioned earlier, the Osaka Exhibition coincided with the burgeoning period of the publication of the Chinese student journals in Japan. At the beginning, the primary goals of those journals were to spread new knowledge and, thereby, to enlighten the Chinese people. However, the overall political turbulence in mainland China and influence from political exiles led some journals and their publishers to political activities by early 1903. For instance, Zhou Hongye, the Hunan student who investigated the identity of the Taiwanese woman in *Jinruikan*, had been involved in an anti-Manchu rally, which was masterminded by Zhang Binglin 章炳麟, a prominent revolutionary figure, although it was banned by the Japanese police at the request of the Chinese Minister Cai.<sup>169</sup> A series of incidents regarding the Osaka Exhibition provided those politically active students with an opportunity to denounce the incapability of Chinese officials and, ultimately, to discredit the potential of the Qing government to achieve a modern state. Through examining the articles of the Chinese student journals regarding the Taiwan Pavilion and the Taiwanese woman in *Jinruikan*, Kitaoka Masako rightfully argues that the distrust of the Qing government arose from the recognition that the

---

<sup>168</sup> Youxue yibian, “Hunan Tongxianghui Diaocha Daban Bolanhui Renleiguan Taiwan Nüzi Shijian,” No. 6 (May 1903), 1-12. The same article was carried in other Chinese students’ journals such as *Jiangsu* No.1 (April, 1903) and *Zhejiangchao* No. 4 (May 1903).

<sup>169</sup> Harrell, 112.

government lacked a sense of humiliation and, thereby, which almost entirely eroded confidence in the Qing government.<sup>170</sup>

#### IV. Bitter Lessons from the Osaka Exhibition

Although the Osaka Exhibition offended Chinese viewers through the incidents discussed so far, they still sought lessons from bitter experience. Even *Zhejiangchao*, one of the Chinese student journals that led the protest against *Jinruikan*, carried a report on the Osaka Exhibition in general for the following reasons:

An exhibition is an institution for expanding commerce and to bolster foreign trade. The commerce of our country has not been prosperous for a long time. On the upper level, there is no Chamber of Commerce. On the lower level, there are no commercial studies. Therefore, commerce is not prosperous in China. If commerce is not prosperous, the nation cannot be rich. If the nation is not rich, it cannot be independent. Thus, if you want a strong nation, you should start with commercial war. Here, I record my observation in order to inform my compatriots.<sup>171</sup>

The Chinese students could not help taking advantage of the Osaka Exhibition to learn about exhibitions in general, although they were so unwilling to admit the achievement of Japan as to claim that “among the displayed machines, there was nothing

---

<sup>170</sup> Kitaoka Masako 北岡正子, “*Daigokai Naikokukangyo Hakurankaito Shinkoku Ryūgakusei* 第五回内国勧業博覧会と清国留学生” in *Kansai Daigaku Bungakubu Chūgokugo Chūgokubungakuka* ed. *Buankajishōtoshiteno Chūgoku* 文化事象としての中国 (Osaka: Kansai Daigaku Shuppanbu, 2002), 227-228.

<sup>171</sup> *Zhejiangchao*, “*Riben Diwuhui Neiguoquanyebolanhui Guanlanji* 日本第五回内国勧業博覧會觀覽記” (Report on Japan’s Fifth Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibition), No.3 (April, 1903), 185.

invented in Japan. However, within only 30 years since the Meiji Restoration, Japan has learned technology. Japan is naturally the hero of stealing.”<sup>172</sup>

The Chinese domestic journals went further, suggesting ways to improve the performance of China at the exhibition by looking into the problems revealed at the Osaka Exhibition. The Chinese journals commonly pointed out the disengagement of the Qing government from the process of organizing the Chinese exhibit at the world exhibition, although the Imperial Commission unprecedented. For instance, both *Zhongwai ribao* and *Hong Kong huaziribao* 香港華字日報 implicitly criticized the fact that management of the items for the exhibition fell into the hands of unqualified foreigners by reporting on the poor performance of a Japanese agent hired by several provinces of the Southeast coast of China.<sup>173</sup> Besides, *Zhongwai ribao* carried a commendatory ode, which Chen Jingru 陳敬如, a Lieutenant Colonel, recited at a banquet to celebrate Huang Xiubo 黃秀伯’s winning of the First Award at the Indo China Exposition Francaise et Internationale, which took place in Hanoi, 1902. The ode began with the claims that commercial affairs were related to the foundation of the nation and, for the past scores of years, European nations had been investing great amounts of financial and human resources in exhibitions as a good means by which to promote commerce and industry. Then, the ode continued to provide detailed information about how Japan, a country of the same race and same letter with China, had been actively engaged in the exhibitions with support from the Meiji Emperor since 1872 (Meiji 5), when the Japanese government first created the position of the Secretary-General for

---

<sup>172</sup> Ibid., 190.

<sup>173</sup> *Zhongwai ribao*, March 5, 1903; *Hong Kong Huaziribao*, March 13, 1903.

Exhibition and its staffs. Then, it contrasted the eager attitude of Japan toward the exhibition with the lukewarm attitude of the Qing government as follows:

In the past years, China was also asked to participate in the exhibition by its host country. However, the Qing government regarded the exhibitions simply as the affairs for *public relations*, and thus made do with sending staffers of the Maritime Customs. Even after they came back from the exhibitions, there was no report about their performance. Thus, quite regrettably it ended up as if the had thrown tens of thousands [of money] into a broken jar.<sup>174</sup>

Chen's statement is interesting for two reasons. First, it clearly relates that the Qing government approached the international exhibition for public relations, or as a diplomatic activity. Secondly, it points out the problems caused by the fact that the IMCS dealt with matters regarding the international exhibitions. As discussed in Chapter One, for Robert Hart, the Inspector General of the IMCS, the purpose of China's participation in the world exhibitions was never to represent China as a nation. Under such circumstances, the foreign staff of the IMCS dealt with the preparation of Chinese exhibits without any sense of commitment to the commercial and industrial development of China. Thus, as Chen implied, it was inevitable for other ministries of the Qing government to replace the IMCS as the central agency in charge of the exhibitions in order to improve the Chinese exhibit and to represent China properly in the world exhibition. In this vein, some Chinese journals such as *Wanguo gongbao* 萬國公報 and

---

<sup>174</sup> *Zhongwai ribao*, "Chen Jingru Canjiang Songci 陳敬如參將頌詞" (A Commendatory Ode by Chen Jingru, a Lieutenant Colonel), April 6, 1903. The official position of Huang Xiubo was *guancha* 觀察 or Intendant of a Circuit. Italic is mine.



*Waijiaobao* also suggested specific ways to more systematically organize participation in the international exhibition under the leadership of the Qing government.<sup>175</sup>

Finally, Chen's ode concluded: "Because the technology of China had reached a fair level, China must have its own exhibitions in order to avoid simply relying on (the invitation of) other countries. The court is also aware of this necessity, but no one has proposed this yet. Thus, by taking advantage of this opportunity, I wish that three Ministers here take the lead in launching exhibitions, and that the industry and commerce of China establish itself, achieving wealth and power of our nation."<sup>176</sup> The suggestion that China should hold its own exhibitions were found in other Chinese domestic journals as well. For instance, *Hong Kong huazi ribao* claimed that China should hold an agriculture exhibition for the reason that nations could not exist in the current world of evolution without competition, reflecting the influence of Social Darwinism among the Chinese elites at that time. This article also indicated a rivalry with Japan: "Considering that Japan has been holding domestic produce exhibitions, how regretful it would be if China never had one like that."<sup>177</sup> *Zhongwai ribao* advanced various suggestions such as the systemization of the process to report detailed statements of exhibit items, as well as the expenses for shipping, insurance, and maritime customs. It was even proposed that awardees of exhibitions should be congratulated with plaques from the provincial

---

<sup>175</sup> *Waijiaobao*, "Lun Gesheng Paiyuan Saihui Banfa Weihe 論各省派員賽會辦法未合" (Discussing that it is Unreasonable for Each Province to Dispatch Officials to the Exhibitions Individually), No. 39 (May, 1903); *Wanguo Gongbao*, "Lun Fusaihuizhifa 論赴賽會之法" (Discussing How to Participate in the Exhibitions), No. 173 (May, 1903).

<sup>176</sup> *Zhongwai ribao*, "Chen Jingru Canjiang Songci," April 6, 1903. The three Ministers mentioned here were the Minister of Trade, the Minister of Commercial Treaties, and the Minister of Telegraph Administration. As discussed in chapter one, the petition for holding a national exhibition in China had been submitted by Pan Shengnian, a Chinese official of the Board of Works, during the period of the Hundred Days' Reforms in 1898. Chen Jinru was apparently unaware of this fact.

<sup>177</sup> *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, May 11, 1903.

governors.<sup>178</sup>

As the Chinese press derived the necessity of improving the current system of preparing the Chinese exhibit at the world exhibition and holding a national exhibition of China from a series of unpleasant incidents of the Osaka Exhibition, the Qing government also made its own moves. Although the controversial issues such as *Jinruikan* were not officially reported to the Qing court, it was at least aware of China's disappointing display at the Osaka Exhibition.<sup>179</sup> According to *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, Lord Zaizhen reported to the Empress Dowager that the Osaka Exhibition was overall quite splendid, but that the display of China ranked the lowest, being unable to match the exhibited items of other countries that had greatly improved because they were unrestricted by old practices. It was also said that this negative self-evaluation provoked a displeased look from the Empress Dowager.<sup>180</sup> As if making up for the unpleasant memories and negative evaluations of the performance of China in the Osaka Exhibition, the Qing government involved itself in preparing for the St. Louis Exposition the following year by investing more money and effort. Thereby, China finally made its official debut in the world exhibitions of the West by sending the Imperial Commission and establishing the China Pavilion in the St. Louis Exposition. In other words, the Chinese exhibit at the St. Louis Exposition would be supposed to represent China as a nation rather than a random collection of products from the treaty ports.

The Osaka Exhibition of 1903 inaugurated China's first meaningful step toward

---

<sup>178</sup> *Zhongwai ribao*, March 7, 1903; *Zhongwai ribao*, March 9, 1903.

<sup>179</sup> According to the official documents recorded in *Qingong Wanguo Bolanhui Dang'an*, there is no evidence that those controversial issues were reported to the Qing government.

<sup>180</sup> *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, June 23, 1903.

participation in overseas exhibitions for both the Qing government and the elite reading public. However, at the same time, the conflicts revealed through the Osaka Exhibition foreshadowed that the Qing government's willingness for reformation and improvement of its diplomatic relationships by participating in the St. Louis Exposition the following year would not be received by the Chinese reading publics as intended. Moreover, the Chinese newspapers and journals, which gave priority to specific political ideologies over the impartiality of the press at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, were ready to project their sense of anti-government outrage into their coverage of the Chinese exhibit at the St. Louis Exposition, thereby deepening the distrust of the Chinese people toward the Qing government, as will be discussed in the following chapter.

## **Chapter Three: Recurrence of Trauma at the St. Louis Exposition of 1904**

### **I. The Louisiana Purchase International Exposition**

The St. Louis Exposition or, a celebration of the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the purchase of Louisiana Territory by the United States, was originally planned to take place in 1903. Thus, in late 1901, on behalf of the government, the diplomatic officers of the United States stationed abroad began inviting foreign countries to the exposition. The American government of the Progressive Era was expanding its commercial and political influences in Asia under the Open Door Policy, and was eager to pursue the participation of Asian countries in the St. Louis Exposition. Under such circumstances, Edwin H. Conger, then U.S. Minister in China, presented an official invitation letter on Oct. 8th, 1901, which the Qing government immediately accepted on Oct. 13th. The promptness of China's acceptance was a desperate diplomatic gesture on the side of the Qing government, which was put on the defensive in its relationship with foreign powers as it signed the "Boxer Protocol" only a month previously to settle the Boxer Uprising. As discussed in the previous chapter, the Qing government also accepted the invitation to the Osaka Exhibition, which was first presented in early 1902. Given the particular pressures of the post-uprising moment, participation in the international exhibitions became one of the main diplomatic activities by the Qing government of the post-Boxer era.

When the opening of the Exposition was delayed from the planned year of 1903 to 1904, John Barrett, the Special Commissioner to Asia, Oceania, and Australasia of the St. Louis World's Fair was dispatched to maintain the participation of the Asian

countries.<sup>181</sup> Barrett first visited Japan and Korea, where he successfully secured their participation in the St. Louis Exposition and, then, arrived at Shanghai in July, 1902. On July 26<sup>th</sup>, he visited the Empress Dowager with Edwin H. Conger, then U.S. Minister in China. In this audience, he reemphasized the purpose of the St. Louis Exposition, and encouraged the visit of the Empress and the Emperor to the exposition in the cause of enhancing friendship between the two countries.<sup>182</sup> Furthermore, Barrett insisted that the Qing government send some imperial representatives to the St. Louis Exposition. To the surprise of the U.S. government, which did not expect much, the Qing government agreed.<sup>183</sup> Thus, Prince Pulun 溥倫, a nephew of the Guangxu Emperor, was appointed the President of the Imperial Commission. In addition, Huang Kaijia 黃開甲 as the Vice Commissioner and ten officials from the local governments of six provinces (Hubei, Hunan, Jiangnan, Guangxi, Guangdong, and Shandong) joined the commission. Robert Hart, the Inspector General of the IMCS, selected Francis Carl and D. Percebois as working managers at the site of the exposition.

On the other hand, private channels also played a significant role in encouraging the Qing government to take another unprecedented action: sending portraits of the Empress Dowager to the exhibition. According to a Chinese newspaper, both Princess

---

<sup>181</sup> John Barrett had served as the United States Minister to Siam from 1893 to 1898 and ardently advocated the development of American trade with the Orient. Regarding John Barrett's life and career, see Salvatore Prisco, *John Barrett, Progressive Era Diplomat: A Study of a Commercial Expansionist, 1887-1920* (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1973).

<sup>182</sup> *Zhongguo di 1 li shi dang an guan* 中國第一歷史檔案館 ed. *Guangxuchao Zhupi Zouzhe* 光緒朝硃批奏摺 Vol. 112 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1995-1996), 116-117.

<sup>183</sup> According to an article in *The Wall Street Journal*, Secretary Hay and Minister Conger said it would be impossible when Barrett told them of his plan to request a visit from imperial representatives at the exposition. *The Wall Street Journal*, "Prince Pu Lun: His Visit Due to John Barrett's Efforts," June 2, 1904.

Lun Rongshou 論榮壽 and Sarah Conger, the wife of the U.S. Minister to China, frequently conversed with the Empress Dowager about the St. Louis Exposition. It was said that Empress Dowager expressed her regret over being unable to visit the exposition in person.<sup>184</sup> Conger, whose pet name among her intimate Chinese friends was “Kang Taitai,” obtained the opportunity to become acquainted with the Empress Dowager when the Qing court made amends to the foreign powers after its members returned to Beijing from their refuge following the Boxer Uprising in January, 1902. The Empress Dowager began to build social relationships with the wives of diplomats and foreign staffers by receiving them, now and then with their children, in the inner chambers of the palace. For example, an audience with the Empress Dowager granted to the ladies of the diplomatic corps in February, 1902, in which Mrs. Conger gave a speech advocating friendship between “China and the other peoples of the earth,” solidified Conger’s close relationship with the Empress.<sup>185</sup> Through this relationship, Mrs. Conger took advantage of the opportunity to talk about the St. Louis Exposition and, furthermore, to successfully persuade the Empress Dowager to send a portrait of the Empress to the exposition. With the permission of the Empress Dowager, Mrs. Conger contacted Katharine Carl, an American artist who was staying in Shanghai at that time with her brother, Francis Carl, an American staffer with the IMCS. Katharine Carl started painting the portraits of the

---

<sup>184</sup> Zhongwai Ribao, “Beijing Jinshi Shuhan (北京近事述函: Recent Affairs of Beijing),” March 5, 1903. Princess Lun Rongshou, Prince Gong 恭親王’s eldest daughter, was adopted by the Empress Dowager. Ms. Conger’s maiden name is Sarah Jane Pike.

<sup>185</sup> For Mrs. Conger’s speech, refer to her book, *Letter from China: With Particular Reference to the Empress Dowager and the Women of China* (Chicago: A.C. McClurg & Co., 1910), 218-219.

Empress Dowager in August, 1903 while staying in the Summer Palace. A complete portrait was dispatched to the St. Louis Exposition in April, 1904.<sup>186</sup>

Once the Qing government decided to participate in the exposition, the Department of Foreign Affairs began to pursue support and cooperation from influential officials, for instance, the Minister-superintendent of Trade in the South and the Minister-superintendent of Trade in the North. The Department of Foreign Affairs also wired Lord Zaizhen, who happened to be in New York after visiting England to attend the coronation of Edward VII, to drop by the exposition site in St. Louis.<sup>187</sup> Yet however eager the Qing government may have been to participate in the exposition, it still faced significant obstacles to its plans. Because the national treasury had recently been all but depleted due to China's payment of war reparations amounting to 450 million taels after the Boxer Uprising, the government found it quite difficult to secure enough financial resources for the exposition. Prince Pulun, the President of the Imperial Commission to the St. Louis Exposition, estimated the funds necessary for participation at around 1,400,000 taels, double the previous cost of 700,000 taels when the IMCS had previously been in full charge of the international expositions.<sup>188</sup>

Even estimated at this drastically increased amount, Pulun expressed concern that the budget might fall short of covering the total expenses needed to participate in the exposition. By Pulun's calculation, 500,000 taels were needed to build the China Pavilion, 150,000 taels to cover the management costs of the IMCS, which was in charge

---

<sup>186</sup> Regarding the process that Katharine Carl painted the portraits of the Empress Dowager, refer to her book, *With the Empress Dowager of China* (New York: The Century, 1906).

<sup>187</sup> Due to his tight schedule, Lord Zaizhen couldn't make it to St. Louis. Zai Zhen, 351.

<sup>188</sup> *Zhongwai ribao*, "Lunbeizi Feng 倫貝子奉" (Prince Pulun's Statement), March 5, 1903.

of procuring and shipping the exhibits to the site of the exposition, and 100,000 taels to defray travel costs and stipends for the Imperial Commission.<sup>189</sup> However, to Pulun's disappointment, the Qing government barely managed to secure 750,000 taels through a disbursement from the Privy Purse of the Empress Dowager and a loan from local officials and rich merchants in southern and eastern China.<sup>190</sup> Yet, the pressure of staging China's first official participation in an international exposition of the West forced Prince Pulun to keep insisting on an increase in the budget. For instance, toward the end of 1903, he received a telegram from Vice Commissioner Huang Kaijia that the Chinese community in America sincerely expected the Qing government to prepare for the Exposition attentively in order to avoid being humiliated by foreigners. In response, Prince Pulun asked the Empress Dowager to add 400,000 taels to the original budget, whereby the Imperial Commission could secure 1,000,000 taels to prepare the exposition.<sup>191</sup>

Finally, after one and half years of preparation, Huang Kaijia commenced the construction of the Chinese Pavilion at the St. Louis Exposition in July 1903. In early March, the Chinese officials and Francis Carl of the IMCS began to depart for America. Prince Pulun and his entourage arrived at St. Louis in time to attend the Opening Ceremony of the St. Louis Exposition on April 30. In addition to those Chinese officials,

---

<sup>189</sup> *Hongkong huazi ribao*, "Saihuizhifei 賽會之費" (The Expenditure for the Exposition), April 16, 1903.

<sup>190</sup> *Waijiaobao*, "Saihui Huiji 賽會彙紀" (Collective Report of the Exposition), Vol. 38 (May, 1903). The four provinces of Zhili, Jiangsu, Guangdong, and Sichuan were each supposed to send 100,000 taels to the central government.

<sup>191</sup> *Hong Kong huaizi ribao*, "Gong Yibaiwan 共一百萬" (Total One Million Taels), Nov. 6, 1903. 600,000 taels -- 500,000 taels for the Chinese Pavilion and 100,000 taels for the expenditures of the Imperial Commission -- were originally assigned to the Imperial Commission.



194 Chinese laborers were mobilized for the operation of 2,000 tons of Chinese exhibits to be placed in fair buildings.<sup>192</sup>

## **II. Chinese Journals' Coverage of the St. Louis Exposition**

China's unprecedented participation impressed the American news media even before the opening of the exposition. *The San Francisco Chronicle* reported, "China is preparing to make a greater showing of its productions than it has made at any previous world's fair."<sup>193</sup> The same newspaper carried another complimentary article about the future Chinese exhibit at the exposition: "China will have at the St. Louis Exposition the largest, finest, rarest and most comprehensive exhibit that ever left the empire. She appropriated \$562,500 to collect and install it, and, in addition, the high officials of the country for the first time in Chinese history have taken an enthusiastic interest and have loaned generously from their rare private collections."<sup>194</sup>

Prince Pulun's visit also received a spotlight from American newspapers and his arrival at major stopovers en route to St. Louis (Honolulu, San Francisco, Chicago, and Washington) was reported. At his reception at the White House, Prince Pulun presented a letter from the Guangxu Emperor's, the full text of which was published by major American newspapers: "The Emperor of China to the President of the United States of America, greeting: From the commencement of China's friendly intercourse with the United States, the relations between the two countries have been growing closer and

---

<sup>192</sup> Irene E. Cortinovic, "China at the St. Louis World's Fair," *Missouri Historical Review*, Vol. LXXII No. 1 (Oct. 1977), 62-63.

<sup>193</sup> *The San Francisco Chronicle*, "Magnitude of the St. Louis Fair," Jan. 19, 1904.

<sup>194</sup> *The San Francisco Chronicle*, "Bring Portion of China's Exhibit," Feb. 26, 1904.

closer every day. Now the holding at St. Louis of the international exposition to celebrate the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the purchase of Louisiana, the object of which is to bring together from every country on the surface of the globe, products and resources of every description for the purpose of illustration and exhibition, gives us a fresh opportunity of manifesting our friendship. (Given this 18<sup>th</sup> day of the twelfth moon in the 29<sup>th</sup> year of Kwan Hus, (February 3, 1904)).”<sup>195</sup>

Much like the American news media, domestic Chinese newspapers carried related articles after the Qing government’s decision to participate in the St. Louis Exposition was made public. Most of articles presented a general introduction to the St. Louis Exposition or discussed the significance of the Chinese participation in the international Exposition. For instance, *Dagongbao* introduced categories of exhibits at the St. Louis Exposition in mid January in 1903.<sup>196</sup> Later, a series of articles followed explaining the specific process of submitting items to the exposition in March.<sup>197</sup> *Wan’guo gongbao* also carried an article about the participation of China in the St. Louis

---

<sup>195</sup> *Los Angeles Times*, “The Guangxu Emperor’s Letter”; *The New York Times*, “Greetings of Kwang Hsu”; *The New York Tribune*, “Chinese Prince at White House”; *San Francisco Chronicle*, “Welcomes the Prince of China: President Roosevelt Receives Pu Lun, Who Presents a letter from Celestial Emperor”; *The Baltimore Sun*, “Roosevelt Meets Prince Pu: The Chinese Commissioner Brings Greetings from the Emperor.” All these articles are dated April 26, 1904. American newspapers had covered Prince Pulun’s every move in the U.S. until he left for Paris in July. Most of coverage was quite positive, although one newspaper, *The Indianapolis Morning Star*, claimed that Prince Pulun’s visit to the St. Louis Exposition was nothing but a pretext for the real purpose of procuring American officers who would serve in China. *The Indianapolis Morning Star*, “Prince Not Here To Get Soldiers,” May 19, 1904.

<sup>196</sup> *Dagongbao*, “Meiguo Shenglu yisheng Bolandhui Chupin Bulei Mulu 美國聖路易省博覽會出品部類目錄” (The Catalogue of the Exhibits at American St. Louis Exposition), Jan. 15 and 16, 1903.

<sup>197</sup> *Dagongbao*, “Meiguo Sanlu yishengcheng Teshe Bolandhui Zhengsong Fuhui Saiwu 美國三魯義師省城特設博覽會徵送赴會賽物啓” (Announcing, collecting, and sending the exhibit items to the St. Louis Exposition), “Announcing, collecting, and sending the exhibit items to the St. Louis Exposition), March 17, 18, and 19, 1903.

Exposition, claiming that this news should spread rapidly in order to demonstrate China's sincere desire to open to the outside world. Moreover, it suggested that the administrative power of *Shanghai* 商會, or the Chamber of Commerce Dealing with Agriculture or Industry, should first be expanded to cover in every corner of the country. To do so would not only provide financial support to specific industrial endeavors across China, but would also allow each chamber to recruit bright people with expert knowledge of the specific fields to represent China at the exposition as delegates to the St. Louis Exposition. After these delegates' return to China, claimed the article, they would report what they saw and heard at the exposition, thus bringing priceless knowledge and experience back to the chambers of commerce.<sup>198</sup> Thus, at least before the opening of the St. Louis Exposition, most Chinese journals approvingly covered the general significance of China's participation in the exposition and its benefits for the development of Chinese industry.

However, among those early articles covering China and the St. Louis Exposition, an article in *Hong Kong huazi ribao* was notable for its questioning of the government's motives:

The Empress Dowager ordered Prince Pulun to participate in the St. Louis Exposition. Also, for that mission, the Empress Dowager ordered him to contact overseas Chinese merchants and to visit the ports of South Seas. Its apparent purpose was to look into commercial affairs, but the

---

<sup>198</sup> *Wan'guo gongbao*, "Lun Fusaihuizhifa 論赴賽會之法" (Discussing How to Participate in the Exposition)," No. 173 (June 1903), 24.

actual objective was to undermine the *Baohuanghui*, or the Protect the Emperor Society.<sup>199</sup>

This article was exceptional in that it attempted to associate the activities of the Qing government for the preparation of the exposition with political surveillance of the exiled reformers, who were expanding their influence throughout the Chinese Diaspora through the Protect the Emperor Society established by Kang Youwei and Liang Qichao in Vancouver, Canada in 1899. As will be discussed later, it would turn out that the Qing government's suspicion of the exiled reformers and their followers among the overseas Chinese community was not groundless, because they would use the “poor,” or even humiliating presentation of China at the St. Louis Exposition as evidence for their criticism of the Qing government. Thus, this initially dissenting voice portended conflicts that would later develop between the reformers and the Qing government regarding the Chinese exhibit at the St. Louis Exposition. The first round began with the arrival of the portrait of the Empress Dowager to the site of the exposition.

### **1) A National Shame? : The Portrait of the Empress Dowager**

As mentioned earlier, it was Sarah Conger who had initially suggested the idea of sending a portrait of the Empress to the exposition. Conger perceived the Empress Dowager not only as a capable leader but also as a charming and open-minded person.

---

<sup>199</sup> *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, “*Beizi Chuyou* 貝子出遊” (Prince Pulun's Excursion), Feb. 14, 1903. *Hong Kong huazi ribao* had been first issued as the Chinese edition of *China Mail*, an English newspaper published in Hong Kong, later becoming a daily newspaper in 1874 (Ye, 211). The Qing court under the Empress Dowager had suppressed the Protect the Emperor Society led by Kang Youwei, who was attempting to muster the overseas Chinese in order to support the Emperor Guangxi after the failure of the Hundred Days' Reforms.

Thus, being inspired by a leaf from the public relations handbook of Queen Victoria, she intended to improve the image of the Empress Dowager among the Westerners through the display of her portrait at the St. Louis Exposition: “For many months I had been indignant over the horrible, unjust caricatures of Her Imperial Majesty in illustrated papers, and with a growing desire that the world might see her more as she really is, I had conceived the idea of asking her Majesty’s permission to speak with her upon the subject of having her portrait painted.”<sup>200</sup>

On June 19<sup>th</sup>, the portrait was officially unveiled at the reception ceremony at the Art Gallery of the St. Louis Exposition, presided over by Prince Pulun, who had just come back from his tour of the United States in mid May. The presence of the portrait of the Empress Dowager made the northeast corner of the Art Gallery, dedicated to portraits painted by the American artists, a popular spot.<sup>201</sup> After the closure of the exhibition, the portrait of the Empress Dowager was presented to President Theodore Roosevelt as the Empress Dowager wished.<sup>202</sup> Thus, the portrait of the Empress Dowager served as a representative emblem of the Chinese presence at the St. Louis Exposition.

The facts that it would be the first exposure of the actual image of the Empress Dowager to the public, and that two American ladies, Sarah Conger and Katharine Carl, were involved in this project, drew the attention of the American news media before and after its arrival to St. Louis: “Chinese Empress Portrait: Painted by American Woman

---

<sup>200</sup> Conger, 247-248. As implied in Mrs. Conger’s letter to her daughter, “We were silent upon this subject; no one knew of the coming event.” The project was a result of the intimate rapport between the two women, the Empress Dowager and Mrs. Conger.

<sup>201</sup> Mark Bennitt ed., *History of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition: Comprising the history of the Louisiana territory, the story of the Louisiana Purchase and a full account of the great exposition, embracing the participation of the states and nations of the world, and other events of the St. Louis world’s fair of 1904* (St. Louis: Universal Exposition Pub. Co., 1905), 502.

<sup>202</sup> Carl, 229.

and sent to St. Louis Fair” (*The Baltimore Sun*, April 22); “Donation from the Dowager” (*Los Angeles Times*, May 5); “Empress’ Gift to the United States” (*The Washington Post*, May 5); “Artist Has a Unique Honor: Miss Carl of America the Only Painter for Whom Chinese Empress Dowager Ever Sat” (*The San Francisco Chronicle*, May 23); “Honor Guard with Picture: About 100 persons Travelling with that of Dowager Empress” (*The Baltimore Sun*, May 28, 1904). On the other hand, regarding the image of the Empress Dowager in that portrait, major newspapers made no comment: “The long-delayed portrait of the Dowager Empress of China arrived today, and was immediately taken to the Art Palace at the Exposition, where it was unveiled. Prince Pu Lun, who is a nephew of the Dowager Empress, conducted the unveiling ceremonies. The Portrait is fourteen feet high. It was admitted into the United States free of duty, and bond for its safety was required.”<sup>203</sup>

However, the Chinese journals’ coverage of the portrait was quite negative and even distorted, treating the presentation of the portrait as a humiliating act against China’s national dignity. Among the Chinese journals, *Jingzhong ribao* 警鐘日報 first carried an article on the portrait under the provocative headline, “The Portrait of the Empress Dowager Insults Our Nation”:

When the Empress Dowager’s portrait arrived at the US, the authority of the St. Louis Exposition didn’t want to accept it, because women’s portraits had never been displayed at the exhibitions. It is also said that the Empress Dowager in the portrait looks like a beauty in her 30s. Her young and beautiful looks as such are scorned by the American

---

<sup>203</sup> *The New York Times*, “Fair Gets Empress’ Portrait: China’s Head Sends her Picture to Exposition—Fourteen Feet High,” June 14, 1904.

people. Some entertainment journals carried many articles ridiculing it. The president of America also wouldn't receive the portrait because ladies of the upper class in America don't give their photos to men other than their fiancée. If he accepts the portrait of the Empress Dowager, it would be quite inappropriate. As a result, the portrait would be returned to the Chinese Embassy in Washington.<sup>204</sup>

*Hong Kong huazi ribao* also carried a related article in a similar vein:

When the portrait arrived at America, it was originally intended to be given to the President of America. However, because of the Western custom that women's portraits are not lightly given to people, it was going to be returned to China. Rumor has it that the portrait was originally planned to be shown to the world at the St. Louis Exposition, but that the committee of the exhibition turned it down on the excuse of the unavailability of space and the portrait was finally sent back to the Chinese Embassy.<sup>205</sup>

Although the articles in *Jingzhong ribao* and *Hong Kong huazi ribao* were carried on June 27<sup>th</sup> and June 29<sup>th</sup> respectively, they actually had been written and wired before the portrait was opened to the public at the Art Gallery. How, then, could the American people or "some entertainment journals" know that the Empress Dowager in the portrait looked like a beauty in her thirties even though actual Empress was pushing seventy at that time? Apart from this question, their claim that the portrait of the Empress Dowager was rejected by both the authority of the St. Louis Exposition and the U.S.

---

<sup>204</sup> *Jingzhong ribao*, "Shengyilu Huichang Yaoshi Jia: Yurong Ruguo 聖易路會場要事 甲：御容辱國" (Main Affairs of the St. Louis Exposition: The Portrait of the Empress Dowager insults our Nation), June 27, 1904.

<sup>205</sup> *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, "Taihouxiang Weijing Shouna 太后像未經收納" (The Portrait of the Empress Dowager has not been accepted), June 29, 1904.

government was obviously fabricated. The American custom regarding women's pictures described in these articles was also an invention.

Since the suppression of the Hundred Days' Reforms, the Empress Dowager had been the target of hatred and distrust among many reformers, let alone the revolutionaries. Slander about the Empress Dowager began to appear in newspapers and journals. Although the Qing government intermittently intervened and outlawed periodicals critical of the government, as seen in the famous *Subao* Incident, it was impossible to control all of them, particularly those published overseas or registered in the authority of a foreign concession.<sup>206</sup> Regarding the two newspapers mentioned above, *Hong Kong huazi ribao* was published in Hong Kong, a British colony, and *Jingzhong ribao* was registered in the authority of a German concession in Shanghai. Particularly, *Jingzhong ribao*, of which the predecessor was *Eshi jingwen* 俄事警聞, the bulletin of *Dui'e tongzhihui* 對俄同志會, or the Volunteer Corps to Resist Russia, was committed to revolutionary and anti-Manchu propaganda.<sup>207</sup>

Thus, these two articles fabricated stories freely in order to make the portrait of the Empress Dowager or, more substantially, the Empress herself, a "national shame." At the same time, these articles deployed rhetoric the sexist rhetoric the Chinese male elites

---

<sup>206</sup> *Subao* 蘇報, a radical newspaper published in Shanghai, was closed down by the Qing government in June, 1903 after it published a series of articles provoking anti-Manchu revolutionary sentiment. As a result, Zou Rong, who wrote *The Revolutionary Army*, and Zhang Binglin were imprisoned.

<sup>207</sup> The Volunteer Corps to Resist Russia was organized under the leadership of Cai Yuanpei 蔡元培 in order to protest against the Russian occupation of Manchuria in 1903. In spring, 1904, after the Russo-Japanese War had erupted, the name of the newspaper was changed to *Jingzhong ribao*, or "Warning Bell Daily." Li Yansheng 李焱勝, *Zhongguo baokan tushi* 中国报刊图史 (Wuhan: Hubei renmin chubanshe, 2005), 53; Billy K. L. So and Gungwu Wang, *Power and Identity in the Chinese World Order* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2003), 39.



adopted in disparaging the Empress Dowager. For instance, Kang Youwei used to depict the Empress Dowager as a “licentious and depraved palace concubine” and a “wanton, avaricious old woman,” and even raised suspicions about her affair with a eunuch.<sup>208</sup> With such gender-biased rhetoric, they regarded the portrait of the Empress Dowager as a private portrait of a “woman,” not that of a monarch representing a nation. In this vein, they depicted the presentation of the portrait of the Empress as a personal exchange between the American president as a man and the Empress Dowager as a woman, thereby giving an impression that the Empress Dowager, a “licentious” woman, was trying to flirt with him.

## **2) Recurrence of Trauma: The Chinese Exhibits in the Palace of the Liberal Arts**

The negative tone of the Chinese journals concerning the performance of the Qing government continued or, more correctly, intensified as they covered the Chinese exhibits in the palace of the Liberal Arts, which, as one of the principal departments of the St. Louis Exposition, displayed broadly ranged exhibits of 35 countries, covering fields from the graphic arts to architectural engineering. It was the Palace of the Liberal Arts where the majority of Chinese exhibits submitted to the St. Louis Exposition were displayed, a vast collection consisting of traditional artifacts and primary export commodities such as tea and silk, amounting to approximately 650,000 USD in total.<sup>209</sup> Although these exhibits didn’t exemplify high technology and industrialization, the overall scale and exquisiteness of the Chinese exhibits was enough to impress viewers, as

---

<sup>208</sup> Sterling Seagrave, *Dragon Lady: The Life and Legend of the Last Empress of China* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992), 250-251.

<sup>209</sup> Bennitt ed., 559.

described in *History of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition*: “The Empire of China made a vast collective exhibit in the Place of Liberal Arts. Its very uniqueness rendered it, par excellence, the much-sought-for spot of the thousands of visitors to the Fair.”<sup>210</sup> *The New York Times* also wrote that “the marked attention these exhibits are attracting bears excellent testimony to the appreciation in which they are held, and the interest thus excited seems to increase daily.”<sup>211</sup>

In contrast, what caught the attention of Chinese visitors were not those exquisite exhibits, but some indiscreet tableaux intended to represent Chinese culture. One such exhibit featured two mannequins respectively representing a Chinese woman with bound feet and an old man with a complexion dark from opium addiction. Another exhibit displayed an assortment of opium pipes, execution swords and cangues. The Chinese journals expressed infuriation and frustration regarding these exhibits. *Dongfang zazhi* 東方雜誌 carried an article entitled “The National Shame of the St. Louis Exposition”: “Because the Chinese government trusted the foreign staff of the Maritime Customs to select the exhibits for the fair, those foreigners who didn’t understand the significance of *guoti* 國體 or the national polity placed the binding shoes and the opium tools on display. Thus, all the visitors looked down on China. What a shame!”<sup>212</sup> *Hong Kong huazi ribao* also wrote that “the Qing government spent a huge amount of 150,000 taels, but, alas, entrusted the money to *taren* 他人 or “others,” who eventually humiliated *guoti* with those corrupt items. From this, it is obvious that the Qing

---

<sup>210</sup> Bennitt ed., 285.

<sup>211</sup> Theodore Harder, “China’s Remarkable Exhibit at the World’s Fair,” *The New York Times*, 28 Aug. 1904.

<sup>212</sup> *Dongfang zazhi*, “Shengluyi Changhuizhi Guochi 聖路易場會之國恥” (National shame at the St. Louis), Vol. 7 (1904), 43.

government lost *zhuquan* 主權 or its sovereign authority in managing affairs of the exhibition.”<sup>213</sup> *Jingzhong ribao* also wrote, “It is extremely shameful that our Chinese exhibits at the St. Louis Exposition were scorned by foreigners. The Department of Foreign Affairs entrusted staff from the Maritime Customs with the task of collecting exhibits. As foreigners, how could they have any objective to protect the national polity of China?”<sup>214</sup>

All these three articles commonly blamed the Qing government for entrusting the foreign staff of the IMCS with the Chinese exhibits. Although the exhibits submitted by *Beijing gongyishangju* 北京工藝商局 or the Peking Industrial Institute were under the direction of Prince Pulun, the provincial governments relied on the foreign staff of the IMCS for procuring and shipping their exhibits to the St. Louis Exposition. From the perspective of the Qing government, it might be inevitable or even appropriate to depend on the IMCS in that it had been in plenary charge of supplying the Chinese exhibits to the international expositions since the Vienna Exhibition of 1873. However, as mentioned earlier, the IMCS was fundamentally limited in its ability to represent China accurately at the international expositions because it tended to focus on ports where an Office of Maritime Customs was located, rather than presenting China as a whole. Also, as the Chinese journals claimed, the foreign staff of the Maritime Customs might have lacked the necessary respect for or familiarity with the national polity of China to be

---

<sup>213</sup> *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, “*Zhongguo Fuhui Shiti* 中國赴會失體”(China Disgraced Herself at the Exhibition), July 19<sup>th</sup>, 1904. In this article, “others” refers to Francis Carl and J.A. Berthet, the foreign staffers of the Maritime Customs, who were in charge of collecting exhibits for the Palace of the Liberal Arts.

<sup>214</sup> *Jingzhong ribao*, “*Shengluयी Huichangzhi Zhongguo Dachiru* 聖路易會場之中國大恥辱” (Huge Shame of China at the St. Louis Exposition), Aug. 15, 1904.

competent to make such “representative” selections. However, while truly unflattering, those embarrassing items made up in actuality only a small part of the entirety of the Chinese exhibits. It was clearly an exaggeration when a Chinese official dispatched to the exposition wrote in *Dagongbao*, “There were *innumerable* items to cause national shame.”<sup>215</sup>

Another noteworthy article about the Chinese exhibits at the Palace of the Liberal Arts was one carried in *Zhejiangchao*. In its critical coverage on the display of tableau figures of a young lady with bound feet and, additionally, a peasant woman showing her naked legs at the Palace of the Liberal Arts, it translated the proper noun “the Palace of the Liberal Arts” into “*Renleiguan*” 人類館, which are read as *Jinruikan* in Japanese.” Considering the fact that the objects generally classified products of the liberal arts, for instance, photography, musical instruments, and books, were displayed at this building, translating liberal arts into *renlei*, or “Human Race,” sounds questionable.<sup>216</sup> Moreover, there was a section of Ethnology at the St. Louis Exposition, which seemed well-suited to be called *Renleiguan*, or “the Pavilion of Human Race,” in that the section displayed various tribes of American Indians, the Ainu from Japan, and different races from Alaska, Patagonia in Southern America, and the African interior,

---

<sup>215</sup> *Dagongbao*, “*Zhailu Fumeisaihui Mouyuan Riji* 摘錄赴美賽會某員日記” (A Diary Abstract of an Official at the St. Louis Exposition), Aug. 30, 1904; *Shibao* dated Sep. 6, 1904 carried the same article. Italic is mine.

<sup>216</sup> Professor Wang Zhenghua translated the Palace of the Liberal Arts into *Renwen jiaoyanggong* 人文教養宮 in her pioneer article on Chinese participation in the St. Louis Exposition. Wang Zhenghua 王正華, “*Chengxian 「Zhongguo」: Wanqign Canyu 1904 nian Meiguo Shengluyi Wanguo Bolanhuizhi Yanjiu* 呈現「中国」: 晚清參與 1904 年美國聖路易萬國博覽會之研究,” in *Huazhong Youhua: Jindai zhongguode Shijue Biaoshu Yu Wenhua Goutu* 畫中有話: 近代中國的視覺表述與文化構圖, December 2003.

wearing ethnically distinct outfits, eating their daily food, living in their traditional dwellings, and working on their accustomed occupations.

Then, why did *Zhejiangchao*'s article use "*Renleiguan*," an overreaching translation for the Palace of the Liberal Arts? The answer could be found in the latter part of the article, which claimed that something similar happened at the Osaka Exhibition, but was stopped thanks to the efforts of the Chinese students in Japan. Furthermore, the concluding statement of the article read: "I believe that the Chinese community in America's righteous indignation was no less than that of the Chinese students in Japan. Thus, I pray that they would express their rage for our nation and wash out humiliation for our people."<sup>217</sup> From this statement, it is clear that *Renleiguan* was objectively used to strengthen the connection between the problematic display at the Palace of the Liberal Arts and the *Jinruikan* incident of the Osaka Exhibition and, ultimately, to mobilize the Chinese community in America in protest. On the other hand, it indicates that the traumatic humiliation lingered in the popular consciousness of the Chinese people, where it could recur in response to similar provocations.

### 3) Illegal "Chinese Beauty": The Chinese Village on the Pike<sup>218</sup>

---

<sup>217</sup> *Zhejiangchao*, Vol. 10 (Oct., 1904), 121.

<sup>218</sup> According to *The San Francisco Chronicle*, the Chinese Village was used as a pretext for bringing illegal Chinese immigrants to the United States. Lee Toy, allegedly the head of an Asian crime ring in Philadelphia, had smuggled Chinese people over the Canadian border through his connection with Immigration Commissioners. He was said to have transported Chinese people on the pretext of their employment at the Chinese Village. For instance, *The San Francisco Chronicle* reported that 188 Chinese arrived at San Francisco in this way in early August, although only half this number worked at the exposition. Among them, a few women were actually transferred to a brothel in Chinatown in San Francisco. Regarding related news coverage, refer to *The San Francisco Chronicle*, "New Game of Chinese Ring: St. Louis Exposition used for the Purpose of Bringing in Mongolians in Violation of the Exclusion Laws," September 2, 1904; "To Investigate North's Office," September 4, 1904; "Two

The Palace of the Liberal Arts was not an anthropological pavilion, but the St. Louis Exposition itself actually did include the most extensive anthropological projects ever staged in any of the world's fairs. The administration of the St. Louis Exposition eagerly sought support from prominent anthropologists in order to establish an assembly of races, particularly of the most "primitive" ethnic groups.<sup>219</sup> As a result, under the direction of Doctor William John McGee, who had been formerly in charge of the Bureau of American Ethnology, the Department of Anthropology was composed of six divisions: Ethnology, Indian Schools, Archaeology, History, Anthropology and Psychometry. As mentioned earlier, it was the Ethnology division that depicted in tableaux various American Indian tribes, as well as different "races" from Alaska, Patagonia in Southern America, and the African interior, each featuring "typical" representations of their respective group.<sup>220</sup> Nine "hairy" Ainu, a minority group from northern Japan, were also brought there by anthropologist Frederick Starr.<sup>221</sup>

Although the Ethnology exhibit did not include any Chinese exhibits, this didn't mean that China avoided becoming the object of anthropological "curiosity" or

---

Chinese Escape Bonds: One Finds a Loophole in Guard Maintained by Chinese Bureau at the St. Louis Fair," November 12, 1904.

<sup>219</sup> Rydell, Findling, and Pelle eds., 54.

<sup>220</sup> Bennett ed., 673-677. The Philippine Reservation, where various tribes from the Philippine Islands were represented in their dummy villages, could be considered the largest ethnological exhibit in the St. Louis Exposition, although it was not organized by the Department of Anthropology. For more detailed information about the exhibits of the Philippines, refer to chapter XV, "The Philippine Exposition and Port Rico Exhibit" of the same book, *History of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition*.

<sup>221</sup> Eric Breitbart, *A World on Display: Photographs from the St. Louis World's Fair 1904* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997), 63. Regarding the Ainu at the St. Louis Exposition, John W. Hanson wrote, "The polite manners of the Ainu proved their chief mark of distinction. There was some *disappointment* when the band of primitive folk arrived in St. Louis. They were the hairy Ainu, true enough, but they weren't man-eaters, dog-eaters, or wild men." John W. Hanson, *The Official History of the Fair, St. Louis: the Sights and Scenes of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition* (Chicago: Monarch Book Co., 1904), 393. *Italic is mine*.

entertainment, one often tinged with the racial discrimination and humiliation that China had experienced in other overseas exhibitions. The St. Louis Exposition included the Pike, a commercial amusement street, which was, as Robert Rydell argues, designed to teach the fairgoers the imperial vision of world progress through the use of the aforementioned ethnological villages.<sup>222</sup> The one-mile long street bustled with various performances by both humans and animals reproducing the cultures of thirty nations, including China. The Chinese Village on the Pike, which consisted of a tea house, a theater, a Chinese temple, and a large bazaar selling various Chinese items such as silk, tea, and ivory carvings, was organized by Yeo Ging Co., a Chinese merchants association in Philadelphia. A dozen children of some Chinese laborers, who remained even after the completion of the Chinese Pavilion, were hired to wonder around the village to attract the attention of the visitors.<sup>223</sup>

The repertoire of the Chinese Village included a “Chinese Beauty,” whose bound feet were displayed for a small admission fee. Chinese journals such as *Dagongbao*, *Shibao* 時報, and *Hong Kong huazi ribao* soon discovered and criticized the show, and reported the matter to Prince Pulun and the Vice Commissioner Huang.<sup>224</sup> However, Prince Pulun and the Vice Commissioner Huang didn’t intervene in this matter on the ground that the Pike, managed by the individual merchants, didn’t belong to the official sector. Furthermore, as the Qing government regarded the internal exhibition primarily as a diplomatic arena, Prince Pulun and Huang focused on establishing social relationships with the leaders from various countries. But Chinese journals did not share

---

<sup>222</sup> Rydell (1984), 178-179.

<sup>223</sup> Cortinovis, 66.

<sup>224</sup> *Dagongbao*, Sep. 6 1904; *Shibao*, Aug. 8 1904; *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, Aug. 19 and 23, 1904.

this view. A typical example of the tenor of the journals' coverage appeared in *Hong Kong huazi ribao*:

Regarding a woman with bound feet in the Chinese entertainment section, Chinese journals published in America already have covered it critically. Of those journals, *Wenxingbao* 文興報 reported it to Prince Pulun and Huang Kaijia, but in vain. Four Chinese students arrived at St. Louis on May 10<sup>th</sup>, and visited the General Manager of the Pike next day. They told him how embarrassing the display of the woman is to Chinese people. After a 5 hour conversation, the general manager agreed to close the venue without confiscating rent and to investigate the affair. It turned out that a man lent his wife to the Chinese Village for monthly 100 taels rent for seven months. Due to the cancelation of the show, the couple decided to return to San Francisco but they couldn't afford their travel expenditure of 800 taels. The members of *Zhongguo weixinhui* 中國維新會 in St. Louis sympathized with them, and raised 450 taels to help them out. Thereafter, the patriotism of Chinese students was praised by people who heard of this affair.<sup>225</sup>

It is highly noteworthy that the movements of protest and negotiation regarding the Chinese Village were led by *Zhongguo weixinhui*, which was generally better known as *Baohuanghui*, or the Protect the Emperor Society. Through the Protect the Emperor Society, Kang Youwei and his fellow reformers attempted to mobilize support for the Guangxu Emperor and the reformation of China among the overseas Chinese communities. *Wenxingbao*, which was mentioned in the above article, was the newspaper that the Protect the Emperor Society operated in the U.S. in addition to Honolulu's

---

<sup>225</sup> *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, "Meiguo Saihui Yutan 美國賽會餘談" (An anecdote of the St. Louis Exposition), Aug. 19<sup>th</sup>, 1904.



*Xinzhongguobao* 新中國報 and Vancouver's *Rixinbao* 日新報.<sup>226</sup> Thus, the involvement of the Protect the Emperor Society and *Wenxingbao*, its newspaper, with regard to the Chinese Village demonstrates that the reformers were promoting their image as true patriots in contrast to aloof and irresponsible Qing officials, who did not care about the suffering of common Chinese people. It also exemplifies how the overseas reformers influenced the public opinions of not only the overseas Chinese community, but also mainland China through its interconnection with Chinese domestic journals.

Overall, the incident of the Chinese Village at the St. Louis Exposition had clear commonalities with that of *Jinruikan* at the Osaka Exhibition. First, the object of dispute concerned a stereotypical image of Chinese culture. Secondly, Chinese students and reformers took active steps to settle the matter, whereas the negligence or indifference of the Chinese officials became the object of harsh criticism.

#### **4) The Eve of Victory: Japan at the St. Louis Exposition**

As the Russo-Japanese War broke out in February that year, the Russian government canceled its official exhibit at the St. Louis Exposition, although their articles had already arrived at St. Louis. On the other hand, the Japanese government ended up officially participating in the exposition, although it had decided not to when the conflict with Russia escalated while it was also busy preparing for the Osaka Exhibition.<sup>227</sup> Furthermore, the Japanese government took advantage of its presence at the exposition to justify the current war against Russia. Thus, in addition to the Imperial

---

<sup>226</sup> L. Eve Armentrout Ma, *Revolutionaries, Monarchists, and Chinatowns: Chinese Politics in the Americas and the 1911 Revolution* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1990), 89.

<sup>227</sup> Yoshida, 177-179.

Japanese Commission, Kaneko Kentarō 金子堅太郎, the Minister of Justice, who had graduated from Harvard University, was sent as a special envoy to court American opinion.<sup>228</sup> At a press conference, Kaneko claimed: “If we fail (in the Russo-Japanese War), the work of fifty years, the struggle for enlightenment, the commercial relations with the whole world will be utterly destroyed, and the hope of the awakening to better things of Asia be gone. There are other people there who would follow in the footsteps of victories Japan—Japan who has so worthily tried to be one of the proud civilization nations of the world.” He also emphasized the particular relationship between the United States and Japan by adding, “They (the Japanese) had not forgotten that the United States had awakened them to their present position by the coming of Commodore Perry.”<sup>229</sup>

Japan’s official participation in the exposition while at war and the zealous public relations activity of the Japanese commissioners and Kaneko Kentarō impressed the Americans favorably. Moreover, to everyone’s surprise, Japan had been successfully standing up to Russia. Thus, the St. Louis Exposition served as a perfect event by which Japan could demonstrate the legitimacy of its mission to “civilize” Asian people, who, as Kaneko claimed, “would follow in the footsteps of victorious Japan.” In due course, Japan displayed at the section for the Japanese Empire a large wooden map, which included not only Japan, but also Chinese and Korean coasts.<sup>230</sup> The Chinese people hardly missed this, as an article in *Jingzhong ribao* lamented:

---

<sup>228</sup> By extension, Kaneko succeeded in persuading President Roosevelt to sponsor a peace conference to terminate the Russo-Japanese War. As is well known, it was Roosevelt who mediated the Portsmouth Treaty of Peace in 1905.

<sup>229</sup> *The New York Times*, “Says Asia’s Salvation is Stake of the War,” March 20, 1904.

<sup>230</sup> Carol Ann Christ, “The Sole Guardians of the Art Inheritance of Asia: Japan and China at the 1904 St. Louis World’s Fair,” *Positions*, 8:3 (Winter 2000): 686-688.

It is highly painful to see the map that includes Korea and three northeast provinces of China in addition to the four islands of Japan. Moreover, Lüshun 旅順 and Liaoning 遼寧 are designated as new territories of Japan. American viewers often look at our Chinese people there as if they wanted to ask, “Did you already become Japanese?” Although Japan always keeps talking about the peace of Far East, it is none other than Japan that wants to divide up China. Thus, we’re urgently notifying our nation. Chinese people, please pay attention, pay attention.<sup>231</sup>

The Chinese people’s concerns expressed in this article resemble those over the incident in which exhibits from the Fujian Province were displayed in the Taiwan Pavilion at the Osaka Exhibition, because the latter also made the Chinese people strongly suspect Japan’s ambitions for the territory of China.

Besides, as it had in the Osaka Exhibition of the previous year, Japan showcased colonial Taiwan as an example of its imperial power in the St. Louis Exposition. To emphasize this theme, the Taiwanese exhibits were displayed as a part of those of Japan without a separate Taiwan Pavilion. Taiwan submitted 500 items, including Taiwanese tea as the primary item for export, for the display of which a Taiwanese Tea House was established next to a Japanese Tea House in the Japan Garden.<sup>232</sup> Also, as at the Osaka Exhibition, two Taiwanese girls served in that Taiwanese Tea House along with four Japanese ladies. About those Taiwanese waitresses, *Hong Kong huazi ribao* wrote: “A

---

<sup>231</sup> *Jingzhong ribao*, “Shenglu yi Huichangzhi Zhongguo Dachiru 聖路易會場之中國大恥辱” (China’s great humiliation at the St. Louis Exposition), Aug. 15, 1904.

<sup>232</sup> *Taiwan Kyōkai Kaihō*, 臺灣協會會報, “Seiroy Bankoku Hankurankainiukeru Taiwan Sōtokuno Setsubi 聖路易萬國博覽會に於ける臺灣總督府の設備”(Arrangements of the Taiwan Colonial Government in the St. Louis World Exhibition), No. 66 (1904), 21-24.

man, Chen brought two Chinese women with bound feet from Taiwan to make them serve tea in the Taiwan Tea House. It was severely criticized by Chinese newspapers. Chen didn't understand patriotism and insulted us Chinese."<sup>233</sup> Although Chen was here criticized as an individual without patriotic spirit, the true agents behind this affair were apparently Japan and the colonial government of Taiwan, which intended to make fairgoers "witness a sign of the expansion of the Empire of Japan."<sup>234</sup>

### 5) "House of Corruption": The Chinese Pavilion

To the Chinese people, who were aggravated by Japan's bold moves at the exposition, even the U.S. seemed to treat Japan specially: "A ceremony to celebrate the completion of the Japanese Pavilion took place on June 1<sup>st</sup>. Many American officials and celebrities appeared at a tea party prior to the ceremony. Even a daughter of the president of the U.S. was among them. *All the praise given by those American guests indicated their respect for Japan.*"<sup>235</sup> Whereas the ceremony for the completion of the Japanese Pavilion was covered as above, none of the major Chinese journals covered that of the Chinese Pavilion, which had took place on May 6<sup>th</sup>, although the ceremony was no less splendid than that of the Japanese Pavilion, with many VIPs, including David R. Francis, the President of the Louis Purchase Exposition Company, attending. The conspicuous reception following the dedication of Chinese Pavilion, which hosted 1,400 guests at the

---

<sup>233</sup> *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, "Zhongguo Fuhui Shiti 中國赴會失體" (China lost face in the exhibition), July 19, 1904.

<sup>234</sup> *Taiwan kyōkai kaihō*, "Seiroi Hakurankainiokeru Taiwan Kissaten 聖路易博覽會に於ける臺灣喫茶店" (The Taiwan Tea House in the St. Louis Exposition), No. 76 (1904), 17-18.

<sup>235</sup> *Jingzhong ribao*, "Meiren Dui Ribenzhiqing 美人對日本之情" (Affection of Americans toward Japan), June 27, 1904. Italic is mine.

Washington Hotel, became one of the most striking social events at the St. Louis Exposition.<sup>236</sup>

In other words, the Chinese journals ignored this significant event marking the accomplishment of the Qing government to make official debut on the stage of the world exhibitions in the West. The Chinese Pavilion, which modeled after Prince Pulun's summer residence with a design by Atkinson and Dallas, a British architecture and civil engineering firm in Shanghai was quite astounding. The New York Times evaluated the Chinese Pavilion as "undoubtedly the most picturesque of all the foreign structures on the World's Fair grounds," and, at the end of the exposition, the Chinese Pavilion was actually awarded a gold medal. However, the Chinese journals' coverage on the Chinese Pavilion was exclusively critical.<sup>237</sup> For instance, *Hong Kong huazi ribao* wrote, "China spent 1 million taels to establish the Chinese Pavilion at the St. Louis Exposition, but the building is extremely crude and the general arrangement is also disappointing. Thus, it especially impairs the national polity."<sup>238</sup> Another Chinese journal commented that, apart from the embarrassingly coarse appearance of the building, Chinaware and products of the Peking Industrial Institute had been assigned to too small a site for national exhibitions, which is shameful and, moreover, injures the relationship with merchants.<sup>239</sup>

---

<sup>236</sup> *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, "Prince Pu Lun's Reception Most Gorgeous of Fair Social Events," May 7, 1904.

<sup>237</sup> Theodore Hardee, "China's Remarkable Exhibit at the World's Fair," *The New York Times*, 28 Aug. 1904.

<sup>238</sup> *Hong Kong huaizi ribao*, "Saihuichang Xumi 賽會場虛糜" (Waste at the Exhibition site), July 13, 1904.

<sup>239</sup> *Jingzhong ribao*, "Shengluyi Huichangyu Zhongguo 聖路易會場與中國" (The St. Louis Exposition and China), May 7, 1904.

However, the most serious controversy over the Chinese Pavilion was related to Huang Kaijia (=Wong Kai Kah), the Imperial Chinese Vice-Commissioner to the St. Louis Exposition. Huang was a member of the first group of 120 Chinese youths sent to the U.S. for study between 1872 and 1881. He studied at the Hartford public schools in Connecticut, to which most of his peer Chinese students went, and attended Yale for two years.<sup>240</sup> Being versed in English and the Western world, he had served in various governmental posts and missions, particularly foreign affairs such as being a counselor to the Chinese delegation led by Prince Zaizhen for the coronation of Edward in 1902. Therefore, at the beginning, Huang seemed to be the perfect choice for the position of Vice Commissioner, as well as for taking responsibility for the building of the Chinese Pavilion. However, Huang eventually got involved in an embezzlement scandal, of which suspicion was first raised by an anonymous Chinese official dispatched to the St. Louis Exposition, whose manuscript was carried in both in *Dagongbao* on Aug. 31 and *Shibao* on Sep. 6:

Out of the total budget 750,000 taels, 450,000 taels was given to X to establish the Chinese Pavilion. However, he lost control of himself to embezzle the money. He used cheap lumber to establish the pavilion and the wages for the construction workers from Guangdong were very low. Thus, the total cost of materials and wages could not be as much as 40,000 taels. The attendants who have returned to China lament his

---

<sup>240</sup> The Chinese Education mission under the supervision of Yung Wing (=Rong Hong) had been arranged as a part of the Self-Strengthening Movement. The goals were to educate the Chinese students in Western science and technology by placing them in American schools and colleges. However, in 1881, the Qing government revoked this program and recalled all the Chinese students including Huang Kaijia.

act. Moreover, he even asked for additional 200,000 taels for the project of the pavilion. His greed reached an inhuman extent.<sup>241</sup>

Although this article didn't mention exactly who embezzled the money, it obviously meant Huang Kaijia in that he was in charge of the construction of the Chinese Pavilion. Later, an editorial of *Waijiaobao* eventually accused Huang of embezzling money by inflating the accounts that the Chinese Pavilion cost 450,000 *taels* (or 300,000USD), although the pavilion actually only cost 20,000 USD (or 30,000 taels). It also claimed that, "being corrupted by the vicious customs of the low class of America," Huang had given himself up to embezzlement since he became an official only through his factional connection.<sup>242</sup>

Whether or not Huang actually embezzled is an elusive question because none of the Chinese journals raising the suspicion clarified the source of their estimate of the actual cost of the Chinese Pavilion, let alone the discrepancy of the estimate even among those Chinese journals. On the other hand, *the New York Times* and *The History of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition* stated the cost of the Chinese Pavilion at 125,000 USD (or 187,500 taels) and 60,000 to 70,000 USD (or 90,000 taels to 105,000 taels) respectively.<sup>243</sup> Although those American estimates were also less than 270,000 USD, the amount that Huang Kaijia reported, they at the same time admitted a possibility that the actual cost could be much higher, because many parts of the pavilion had been

---

<sup>241</sup> *Dagongbao*, "Zhailu Fumeisaihui Mouyuan Riji 摘錄赴美賽會某員日記" (A diary abstract of an official at the St. Louis Exposition), *Dagongbao*, Aug. 31 1904; *Shibao*, Sep.6 1904.

<sup>242</sup> *Waijiaobao*, "Lun Lunbeizi Saihuizhi Jieguo 論倫貝子賽會之結果" (The Results of Prince Pulun's Participation in the Exhibition), Vol. 89 (Nov. 1904), 3. I added the converted amount within parenthesis based on the exchange rate between Chinese tael and US dollar (gold), 3:2 at that time.

<sup>243</sup> Bennett, *op. cit.*, p. 286; *The New York Times*, 28 Aug. 1904.

already purchased in China. In other words, the estimates of *the New York Times* and *The History of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition* were based on expenditures transacted only in America.

Thus, without a reliable source of disbursement for the Chinese Pavilion, it is impossible to prove that Huang Kaijia actually embezzled the money. The more noteworthy point is, however, that the distrust of the true objectives and capabilities of the Chinese officials at the St. Louis could be deepened among the Chinese reading publics, who were reading those negative articles regardless of the truth. For instance, by quoting an article of *Dagongbao*, *Jingzhong ribao* introduced another scandal of a Chinese official who was working for the Chinese Pavilion:

Someone purchased many items on the pretext of displaying them at the Chinese Pavilion. However, he smuggled some of those items to New York for sale. Then, he misreported that he gifted them to people for social relationships. By doing so, he is said to have earned 300,000 dollars or, according to a rumor, 500,000 dollars. Americans also know about this.<sup>244</sup>

Although it is not certain whether or not the rumor was true, this is another example in which the Chinese journals suspected that the Chinese officials were taking advantage of the St. Louis Exposition for personal benefits rather than those of nation.<sup>245</sup>

---

<sup>244</sup> *Jingzhong ribao*, “Shengluyi Huichangyu Zhongguo 聖路易會場與中國” (The St. Louis Exposition and China), May 7, 1904. If this report was true, Huang Kaijia might be a key suspect in that he was in full charge of the Chinese Pavilion.

<sup>245</sup> Although it is not certain whether or not Huang Kaijia embezzled, it seems true that Huang’s family enjoyed a rich lifestyle. For instance, Huang’s wife purchased rice lands of 4,000 acres in Texas for USD 140,000. Their splendid life became a topic of conversation in St. Louis. At a tea party hosted by the Huang family, their gowns and dresses cost over USD 60,000, and the tea and the



Such scandals concerning Chinese officials involved in the Chinese Pavilion also led to the criticism of Prince Pulun, although he had been exceptionally well-regarded by the Chinese journals. For instance, even *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, which was quite critical of the Qing court, used to describe Prince Pulun in his mid thirties as one of young imperial family members with bright prospects along with Prince Zaizhen, a son of the Prince Qing.<sup>246</sup> Another article of *Hong Kong huazi ribao* also wrote, “Prince Pulun’s conduct and brightness have been praised by the Americans. Thus, they eagerly look forward to the appearance of Prince Pulun at the annual meeting of the Asiatic Association.”<sup>247</sup> However, this positive tone regarding Prince Pulun also switched to a negative one by the time that the Chinese performance at the St. Louis Exposition was being critically covered by the Chinese journals. While reporting Prince Pulun’s extravagant party at a hotel, *Hong Kong huazi ribao* critically commented, “Didn’t the Qing government dispatch those high officials for diplomatic purposes and the expansion of the market for the Chinese goods? Then, how could they end up being a laughingstock among foreigners by squandering money like this?”<sup>248</sup> Also, *Waijiaobao* claimed that the Qing government, or at least Prince Pulun himself, was already aware of Huang’s

---

refreshments cost no less than USD 15,000. (*The Baltimore Sun*, “MME Wong Buys Plantation,” April 13, 1904) Their conspicuous lifestyle probably provided grounds for people’s suspicion of Huang’s embezzlement.

<sup>246</sup> *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, “*Qingguo Huangzu* 清國皇族”(The Qing Imperial Family), March 23, 1903.

<sup>247</sup> *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, “*Mei Zan Beizi* 美讚貝子” (America praises Prince Pulun), June 22, 1904.

<sup>248</sup> *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, “*Lun Kuochuo Buzubojiaosheshengming* 論闊綽不足博交涉盛名” (Discussing that extravagance is not enough for negotiation and achieving name), Aug. 12, 1904.

fraudulent behavior, but no action was taken, partially because Huang had bribed high officials.<sup>249</sup>

Finally, after the end of the St. Louis Exposition, the performance of the Chinese Imperial Commission was harshly criticized by the Chinese journals. For instance, an article of *Shiyejie* 實業界, or *The Business World*, which was a Chinese-language journal published in Berkeley, California by Chinese students harshly blamed Prince Pulun for failing in his negotiations with the government of the United States to hire Chinese craftsmen for the construction of the Chinese Pavilion at the St. Louis Exposition and, furthermore, criticized the overall incompetence of the Qing government.<sup>250</sup> This article was carried in both *Waijiaobao* and *Dongfang zazhi*, thereby exemplifying the connection between the overseas Chinese journals and the domestic Chinese journals.<sup>251</sup>

The incident in question here was that Huang Kaijia originally brought along twelve Chinese craftsmen from mainland China for the construction of the Chinese Pavilion at the St. Louis Exposition. However, the Central Trades and Labor Union of St. Louis opposed the entrance of any Chinese laborers in the site of the exposition, which forced Huang to return all these Chinese laborers to China. The prohibition of the immigration of Chinese laborers to the United States began with the Exclusion Act,

---

<sup>249</sup> *Waijiaobao*, “Lun Lunbeizi Saihuizhi Jieguo 論倫貝子賽會之結果”(Discussing the Results of Prince Pulun’s Participation in the Exhibition), Vol. 89 (Nov. 1904),3.

<sup>250</sup> *Shiyejie* 實業界, “Ji Sanluyisi Bolanhui Zhongguo Rusai Qingxing 記散魯伊斯博覽會中國入賽情形”(Record of China’s Participation in the St. Louis Exposition), Feb. 23, 1905. *Shiyejie* 實業界, which was also known as *Meizhou Xuebao* 美洲學報: *Shiyejie* 實業界, was first published in early 1905. The two chief editors were Wang Jianzu 王建祖 and Zhang Zongyuan 章宗元, both of whom were studying business at UC Berkeley (Ye, 801).

<sup>251</sup> *Waijiaobao*, Vol. 111 (June 1905), 4-7; *Dongfang zazhi*, Vol. 9 (1905).

which was first enacted in 1882. The Exclusion Act was constantly strengthened with series of supplemental laws that expanded the scope of the definition of “laborer” while limiting exempt categories of Chinese. Eventually, in January 1904, Congress passed a resolution to extend the Exclusion laws *indefinitely*.<sup>252</sup> The opposition of the Central Trades and Labor Union of St. Louis to the employment of Chinese laborers for the Chinese Pavilion was also based on this Exclusion Act, although those Chinese laborers didn’t intend to immigrate to the United States.

In such an unfavorable atmosphere toward the Chinese people in the U.S., the early-mentioned incident that three Chinese officials were beaten up at a hotel in St. Louis occurred. The same article covering this incident provided another example of the maltreatment of the Chinese people in the American society: 2 years previously Tan Jinyong 譚錦鏞, a military official of the Chinese Consul in San Francisco, committed suicide because he couldn’t overcome the humiliation after he was beaten and tied up on an electric pole by American police. Regarding such unjust treatment, the article first criticized the U.S. government:

Why did the American government invite China to the exhibition even though it clearly knew that the American people disliked the Chinese people? If the American government truly intended to invite China, it should have warned its people not to be rude beforehand. There are hosts on one hand and humiliators on the other hand. Although

---

<sup>252</sup> Madeline Yuan-yin Hsu, *Dreaming of Gold, Dreaming of Home: Transnationalism and Migration between the United States and South China, 1882-1943* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), 64-66.

America claims to be a country of civilization, it is actually nothing but a barbarian country.<sup>253</sup>

However, the final reproach pointed at the Qing government. First, it claimed, when invited by the U.S. government, the Foreign Office of China should have clarified that the Chinese people could be protected from any possible humiliation in America by consulting with Liang Cheng 梁晟, the U.S. Minister in China, who, then, could have enacted related laws. Secondly, Liang Cheng should have officially notified the American government to secure the safety of the Chinese officials in America and set a legal basis to punish the offenders. Then, the American people could not have harassed the Chinese people in public no matter how the former looked down on the latter: “Alas, the Chinese officialdom ignores *dao* 道 or the principle of diplomacy. The negligence of *yi* 義 or righteousness, which is indispensable for diplomatic relationship, could bring about humiliation to its countrymen.”<sup>254</sup>

As these Chinese local periodicals claimed, the Qing government probably didn’t handle problems as successfully as supposed. However, this does not mean that the Qing government or the Chinese diplomats simply looked on at the unfair way the Chinese related to the St. Louis Exposition were treated. According to *The Washington Post*, Liang Cheng, then U.S. Minister in China, filed a formal protest in regard to how the Chinese Exclusion Law operated to the disadvantage of the Chinese businessmen at the St. Louis Exposition. Chang Youtong, a secretary of the Chinese Commissioner,

---

<sup>253</sup> *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, “Lun Meiguo Shanlei Fandian Ouru Huaren 論美國山麓飯店毆辱華人” (Discussing a Hotel in St. Louis’s Insult on the Chinese People), June 24, 1904.

<sup>254</sup> *Ibid.*

officially remonstrated that the Chinese businessmen were detained by customs officers for two days, even though they had official letters from the American consul at Beijing and enough money.<sup>255</sup> However, none of the Chinese periodicals mentioned these facts, as they were silent about the effort of the Chinese diplomats to solve the problems at the Osaka Exhibition of 1903.

### **III. The Aftermath of the St. Louis Exposition**

The official debut of China on the stage of the world exhibitions in West through the St. Louis Exposition was highly evaluated by Americans, at least, in public. The New York Times reported, “It is a source of gratification to both the Chinese Commission and the exposition management that this first direct effort on the part of the Imperial Government at taking part in an exhibition is meeting with such remarkable success. *And the ultimate effect of China’s laudable enterprise in this instance will prove a lasting tribute to the sagacity and far-seeing statesmanship of those who are responsible for the empire’s splendid representation at St. Louis.*”<sup>256</sup> Particularly, Prince Pulun’s visit to the exposition, which was perceived as a diplomatic achievement from the perspective of the U.S. government, was appreciated: “The Chinese Imperial government has taken especial pain to do the United States a signal honor by sending as the throne’s representative to the Louisiana Purchase Exposition a scion of the imperial blood—

---

<sup>255</sup> *The Washington Post*, “Protest from Chinese,” April 12, 1904.

<sup>256</sup> *The New York Times*, 28 Aug. 1904. Italic is mine.

Prince Pu Lun—who came to St. Louis last April as commissioner general for the Celestial Empire.”<sup>257</sup>

However, the responses of Chinese periodicals were quite oppositional. The effort of the Qing government to promote diplomatic relationships with the Western powers through its official participation in the St. Louis Exposition was not appreciated at all. This is understandable to a certain degree, in that undesirable incidents such as the assault on the Chinese at a St. Louis hotel, and various discriminations imposed on the Chinese staffers, businessmen, and laborers at the exposition made the official slogan, “promoting the goodwill between China and the United States” sound absurd. However, it is also true that Chinese periodicals, both domestic and overseas, which were led by reformers or revolutionaries, objectively ignored any credit the Qing government might deserve and sought to form public sentiment against the government by highlighting the corruption and impotence of the Qing officials and even fabricating coverage. As a result, to Chinese reading publics, the St. Louis Exposition might be remembered as an occasion in which “the Qing government spent million tales only to bring unwashable shame which would last forever.”<sup>258</sup>

As there were repercussions from the Osaka Exhibition in the way the Chinese people perceived the St. Louis Exposition, those of the St. Louis Exposition foreshadowed the Exposition Universelle et Internationale de Liège or Liège Universal Exposition, which took place in Liège, Belgium in the following year of 1905.<sup>259</sup> Yang

---

<sup>257</sup> *The Washington Post*, “China at the Fair: Gorgeous and Costly Display of Flowery Kingdom--“Never Before has the Oriental Empire attempted to make an exhibit on such a large and elaborate scale—splendidly ornamental character of the government structure,” Sep. 5, 1904.

<sup>258</sup> *Waijiaobao*, Vol. 111 (June 1905), 3.

<sup>259</sup> The Liège Universal Exposition took place from April 27<sup>th</sup> to June 11<sup>th</sup>, 1905.

Zhaoyun 楊兆璽, the then Chinese Minister to Belgium, was appointed to be the President of Chinese Commission to the Liège Universal Exposition. Although it was still Robert Hart, the Inspector General of the IMCS that undertook collecting items in China for the Liège Exposition, this was the first case in which a Chinese civil official, not a member of the Manchu imperial family, was in full charge of the Chinese exhibit at the foreign exhibition.

In terms of the overall evaluation of Chinese performance at the Liège Exposition, it could be considered successful to some degree, because the Chinese participants, including 17 individual merchants, won 100 awards, being roughly equivalent to the number of awards won by Britain, America, Austria, and Italy.<sup>260</sup> However, even before the exhibition started, *Jingzhong ribao*, which criticized the disappointing performance of the Chinese government at the St. Louis Exposition, carried a letter of precaution by the Chinese students in Belgium at that time.

The damage which the humiliation at the St. Louis Exposition brought to our business world is not ignorable. When we first heard the news, we felt unendurable sorrow...Although Yang Zhaoyun, the Chinese Minister to Belgium, is quite reluctant to represent you merchants who attend the exhibition, he dare not act against you. Moreover, you have support from we 20 students. If Yang opposes you, humiliates national polity, and *imitates Huang Kaijia*, we have certain means to handle Yang.<sup>261</sup>

---

<sup>260</sup> *Zhongguoyu Shibo: Lishi Jilu 1851-1940* (中國與世博: 歷史記錄 1851-1940: China and World Exposition: Historical Records) (Shanghai: Shanghai Kexuejishu Wenxian Chupanshe, 2002), 75-78.

<sup>261</sup> *Jingzhong ribao*, “*Gao Saihui Biguozhi Shangmin, Biguo Liuxuesheng Zhuanhan* (告賽會比國之商民, 比國留學生專函: Announcing to merchants who participate in Belgium Exposition, a special letter from Chinese students in Belgium),” Jan. 24, 1905. *Italic is mine.*

As articulated in the above quotation, the Chinese students in Belgium knew about the unpleasant experiences of China at the St. Louis Exposition of the previous year, which is a proof that the news regarding exhibitions were circulated not only in mainland China but in overseas Chinese community. Also, it is worth noticing that they were cautioning against any possible maladministration of Yang Zhaoyun by mentioning Huang Kaijia, who was suspected of embezzlement and smuggling during the St. Louis Exposition. As discussed earlier, suspicion of Huang had not been corroborated. However, those Chinese students seemed to be convinced of his charge, and revealed their distrust of Chinese officials.

Thus, as the Osaka Exhibition did, the St. Louis Exposition left a negative imprint on Chinese people's perception of the Chinese participation in the world exhibitions. The Qing government faced harsh criticism from the Chinese journals, hardly achieving what it originally had intended through the official participation in the St. Louis Exposition. However, from the long-term perspective, their efforts bore some fruit. For example, the participation in the St. Louis Exposition led the Qing government to the enactment of *Shangbu Xinding Chuyang Saihui Zhangcheng* 商部新訂出洋賽會章程 or the "New Regulations on Participation in Overseas Exhibitions" in the following year, 1905. By appointing the Department of Commerce as the competent authorities, the Qing government could control affairs related to overseas exhibitions more systematically and directly, breaking its longtime reliance on the services of the foreign staff of the IMCS. Furthermore, while continuing to participate in the international expositions such as Universal Exposition of Milan (1906), the Qing government also dispatched officials abroad to learn more about the exhibition and



eventually hosted the Nanyang Industrial Exposition in 1910, which became the first and last international exhibition of the Qing dynasty.<sup>262</sup>

---

<sup>262</sup> Regarding the Universal Exposition of Milan, an article of *Dongfang Zazhi* Vol. 3, Issue 8, wrote: “The Chinese Pavilion at the Milan Exposition is quite humiliating compared with that at the Liège Exposition. China’s participation in this exposition has nothing to do with so-called *dao* or principle of commerce and industry in that the government merely pursues diplomatic activities and merchants only seek profits. Last year the Liège Exposition saw few nationally embarrassing incidents thanks to the eager intervention of the group of Chinese students in Belgium for Chinese officials and merchants at the exhibition. However, this Milan Exposition is edgily unpredictable without the support from Chinese students.” Shanghai Tushuguan ed., 269. As many previous articles regarding the performance of the Qing government at exhibitions, this article reveals distrust of the Qing government, contrasting students’ capability.

## Chapter Four: The Nanyang Industrial Exposition of 1910, the Last Show of the Qing Dynasty

This chapter deals with *Nanyang quanyehui* 南洋勸業會, or the Nanyang Industrial Exposition of 1910, the first national exposition hosted by China as well as the first and last exposition of the Qing dynasty.<sup>263</sup> The few scholars who have studied the exposition tend to locate it in the economic history of the late Qing period. For instance, Wang Xiang 王翔, a Chinese scholar, argued that the Nanyang Exposition verified the entrance of the Qing China into the initial stage of capitalism in industry and commerce.<sup>264</sup> Similarly, Nozawa Yutaka 野澤豐, a Japanese scholar who wrote one of the earliest articles on the Nanyang Exposition, argued that the Nanyang Exposition manifested the tendency of the burgeoning bourgeois class to support the development of Capitalism and significantly contributed to the growth of the class during the late Qing period.<sup>265</sup> Michael Godley's article, which might be the first English academic work about the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, approached the topic more broadly, focusing on the relations of different groups involved in the process of preparing the exposition.

---

<sup>263</sup> The Nanyang Industrial Exposition opened on June 5<sup>th</sup> and closed on Nov. 29<sup>th</sup>. In the lunar calendar, this corresponded to the period of the time ranging from the fourth Month, 28<sup>th</sup> day to the 10<sup>th</sup> Month, 28<sup>th</sup> day of the second year of Xuantong 宣統.

<sup>264</sup> Wang Xiang 王翔, "Zhongguo Jindaihuade Yige Lichengbei 中國近代化的一個里程碑," *Jianghai Xuekan* 江海學刊, No. 3 (1989). 131.

<sup>265</sup> Nozawa Yutaka 野澤豐, "Xinhai Gemingyu Chanye Wenti: 1910 Niande Nanyang Quanyehuiyu Rimei Shiyetuande Fanghua 辛亥革命與產業問題: 1910 年的南洋勸業會與日美實業團的訪華," in Zhonghua Shuji Bianjibu ed. *Jinian Xinhai Geming Qishinian Xueshutaolunhui Lunwenji* 紀念辛亥革命七十年學術討論會論文集 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1983), 2491-2492. Furthermore, Nozawa defined the Xinhai Revolution as the Bourgeoisie Democratic Revolution in that both Revolutionary and Constitutionals shared the aim of developing Capitalism in China and received support from the propertied classes.

However, there have as yet been no scholarly works locating and examining the Nanyang Industrial Exposition in the context of 60 years' Chinese experiences at the world exhibitions during the late Qing period. In this chapter, I will approach the Nanyang Industrial Exposition as an extension of China's experiences during the previous international exhibitions -- the Osaka Exhibition (Chapter Two) and the St. Louis Exposition (Chapter Three) -- focusing in particular on the continuous rivalry between China and Japan, and the Chinese press's coverage of the exposition.

### **I. Duanfang, the Mastermind**

It is commonly known that Duanfang 端方, the Governor-General of Liang-Jiang 兩江 and the Minister-superintendent of Trade in the South, first proposed the Nanyang Industrial Exposition in 1908. However, the idea of hosting a national exposition in China had appeared earlier as discussed in Chapter One. In 1904, Zhang Zhenxun 張振勛, an overseas Chinese merchant from Southeast Asia, had an audience with the Empress Dowager to propose holding a grand-scale exposition in China, which would both broaden the perspective of the Chinese people and stimulate the economy.<sup>266</sup> Also, small-scaled events occurred independently throughout the nation, including, for instance, various exhibitions of local products on the level of city and province in Tianjin, Wuhan, and Chengdu since 1907.<sup>267</sup> Later, a specific blueprint for holding a national exposition in the area of 600 *mu* 畝 surrounding the Jiangning 江寧 Park in Nanjing was proposed by Chen Qi 陳琪, a manager of the Jiangning Park Office, and his college,

---

<sup>266</sup> Shanghai Tushuguan ed., 98.

<sup>267</sup> Wang (1989), 129.

Yan Qizhang 嚴其章 in 1908. It was Duanfang who positively responded to their petition, commenting that “A national exposition would have great influence on the industry of China. The first exposition should be rather a simple one to focus on domestic goods, being modeled after the exhibitions of Japan.”<sup>268</sup> Later, Duanfang took the initiative to co-submit a petition for the Nanyang Industrial Exposition with Chen Qitai 陳啓泰, the Governor of Jiangsu Province, to the Qing court on December 7, 1908.

Duanfang was one of few progressive Manchu officials oriented towards reformation and possessing a wide knowledge about the outside world, including the world exhibitions. Duanfang traveled Japan, the U.S., Britain, and other European countries in 1905 and 1906 as a member of the Five Constitutional Study Commissioners, whose primary purpose was “to investigate all aspects of governmental administration with the objective of selecting the best for adoption.”<sup>269</sup> While he was staying in Italy, Duanfang had an opportunity to visit the Universal Exposition of Milan of 1906 in person. As mentioned in Chapter Two, Duanfang had submitted his own personal collection of curios to the Osaka Exhibition of 1903. While serving as the Governor-General of Liang-Jiang, Duanfang attained a strong insight into commerce and industry, because his jurisdiction, particularly Jiangsu Province, enjoyed the most developed system of capitalism in China at that time.<sup>270</sup> Given this background, it is not surprising

---

<sup>268</sup> Zhu Ying 朱英, “Duanfang Yu Nanyang Quanyehui 端方與南洋勸業會,” *Shixue Yuekan* Vol. 1 (1988), 68. The primary source is “*Nanyang Dachen Duanfang Bi Jiangning Gongyuan Banshichu Bingwen* 南洋大臣端方批江寧公園判事處稟文” from the Archive of Suzhou Chamber of Commerce. Later Chen Qi became the Managing Director of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition.

<sup>269</sup> Edward Rhoads, *Manchus & Han: Ethnic Relations and Political Power in Late Qing and Early Republican China, 1861-1928* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2000), 96. The other four members were Prince Zaize 載澤, Li Shengduo 李盛鐸 (Shuntian prefect), Dai Hongci 戴鴻慈 (Junior vice-president of the Board of Revenue), and Shang Qiheng 尙其亨 (Shandong treasurer).

<sup>270</sup> Zhu, 70.

that Duanfang eagerly led the project of hosting the first national exposition of China. As he was advancing the project, Duanfang concurrently served as *Nanyang tongshang dachen* 南洋通商大臣, or the Minister-superintendent of Trade in the South, the office of which was located in Nanjing. Thus, Nanjing was a convenient choice for the venue of the first national exposition of China, beating other possible candidates such as Beijing, the capital, or Shanghai, the commercial and industrial center of China at that time.<sup>271</sup> The official title of the exposition also came to include Nanyang.<sup>272</sup>

In his petition about the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, Duanfang articulated the purpose of the exposition:

The wealth and power of a nation should be sought in the development of industry, which could be most efficiently achieved through competition. The Western countries have encouraged competition and provided the opportunity of studying through various expositions of agriculture, industry, and commerce. Emulating those of the West, Japan also held the Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibitions, through which they could promote potential domestic goods, thereby improving their quality. The speed of the industrial development in Japan impressed the world, and Japan eventually held an international exhibition. In sum, it can be claimed that the purpose of the exposition is to enhance the standard of nation through international competition.<sup>273</sup>

---

<sup>271</sup> In terms of the administrative division during the late Qing period, Nanyang 南洋 included the coastal areas of Jiangsu, Zhejiang, Fujian, and Guangdong provinces whereas Beiyang 北洋 included those of Fengtian, Zhili, and Shandong.

<sup>272</sup> Thus, here, Nanyang doesn't mean Southeast Asia, but it was often assumed to, because the overseas Chinese businessmen from Southeast Asia happened to contribute to the Nanyang Industrial Exposition in many ways, which will be discussed in detail later.

<sup>273</sup> Duanfang, "Chouban nanyang quanyehui zhe 籌辦南洋勸業會摺"(Petition for the Nanyang Industrial Exhibition) in Shen Yunlong 潘雲龍 ed. *Duanzhongmingong Zougao* 端忠敏公奏稿

Regarding the specific details of the exposition, Duanfang provided five pivotal points, which would form the basic guidelines for the Nanyang Industrial Exposition in practice. First, the purpose of the exposition should be pure: “It should pursue not profit but the enhancement of people’s knowledge and industry.” Secondly, its scale and name should be practically arranged. *bolan* 博覽, or literally “Extensive Show” should not be used in the official name of the exposition, because if the exposition is of such “extensive” scale, it could cause fund starvation and, moreover, turn the exposition into simply an ostensible show. Thirdly, even if the scale is not extensive, its arrangement should be comprehensive enough to include the exhibits from every corner of the nation. Fourthly, excellent exhibits should be awarded, thereby honoring the presenters. Finally, the preparation should be launched promptly.

Upon submitting his petition, Duanfang immediately proceeded to the next step, beginning with the establishment of the Office of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition to co-ordinate the general preparation. It was staffed by 40 people, including Dao Chenqi 道陳琪 as the secretary and Xiang Ruikun 向瑞琨 as the assistant manager, most of whom had knowledge about exhibitions through their education, both abroad and domestic, and through their official careers. Simultaneously, the Board of Affairs for the event, of which 13 directors were influential businessmen in Jiangsu and Zhejiang provinces, was launched in Shanghai. Duanfang also sought cooperation from related governmental departments. He sent out an official document to the Department of

---

(*Jindai Zhongguo Shiliao Congkan Dishiji* 近代中國史料總刊第十輯 Vol. 94 (1) ~ (4)) (Taipei: Wenhai Chubanshe, 1966-1973), 1568-1572.

Foreign Affairs in order to seek their cooperation on December 25, 1908.<sup>274</sup> Later, in March, 1909, he wrote the governor of each province to request that they organize exhibitions of local products from their administrative districts for the preliminary screening of the exhibits to be submitted to the Nanyang Industrial Exposition. As a result, the exhibitions of local produce in the Liang-Jiang area -- Jiangsu, Anhui, and Jiangxi provinces -- were followed by those of Zhili, Henan, Shaanxi, Hunan, Hubei, Yunnan, Sichuan, Guangdong, and Guangxi provinces.<sup>275</sup> As *Lijin* 厘金, or local taxes levied on goods in transit over district barriers could be an imposing obstacle to the transportation of the goods to the exposition, Duan attempted to persuade the Qing government to waive *Lijin* for the goods submitted to the exposition, despite the initial unwillingness of *Duzhibu* 度支部, or the Board of Revenue and Finance.<sup>276</sup>

On May 21, 1909, Duanfang submitted another petition to report the measures taken in accordance with an imperial edict, which had allowed Duanfang to request cooperation from the related governmental departments in order to prepare for the exposition.<sup>277</sup> In this memorial, he wrote, “At the initial stage of the preparation, the regulations of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition emulated those of the exhibitions of Japan.” Thus, it is clear that the general configuration of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition was influenced by the Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibitions of

---

<sup>274</sup> *Zhongguo di 1 lishi dang'anguan* ed. (2007), Vol. 6, 2905.

<sup>275</sup> Zhu, 69.

<sup>276</sup> Duan's request as such was not accepted by the Qing government, causing discontent among the Chinese merchants who submitted their products to the Nanyang Industrial Exposition. On the last day of the exposition, the president of the Organization of the Exhibitors raised this issue in his address. *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, December 8, 1910.

<sup>277</sup> Duanfang, “Lüchen Nanyang Quanyehui Choubai Qingxing 縷陳南洋勸業會籌備情形”(Report on the current preparation status of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition) in Shen Yunlong ed. *Duanzhongmingong Zougao* (Taipei: Wenhai Chubanshe, 1966-1973), 1728-1729.

Japan, which later would be emphasized often by the Japanese press after the opening of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition. This petition is also the first official document where the plan to include the pavilions of foreign exhibits at the Nanyang Industrial Exposition was mentioned: “The pavilions of foreign exhibits would be established in order to expand the knowledge of the Chinese people and to improve the social ethos of China. This would bring about the effects and benefits of comparison and competition, albeit in a limited way.”

Regarding the reasons for adding the foreign pavilions to the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, *Taiwan riri xinbao*, the major newspaper in Taiwan, claimed, “At first, the Chinese authorities didn’t want to exhibit foreign goods because it would reveal the coarseness of the Chinese counterparts. However, the Japanese Consul in Nanjing and other foreign consuls persuaded the Qing government to have foreign exhibits at the Nanyang Industrial Exposition.”<sup>278</sup> An article from *The World To-Day: A Monthly Record of Human Progress* also wrote, “It was at first feared that the contrast between foreign goods and the cruder native products would be discouraging, and the admission of foreign exhibits at all was due to *pressure from the foreigners*, Chinese wishes, as usual, being overridden.”<sup>279</sup> As Duanfang’s first petition proposing the Nanyang Industrial Exposition had not mentioned foreign exhibits, it might be true that foreign pavilions were not considered in the original plan. However, the reason for this could be different from what these two foreign journals claimed. As seen in the fact that Duanfang

---

<sup>278</sup> *Taiwan riri xinbao*, “Nanyang Quanyehui 南京博覽會” (Nanyang Industrial Exposition), April 7, 1910.

<sup>279</sup> Ernst R. Holmes, “The First Exposition in China,” *The World To-Day: A Monthly Record of Human Progress* (August 1910), 916. *Italic is mine.*



avoided using the term *bolan*, or “Extensive Show,” in the name of the exposition, he intended to keep the Nanyang Industrial Exposition at a manageable scale. As a matter of fact, the Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibitions of Japan, which the Nanyang Industrial Exposition modeled itself after, also had concentrated on domestic products only until the Osaka Exhibition of 1903, or the 5<sup>th</sup> and the last Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibition included foreign exhibits for the first time. Thus, from the perspective of Duanfang and the Qing government, there was no reason for including foreign exhibits in the first national exposition of China.

The final plan of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition that would include both domestic and foreign exhibits had not been officially authorized by the Qing government until July, 1909. However, considering the specific language of the imperial edict at the beginning of Duanfang’s second petition of May, “Inform the related governmental departments (about the Nanyang Industrial Exposition),” tacit approval from the Qing government had enabled Duanfang to carry out the preliminary preparation before the official permission was issued. However, unfortunately, Duanfang, the mastermind of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, couldn’t consummate the project, because he was appointed as the Minister-superintendent of Trade in the North in June, 1909. At that point, Zhang Renjun 張人駿, a conservative Han-Chinese official, succeeded Duanfang in his position of Minister-superintendent of Trade in the South, and thus also became the president of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition. However, Zhang’s attitude toward the exposition was not considered to be as enthusiastic as that of his Manchu predecessor,

who had showed great leadership among both the staff of the exposition and the business sponsors in the process of preparation.<sup>280</sup>

In addition to internal problems such as the abrupt change of leadership and the temporal pressure of finishing preparation within less than a year, another imposing concern, particularly from the perspective of the foreigners living in China, was the socio-political instability of China, which resulted in various kinds of uprisings. Not two months before the opening of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, the Changsha rice riot occurred, involving over twenty thousand participants. Serious crop failures and skyrocketing price of rice in Hunan area triggered the riot, and the situation worsened owing to the provincialism of the powerful local gentry which resisted the administrative efforts of the central government.<sup>281</sup> During this riot, foreign-owned shops and residences and Christian missions were among the major targets of destruction, along with modern schools. Under such circumstances, *The New York Times* carried several articles to warn of the possible riots in Nanjing, “which had long been noted for its strong pro-Chinese and anti-Manchu feeling.”<sup>282</sup> For instance, a short article cautioning of “serious evidence of unrest, for instance, cutting off their queues as anti-dynastic demonstration, among the Chinese in Nanjing” appeared on May 18<sup>th</sup>, and was followed by a more extensive article about the agitation in Nanjing next day: “United States Minister Calhoun at Peking reports a serious situation at Nanking. In a telegram to the State Department he says that the Consulate at Nanking advises the legation that there

---

<sup>280</sup> Zhu, 69-70.

<sup>281</sup> Arthur L. Rosenbaum, “Gentry Power and the Changsha Rice Riot of 1910,” in *Journal of Asian Studies* Vol. XXXIV, No. 3 (May 1975): 689-715.

<sup>282</sup> *The New York Times*, “Nanyang Exposition Haunted by Boxers’ Uprising,” June 4, 1910.

are disquieting anti-foreign and anti-dynastic rumors, not unlike those that preceded the Boxer outbreak. The consular body at Nanking has presented a memorandum to the Viceroy calling his attention to the serious conditions and emphasizing the importance of immediate measures to stop the anti-foreign movement.”<sup>283</sup>

In addition to the request for action from China, the foreign diplomatic body started to take their own actions in response to this perceived instability. Aside from the U.S. Naval Vessels already stationed in Chinese waters, William J. Calhoun, the U.S. Minister, got the warship *New Orleans* ready in the Yangzi River to land a force in Nanjing, if necessary, to protect the foreign consulates.<sup>284</sup> German, British, and Japanese warships were also standing by for the same purpose.<sup>285</sup> The Qing government also dispatched Chinese warships with troops to Nanjing in case of a disturbance against foreigners.<sup>286</sup> As the loyalty of the Chinese soldiers in Nanjing was not considered reliable, a force from Shanghai was sent to replace them. Some placards found in Nanjing incited the people to destroy foreign life and property, making foreign residents anxious and causing a rumor that the Consuls were planning their evacuation. Also, the foreign Consuls in Nanjing were said to have received a warning from a Chinese group called the Revolutionary Board of War that it would make war on the Manchus and the foreigners should not intervene.<sup>287</sup> As a result, both foreigners and some Chinese people

---

<sup>283</sup> *The New York Times*, “Grave Signs in China,” May 18, 1910; *The New York Times*, “Nanking Situation Serious,” May 19, 1910.

<sup>284</sup> William J. Calhoun was appointed Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to China in 1909, where he served until 1913.

<sup>285</sup> *The New York Times*, “Chinese Menacing Aliens in Nanking,” June 4, 1910.

<sup>286</sup> *The New York Times*, “Fear Outbreak at Nanking,” June 1, 1910.

<sup>287</sup> *Ashburton Guardian*, “Trouble in China,” June 6, 1910.

seemed to anticipate that a revolution could occur on June 5<sup>th</sup>, or the opening date of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition.<sup>288</sup>

In spite of such apprehensions, “the opening ceremony of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition passed off most smoothly” as scheduled.<sup>289</sup> Regarding the tension before the exposition, *Shengjing shibao* 盛京時報, a daily newspaper of Fengtian 奉天, carried an interesting article, which allegedly quoted from the leader of *Gemingdang* 革命黨 or the Revolutionary Board of War:

It is rumored that the Revolutionary Board of War would raise a commotion in Nanjing by taking advantage of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition. The Chinese people as well as the foreigners believed it. They were so anxious that they took their own precautions against it. However, actually, we, the Revolutionary Board of War, don't have any plan to cause an uprising in the area surrounding the Yangzi River, because it is geographically too hard to retreat there. Our comrades just want to promote influences in that area without any objective of uprising. The origin of the rumor is a secret military unit dispatched to that area by the central government, which desperately aims to lay a foundation for their presence. We also didn't send letters to the foreign diplomats in Beijing that the diplomats should not take sides with the Manchus when an uprising occurs. It must be fabricated. If this is untrue, how could you explain the absence of any commotion at the site of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition?<sup>290</sup>

---

<sup>288</sup> *The New York Times*, “Chinese Menacing Aliens in Nanking,” June 4, 1910.

<sup>289</sup> *The New York Times*, “No Nanking Outbreak Yet,” June 6, 1910.

<sup>290</sup> *Shengjing shibao*, “*Nanjing Yaoyan Suoyouqi* 南京謠言所由起”(The Origin of the Nanjing Rumor), June 23, 1910. The leader of the Revolutionary Board of War was not identified in this article. *Shengjing shibao* was founded in 1906 with a Japanese general manager, Nakashima Masao 中島眞雄.

Although no violent disturbances took place, the event organizers faced other obstacles. Constant rain throughout early spring retarded the completion of construction, which had been already behind schedule, and many exhibits from each province had not even arrived at Nanjing. As a result, the opening ceremony of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, which had been originally supposed to take place on the first day of the fourth month by the lunar calendar, was performed on the twenty eighth day of the same month or June 5<sup>th</sup> of the solar calendar.

## **II. The Opening of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition**

The site of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition was located in the Jiangning Park in the northern part of Nanjing as originally proposed. Because the total budget for building and organizing had increased from 500,000 taels, Duanfang's estimate in his petition, to 1,000,000 taels or 600,000 USD, the site of the exposition expanded to 1000 *Mu* or, approximately, 165 acre.<sup>291</sup> The Organizing Committee of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition was in charge of building and managing 15 buildings at the site: pavilions of Education, Industrial Arts, Agriculture, Art, Hygiene, Ordnance, Machinery, Transportation, *Jingji* 京畿 area, and Promotion of Industry as well as general purpose structures such as Assembly Hall, Monumental Tower, a General Office, a Bureau of a Judging Committee, and a Depot. These buildings were designed by Atkinson and Dallas

---

<sup>291</sup> Although Zhang Renjun's conservative reputation made people concerned about his eagerness to lead the exposition, he succeeded in securing 600,000 USD, of which 265,000 USD was given by the throne and 144,500 USD was donated by the local chambers of commerce (Holmes, 914).

Civil Engineer & Architects, a British company in Shanghai, which also had designed the Chinese Pavilion at the St. Louis Exposition.<sup>292</sup>

Excepting Meng'gu, Xinjiang, and Xizang provinces, twenty two provinces participating in the exposition built their own pavilions: provinces of Zhili 直隸, Sichuan 四川, Hubei 湖北, Hunan 湖南, Guangdong 廣東, Henan 河南, Shandong 山東, Zhejiang 浙江, Fujian 福建, Anhui 安徽, Jiangxi 江西, and the combined provinces of Dongsanxing 東三省, Shanshan 山陝, and Yungui 雲貴. The number of the exhibits from all these provinces reached over 100 million, which were divided into 24 categories and 420 kinds. Three industry-promotion pavilions: Jiangling Silk Industry Pavilion, Hunan Ceramic Industry Pavilion, and Boshan 博山 Glass Industry Pavilion. There were also three special pavilions: Lanqi 蘭綺 Pavilion of Jiangnan Arsenal, Education Pavilion of the Guangdong Education Association, and Fishery Pavilion of Fishery Corporation of Jiangsu and Zhejiang provinces. In addition, there was the Ji'nanguan 暨南 Pavilion for the exhibits submitted by the Overseas Chinese of Southeast Asia, and three Foreign Samples Buildings. In total, there were over 30 pavilions of various exhibits at the site of the exposition with a grand fountain and a four-story monumental tower equipped with an elevator leading to an observation platform on the top. Trolleys operated around the exposition site for the visitors.

In addition to the formal pavilions, there was an entertainment quarter called *Chibizhiyule* 赤壁之游樂, which consisted of a Russian circus, a zoo of the animals

---

<sup>292</sup> Arif Dirlik, "Architecture of Global Modernity, Colonialism and Places," in Sang Lee and Ruth Baumeister eds., *The Domestic and the Foreign in Architecture* (Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2007), 40. The company was cofounded by Brenan Atkinson and Arthur Dallas. Zheng Shiling 鄭時齡, *Shanghai Jindai Jianzhu Fengge* 上海近代建築風格 (Shanghai: Shanghai jia yu chuban she, 1999), 323.

from Northeast Three Provinces, a botanical garden, theaters, musical performances, motion pictures, and various stores. Some programs in the entertainment quarter were said to be arranged by Americans from Manila.<sup>293</sup> However, there was no anthropological exhibit, which, as discussed in the previous chapters, had been one of the most controversial issues in international exhibitions. Finally, over 200 inns and stores for visitors newly opened outside the site of the exposition. Thus, at least in terms of the external scale and organization, the Nanyang Industrial Exposition was impressive enough for a first national exhibition, although the construction of the entire site and the opening of each pavilion had not been completed until a month after its opening ceremony, which produced criticism from some domestic journals.<sup>294</sup>

Although there were various concerns before the opening of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, the general atmosphere of the exposition turned out to be so peaceful that William E. Geil, an American explorer, remarked, “The Government’s armed precautions were useless. There was no violence at all.”<sup>295</sup> However, as a matter of fact, this peace was the result of the thorough precautions of the Qing government and the authority of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition. The staff of the Exposition Office and trained policemen were in charge of security both within and without the site respectively. The New Armies also were guarding outside the city wall of Nanjing, while battleships were standing by in the waterways. The population was solemnly warned that

---

<sup>293</sup> Holmes, 916.

<sup>294</sup> The sites of the First Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibition (Tokyo) and the Fifth Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibition (Osaka) were approximately 25 acre and 82 acres respectively. By mid- June, the construction of the exposition site was done 50 ~ 60% only, and none of provincial pavilions had opened yet. *Shuntian shibao*, June 23, 1910.

<sup>295</sup> Dr. William E. Geil, “China’s awakening shown throughout the country,” in *The New York Times*, Sep. 4, 1910.

any disturbance caused by local soldiers would be handled by military law.<sup>296</sup> Furthermore, all the inns in Nanjing were required to submit their guest books to the police station every five days ostensibly in the name of counting the number of visitors to the exposition; however, its actual goal was to track down potential troublemakers.<sup>297</sup> On the other hand, in order to prevent any commotion that might be caused by the lack of rice in Nanjing, the Qing government had imported 200,000 *shi* 石 of rice from places like Vietnam and Thailand.<sup>298</sup> Moreover, during the period of the Nanjing Industrial Exposition, charity granaries were established to distribute rice to the poor people in Nanjing. Although an article in *Taiwan riri xinbao* claimed, “Distributing rice has nothing to do with the original goal of the exposition and it is even ridiculous,” it was the best possible measure that could be adopted to prevent disturbances owing to the shortage of rice.<sup>299</sup>

In terms of its management style, the authority of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition evinced relatively flexible attitude. For instance, public opinion generally held that the ticket price was too expensive. As even the Japanese newspaper *Asahi shimbun* pointed out, “The admission of the exhibition is usually 10 *Sen* 錢, but that of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition is as much as 30 *Sen*, although the living standard of Nanjing is lower than that of Japan.”<sup>300</sup> The ordinary ticket was finally lowered from 3

<sup>296</sup> *Shuntian shibao*, June 8, 1910.

<sup>297</sup> *Shuntian shibao*, July 1, 1910.

<sup>298</sup> 200,000 *Shi* is approximately 27 Million lb. Because of the concern about the lack of rice, Anhui Province, in which Wuhu 蕪湖 was one of the main sources of rice, asked for the postponement of the opening of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition until the fall. *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, May 7, 1910; *Shuntian shibao*, May 22, 1910.

<sup>299</sup> *Taiwan riri xinbao* (Japanese), “Nankin Hakurankaiwo mirunoki 南京博覽會をみるの記” (Report on the observation of the Nanyang Exhibition), July 8, 1910.

<sup>300</sup> *Asahi shimbun*, “Nankin Hakurankai”(南京博覽會), July 31, 1910.



*Jiao* 角 to 1 *Jiao*, and a special ticket for soldiers, students, and children was reduced from 1.5 *Jiao* to 1 *Jiao* in mid-July, which portended a heavy financial blow, since ticket sales were the major source of income for the Nanyang Industrial Exposition.<sup>301</sup> Also, for the promotion of the exposition, anyone who purchased an admission ticket received a 30% discount for their train fare.<sup>302</sup> As a result, the number of visitors gradually increased when the weather was also cooling off. By mid-October, the number of visitors per day was often over 10,000, and the total number of the Chinese visitors and the foreign visitors reached approximately 300,000 and 5,000 respectively.<sup>303</sup>

### III. Friend or Spy? : Japan at the Nanyang Industrial Exposition

The Nanyang Industrial Exposition included three Foreign Samples Buildings. Whereas the exhibits of the U.S., Germany, and Britain mostly focused on machines, chemicals, and electricity, Japan mainly exhibited export goods to China such as cotton cloth, sugar, and seafood, in addition to some displays on their army and navy. As mentioned earlier, the foreign consuls in China exerted pressure on the decision to include the foreign exhibits at the Nanyang Industrial Exposition. From their perspective, the exposition must be a rare occasion in which they could introduce their products to the Chinese people from every province or demonstrate their superiority through various exhibitions of advanced technology. Either or both would ultimately contribute to the expansion of their power in China. At the same time, foreign businessmen could observe

---

<sup>301</sup> 10 *Jiao* was 1 *Yuan* 圓. The Chinese Yuan was introduced at par with the Mexican Peso in 1889.

<sup>302</sup> *Dagongbao*, July 30, 1910.

<sup>303</sup> *Minlibao* 民立報, Oct. 14, 1910; *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, Oct. 24, 1910.

the primary Chinese products and, thereby evaluate the agriculture, industry, and commerce of China for their future strategy in Chinese market.<sup>304</sup>

An example of the exhibition's promotion of global trade would be the visit of Robert Dollar, a San Francisco shipping magnate who owned the Dollar Steamship Company and who led a group of businessmen belonging to the Pacific Coast Chamber of Commerce to China in September.<sup>305</sup> In addition to their visit to the exposition on the first day of their arrival in Nanjing, where they stayed for four days, they participated in various social events, because the purpose of their visit to China was "to create a better feeling of friendship between the two nations and incidentally to promote and increase trade relations."<sup>306</sup> For instance, they attended a welcoming party organized by the representatives of *Ziyiju* 諮議局, or the Provincial Assembly of 16 provinces on September 25. Dollar discussed various China-U.S. partnerships such as joint operation of banks and shipping with Zhang Jian 張謇, who was an influential businessman and the chairman of the Jiangsu *Ziyiju*.<sup>307</sup>

The majority of the foreign visitors to the Nanyang Industrial Exposition were Japanese people, who took advantage of the geographical proximity and even the special discount on their transportation offered by NYK Line and Nishin Steamboat Shipping Company.<sup>308</sup> Under the leadership of Kondō Renpei 近藤廉平, the president of *Nippon*

---

<sup>304</sup> Nozawa, 2477.

<sup>305</sup> The group consisted of 23 businessmen, 17 wives of theirs, and 2 secretaries. The invitation was sent to the Pacific Coast Chamber of Commerce in February, 1909 and their visit to China was confirmed in August.

<sup>306</sup> Robert Dollar. *Private diary of Robert Dollar on his recent visits to China* (San Francisco: W.S. Van Cott & Co., 1912), 10.

<sup>307</sup> Wang (1989), 133.

<sup>308</sup> *Asahi shimbun* (Tokyo), April 29, 1910. NYK Line and Nishin Steamboat Shipping Company offered exclusive group discount to the visitors to the Nanjing Industrial Exposition.

*Yusen Kaisha* 日本郵船会社, or NYK Line, a group of 12 influential businessmen from Osaka, Yokohama, Tokyo, Kobe, Kyoto, and Nagoya and 2 attendants visited the exposition. Also, a group of Japanese newspaper reporters were specially dispatched to Nanjing for the coverage of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition. At first glance, the Japanese were welcomed. For instance, at the welcoming remarks of the reception for the Japanese tourists, the friendship between China and Japan based on “Same Culture, Same Race” of being the disciples of Confucius was emphasized.<sup>309</sup> The establishment of a Chinese-Japanese joint news agency was agreed upon by both sides at a reception for the Japanese reporters.<sup>310</sup>

However, the inevitable tension between two countries was also noticeable, as implied in a Japanese diplomatic document: “The purpose of dispatching the Japanese delegation of businessmen to the Nanyang Industrial Exposition is to alleviate conflicts caused by old ill feelings between two countries.”<sup>311</sup> As the ambition of Japan toward Chinese territory, particularly Three Northeast Provinces had been apparent since the end of the Russo-Japanese War, Japan’s every move relating to China easily caused suspicion among the Chinese people. For instance, regarding the eagerness of the Japanese visitors to the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, *Shenbao* reported: “According to a Chinese student from Tokyo, many Japanese of various fields are trying to come to Nanjing during the summer break. Approximately 2000 people have already decided to

---

<sup>309</sup> *Dagongbao*, June 25, 1910.

<sup>310</sup> *Shenbao*, “*Zhongri Baojiezhi Lianluo* 中日報界之聯絡” (Affiliations between China-Japan Journalists), June 10, 1910; *Shuntain shibao*, June 19. This reception was held to return the courtesy of the welcome party by the Japanese Consul in Shanghai on June 2nd, in which the Chinese newspaper reporters of Shanghai were invited. *Shenbao*, June 3, 1910.

<sup>311</sup> Nozawa, 2480. The quotation is from a diplomatic document of Japan.

visit the Nanyang Industrial Exposition. We're wondering why Japanese people are so eager to come to see our exposition, although it is merely the first national exposition of China, whereas Japan already has held several expositions."<sup>312</sup> According to *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, a Japanese newspaper carried an advertisement for a group tour to the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, the itinerary of which covered the areas surrounding the Yangzi River: Shanghai, Suzhou, Hangzhou, Hunan, Hubei, and Nanjing. After enumerating the benefits of this visit, the advertisement concluded, "All gentlemen and students of *ardent patriotism*, we truly hope that you never miss this opportunity."<sup>313</sup> There was no reason that the Japanese travel in China should be confined to Nanjing, but the patriotic rhetoric at the end of the advertisement was open to further interpretation. *Hong Kong huazi ribao* construed the rhetoric to mean that the Japanese people intended to spy on the key commercial and military spots of the *Jiangnan* 江南 areas freely under the pretext of visiting the Nanyang Industrial Exposition. Then, pointing out that the Chinese people naively welcomed Japanese visitors, *Hong Kong huazi ribao* concluded, "We should take precautions against the too ardent interest of the Japanese people in the Nanyang Industrial Exposition and, ultimately, strengthen China in order to check any suspicious activity (of Japan)."<sup>314</sup>

As mentioned earlier, Japanese newspaper reporters were dispatched to Nanjing to cover the exposition. *Asahi shimbun* (Tokyo) started covering the Nanyang Industrial

---

<sup>312</sup> *Shenbao*, "Ribenzhenzhi Guanguangre 日本人之觀光熱"(The Eagerness of the Japanese Visitors), July 20, 1910.

<sup>313</sup> *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, "Lun Rirenzhi Guchui Duhua Yanjiu 論日人之鼓吹渡華研究"(Discussing Japan's encouragement of visiting China), June 23, 1910. Italics are mine. The Japanese newspaper that carried the above advertisement was not identified. The article was written under the pen name of Pei Xian 佩弦.

<sup>314</sup> Ibid.

Exposition even before its opening. Regarding the opening ceremony of the exposition, *Asahi shimbun* wrote: “We Japanese people can contribute to the festive atmosphere of Nanjing by visiting the exposition in person without neglecting the event of our neighboring country. The friendship between countries should not be confined to the political realm and should be extended to social and commercial ones.”<sup>315</sup> In general, *Asahi shimbun*’s coverage of the exposition was descriptive rather than evaluative, except a column published under a penname, Korō 孤郎: “*The formation of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition modeled after that of our Japanese exhibitions in many ways*. Thus, it is possible to point out its strength and weakness through comparison. However, all the same, it is unfair to criticize their mistakes and faults, considering the absence of their experience. In this sense, the first exposition in China is quite approvable, although it is problematic that the tickets are too expensive for Chinese people.”<sup>316</sup>

The fact that the Nanyang Industrial Exposition emulated the exhibitions of Japan seemed to be embedded in the mind of the Japanese people. *Taiwan riri xinbao*, the major newspaper in Taiwan during the Japanese colonial period, wrote, “It is said that the management of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition is modeled after that of the 5<sup>th</sup> Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibition that took place in the Ueno Park in Tokyo [*sic*].”<sup>317</sup> Another article of *Taiwan riri xinbao* also claimed that, for the above-

---

<sup>315</sup> *Asahi shimbun*, June 7<sup>th</sup>, 1910.

<sup>316</sup> *Asahi shimbun*, “*Nankin Hakurankai* 南洋勸業會” (The Nanyang Industrial Exposition), June 31, 1910. Italics are mine.

<sup>317</sup> *Taiwan riri xinbao* (Chinese), “*Nanyang Quan’yehui* 南洋勸業會” (The Nanyang Industrial Exposition), Jan. 16, 1910. As discussed in Chapter Two, the 5<sup>th</sup> Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibition took place in Osaka.

mentioned reason, some Chinese students who had studied in Japan were engaged in translating the general rules of Japanese exhibitions for the arrangement of the exhibits at the Nanyang Industrial Exposition. Partially because of this awareness of what the Nanyang Industrial Exposition owed to the Japanese domestic exhibitions, Japan seemed to expect “special” treatment at the site of the exposition. For instance, Japan had made a demand that “Japan should not be considered to be a foreign nation and its exhibits should be displayed in the various classified pavilions” like Chinese exhibits. This bold demand caused strong protest from other foreign countries, which was led by the U.S.<sup>318</sup>

The above-mentioned article in *Taiwan riri xinbao* also complained about the “anti-foreign” attitude of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition: “The foreign exhibits are poorly treated and the four nations of the Foreign Samples Buildings -- The U.S., Britain, Germany, and Japan -- are not even allowed to hoist their national flags. Thus, the Japanese exhibits hung the Rising Sun Flags for decoration, but they were forced to take down the flags, which is definitely ridiculous.”<sup>319</sup> It is not clear why the national flags of foreign countries were not allowed to be hoisted at the site of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition and, as this article claimed, it might have been a reflection of the anti-foreign sentiment of China at that time. However, from the perspective of China, the Rising Sun Flags, or the war flags of the Japanese army, must have been much more unacceptable. Moreover, as their national flags were not allowed, the U.S., Britain, and Germany agreed to use the official flags of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition instead. Thus, Japan’s hanging of the Rising Sun Flags was definitely indiscreet and provocative.

---

<sup>318</sup> Holmes, 916.

<sup>319</sup> *Taiwan riri xinbao* (Japanese), July 8, 1910.

The tug of war between China and Japan at the site of exposition was not confined to the Nanyang Industrial Exposition that year, because there were two other major international expositions in 1910, the Japan-British Exhibition in London and the Brussels Universal Exposition.<sup>320</sup> Because of the Japan-British Exhibition, the Japanese government had decided not to participate officially in the Brussels Universal Exposition, and only some merchants individually submitted their exhibits. However, as the Chinese Pavilion came to be highly praised and, furthermore, played the role of representing the Far East to Europe, the Japanese exhibitors, who were not allowed to display their national flags at the site of the exposition, got so furious that they telegraphed the Japanese government to ask for help. As a result, Prince Fushimi Sadanaru went to Belgium in person to convert the section of Japanese exhibits in the Brussels Universal Exposition into an official one with the Japanese Ambassador to Belgium serving as the general director.<sup>321</sup> They even held a formal opening ceremony on July 2<sup>nd</sup>, but the Japanese exhibits didn't get as much attention from the public as their Chinese counterparts. The article in *Shibao* that covered this affair commented, "This is a demonstration of development of the Chinese diplomacy."<sup>322</sup> This might be the first ever positive evaluation by the Chinese journal on the performance of the Qing government at

---

<sup>320</sup> The Japan-British Exhibition took place from May 14 to October 29 and the Brussels Universal Exposition from April 23 to November 7, 1910.

<sup>321</sup> Prince Fushimi Sadanaru or Fushimi-no-miya Sadanaru-Shinnō 伏見宮貞愛親王 served in both the Sino-Japanese War and the Russo-Japanese War. As a key aide to Crown Prince Yoshihito, he also carried out important diplomatic missions in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>322</sup> *Shibao*, "Bijing Saihuiji 比京賽會記"(Report on the Brussels Exposition), Aug. 15, 1910.

any international exhibitions, although the rest part of the article still pointed out the poor location and unsatisfying appearance of the Chinese Pavilion.<sup>323</sup>

On the other hand, whereas the Brussels Universal Exposition brought China the delight of “beating” Japan at the site of the exposition, the Japan-British Exhibition acknowledged the new status of Japan as ‘the Island Empire of the East’ on a par with Britain as the ‘the Island Empire of the West.’ Through an extensive and splendid collection of Japanese exhibits, Japan intended to leave a major impression on the British government and public, some of whom even thought that Japan was a part of China.<sup>324</sup> Also, it was no less important to demonstrate the achievement and potency of Japan as a colonial power. Thus, the Japanese government specially arranged the Palace of the Orient to display exhibits from Taiwan, Korea, the Province of Kwantung 關東, or the Japanese Concession in the Liaodong Peninsula, and the South Manchuria Company. The ambition of the colonial government in Taiwan to demonstrate what they had accomplished and their future prospects made their exhibits, including a life-like model of an aboriginal village, take up a half of the entire space of the Palace of the Orient.<sup>325</sup> The South Manchuria Company also intended to encourage loans from the financiers of the City of London and to attract tourists to Manchuria through their impressive exhibits

---

<sup>323</sup> Another article about China at the Brussels Universal Exposition, “*Bijing Bolanhuizhi Zhongguo Chupinguan* 北京博覽會場之中國出品觀”(Views on the Chinese exhibits at the Brussels Universal Exposition) was carried in *Shenbao* dated Aug., 14, 1910.

<sup>324</sup> Ayako Hotta-Lister, *The Japan-British Exhibition of 1910: Gateway to the Island Empire of the East* (Richmond Surrey: Japan Library, 1999), 6. It was said that the total space for the main Japanese exhibits occupied 130,000 square feet, doubling the area for the Japanese exhibits at the St. Louis Exposition in 1904.

<sup>325</sup> Mutsu Hirokichi ed., *The British Press and the Japan-British Exhibition of 1910* (Victoria: Melbourne Institute of Asian Languages and Societies, 2001), 202.



alongside the general products from Manchuria.<sup>326</sup> Those exhibits from Japanese “colonies” seemed to produce the effects intended:

Japan has now won her place as a Colonial Power, and an elaborate exhibit shows what she has accomplished in Manchuria, Korea, and Formosa. The collection of articles of Korean workmanship and the peninsula’s agricultural products, surprising as it is in extent and richness, is hardly more remarkable than the illustrations of Japan’s work in organizing and developing the country. No less interesting are the exhibits from Formosa, which, under Japanese government, has been transformed from a worthless haunt of savagery into a peaceful and prosperous land.<sup>327</sup>

Regarding the Japan-British Exhibition, *Shenbao* carried an article, responding to the address given by Count Mutsu Hirokichi 陸奥広吉, the Commissioner of the Imperial Japanese Government to the Exhibition, at the Royal Society of Arts on January 19<sup>th</sup>, 1910. As in the case of the wooden map of the Japanese Empire at the St. Louis Exposition, which included the Three Northeast Provinces of China, the article expressed rage about the ambition of Japan toward Chinese territory revealed through the inclusion of the exhibits from Manchuria at the Palace of the Orient. However, the substance of the article was China’s anxiety about catching up with Japan, which had achieved new status as an international power through the Japan-British Exhibition:

In terms of world politics, commerce, and international relationships, the most critical event of this year is the Japan-British

---

<sup>326</sup> Hotta-Lister, 86-87.

<sup>327</sup> Mutsu, 66. This article was carried in *Daily Telegraph* on May 16, 1910.

Exhibition...Although the upcoming Nanyang Industrial Exposition would not be considered a world affair, it is quite significant, at least, for our history. Thus, the authority of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition should pay full attention to its organization and management...If the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, which draws attention from foreigners, doesn't work properly, China would be the laughingstock of the world. Modes of managing domestic affairs substantially extend to international affairs. Not surprisingly, Japan, which has been domestically successful, is now advancing overseas, whereas China is just looking up at their backs.<sup>328</sup>

As discussed earlier, the existence of Taiwanese exhibits and people as a part of the Japanese sections at both the Osaka Exhibition of 1903 and the St. Louis Exposition of 1904 was highly offensive to China. Thus, the question of whether or not the Taiwanese exhibits were included in the Japanese section of the Foreign Samples Building at the Nanyang Industrial Exposition is very important, but no related evidence has been found yet. Only an article in *Taiwan jihō* 臺灣時報, a Japanese-language journal published by the Japanese colonial government in Taiwan, mentioned the enthusiasm of the colonial government to submit Taiwanese products to the Nanyang Industrial Exposition: "At this point that Taiwan has been a Japanese colony for 13 years, the Nanyang Industrial Exposition would be a good place for presenting the industrial products and situation of Taiwan to the whole nation of China. Moreover, not only Asian countries but also Western countries are said to submit their products. It would provide a great opportunity to introduce the achievements of the successful Japanese colony to

---

<sup>328</sup> Shenbao, "Lun Riyingbolanhuiyu Nanyang Quanyehui 論日英博覽會與南洋勸業會" (Discussing the Japan-British Exhibition and the Nanyang Industrial Exposition), May, 14, 1910.

China and the world. Thus, the Taiwanese local merchants should submit their local products such as hulled millet, sugar, tea, timber, coal, marine products, and various craftworks to the exposition. Then, wouldn't those Taiwanese products be introduced to overseas market and draw attention from European and American people?"<sup>329</sup> Considering such advantages as mentioned in this article, it seems plausible that the Taiwanese exhibits were displayed at the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, but the further study is required to answer the question.

#### **IV. The Chinese Press and the Nanyang Industrial Exposition**

As the Nanyang Industrial Exposition was the first national exhibition in China, it was natural that Chinese journals paid great attention to it. The authority of the exposition, which needed wide exposure of the exposition to the Chinese public, was also quite cooperative, in that all the chief editors and reporters of newspapers or journals were allowed to enter the site of exposition freely with their press pass. Moreover, for the convenience of the reporters covering the exposition, the national association of Chinese newspapers raised funds to create a lounge for reporters at the site of the exposition. As a result, whatever occurred at the site of the exposition could be carried in the Chinese newspapers: "The request from an American for having a polo game at the race track was allowed by the authority of the exposition, which was interested in sports activities in connection with the exposition."<sup>330</sup> Even the quotidian elements of managing the

---

<sup>329</sup> *Taiwan jihō*, "Nanyō Saikaiyōbi Taiwan 南洋賽會及臺灣"(The Nanyang Industrial Exposition and Taiwan), 1909. The predecessor of *Taiwan jihō* was *Taiwan kyōkai kaihō* 臺灣協會會報, which was quoted in Chapter Three.

<sup>330</sup> *Shenbao*, July 16, 1910. Before the opening of the exposition, an international athletic meet was hosted in Shanghai in June. Also, as one of extra activities of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition a

exposition received coverage: “There are over 10 public restrooms equipped with electric light for the convenience of the visitors. Everyday garbage carts clean the site of the exposition, and stores and theaters pay careful attention to sanitation.”<sup>331</sup>

Considering the attitude of the Chinese journals toward the performance of China in the international expositions, their coverage on the Nanyang Industrial Exposition was anticipated to be quite critical. However, as a matter of fact, most of coverage about the exposition by domestic Chinese newspapers such as *Shibao*, *Dagongbao*, *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, *Shengjing shibao*, and *Shutian shibao* maintained a simply descriptive or even positive tone. For instance, toward the end of the exposition, *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, which had carried very critical coverage about the performance of the Qing government at the St. Louis Exposition, reported that Yang Shiqi 楊士琦, the Adjunct General of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, was very satisfied with the result of the exposition because, “For six months since the opening of the exposition, there has been no unpleasant event. Moreover, the exhibits were superb. The visitors from friendly nations as well as our Chinese people highly praise the exposition.”<sup>332</sup> Even *Minlibao* 民立報, one of the most revolutionary Chinese newspapers at that time, carried a short article with a quotation from the U.S. delegation of businessmen: “It is remarkable that the first (national) exhibition of China has already achieved its fruit.”<sup>333</sup>

---

national athletic meet was held in October. These two athletic meet can be considered to have marked the beginning of China’s new attitude toward physical culture. Francis Hawks Pott, *The Emergency in China* (New York: The Presbyterian Department of Missionary Education, 1913), 135.

<sup>331</sup> *Shuntian shibao*, “Gonggong weisheng anpai 公共衛生安排” (The Arrangement of Public Sanitation), July 6, 1910.

<sup>332</sup> *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, “Yang Shiqi zhi qiexinshi 楊士琦之愜心事” (Yang Shiqi’s satisfaction), Nov. 25, 1910.

<sup>333</sup> *Minlibao*, “Meituanzhongzhi Yirenyan 美團中之一人言” (A quotation from a member of the U.S. delegation of businessmen), Nov.13, 1910. Yu Youren 於右任 founded *Minlibao* in 1910 in the

A notable exception was *Shenbao*, one of the most influential newspapers in China at that time, which carried several articles pointing out the problems found in the Nanyang Industrial Exposition. For instance, an article dated November 10<sup>th</sup> criticized the aesthetic minutiae of the exposition: “Whereas the fountain of the Osaka Exhibition provided a grand spectacle of spouting water, the small and plain fountain of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition does nothing but sprinkle water.” It likewise criticized the construction of various halls: “Regarding the provincial pavilions, those of Shangdong, Henan, Yungui 雲貴, and Shanshan 山陝 are the worst, and the rest of them are not much better, either. Their exhibition halls are narrow and the lighting and ventilation are not sufficient. In general, the pavilions of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition are grand in terms of size, but their decoration is not good enough.” The article ultimately proclaimed the exposition boring: “The space for entertainment is quite lacking. It is understandable that the visitors should not be distracted from the original goal of observing the exhibits, but the deficiency of entertaining elements would fail to attract the visitors.”<sup>334</sup> Another article in *Shenbao* also pointed out the excessive awards: “At the exhibitions of the West, the awards are given so prudently that the awardees feel quite honored. However, at the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, eight or nine out of ten exhibitors received awards. This implies that the majority of the products of our nation, both natural and manmade, have already reached an excellent standard, but it is hard to agree...The chairman of the

---

wake of *Minhuribao* 民虜日報 and *Minxuribao* 民吁日報, both of which were forced to suspend publication in 1909. Later, when a branch office of *Tongmenghui* 同盟會, or the Chinese Revolutionary Alliance was established in Shanghai in 1911, *Minlibao* would serve as its organ.

<sup>334</sup> *Shenbao*, “*Duiyu Nanyangquanyehuizhi Pinglun* 對於南洋勸業會之評論”(A Review on the Nanyang Industrial Exposition), Nov. 10, 1910.

awarding committee should have been more attentive.”<sup>335</sup> Finally, as the final review on the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, an editorial in *Shenbao* wrote:

The exhibits of the exposition look quite remarkable on the surface, but there are rarely inventions. Also, there are many luxurious items, but quite few practical ones. Apparently this exposition wasted money without gaining any benefits. In this sense, the Nanyang Industrial Exposition is not quite different from the *Saizhenhui* 賽珍會, or traditional fair, which displayed dazzling goods simply for the competition of their rarity. Therefore, it can be concluded that our nation has not got rid of the conventional customs yet nor benefitted from interaction with the world.<sup>336</sup>

Clearly, this editorial was critical about the quality of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, which failed in satisfying the standards of modern exposition. However, at the same time, unlike the previous coverage of the Osaka Exhibition and the St. Louis Exposition by the Chinese journals, the editors of *Shenbao* didn't associate the problems revealed through the exposition with the inability of the Qing government for political aggression. Initially, this might be understood in the context of the general tendency of *Shenbao*, which had maintained political neutrality since its foundation in 1872, while expressing its voice resolutely on social matters.<sup>337</sup>

---

<sup>335</sup> *Shenbao*, “*Guan Nanyangquanyehui Chuyan* 觀南洋勸業會芻言”(Humble opinions about the Nanyang Industrial Exposition), Nov. 16 & 17, 1910. Under the direction of Yang Shiqi, the Head of the Judging Committee, 5,269 exhibits won awards on the criterion of the contribution to the industrial development.

<sup>336</sup> *Shenbao*, “*Duiyu Nanyangquanyehui Pinglun* 對於南洋勸業會之評論” (A Review on the Nanyang Industrial Exposition), Nov. 7 & 8, 1910.

<sup>337</sup> Zhou Yongming, *Historicizing Online Politics: Telegraphy, the Internet, and Political Participation in China* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006), 53.

However, this could be interpreted more positively in that *Shenbao* didn't feel a need to criticize or provoke the Qing government, because of *Shenbao*'s relation to the constitutional movement at that time. As mentioned earlier, the Constitutional Study Commissioners, including Duanfang, were dispatched to study the governmental administration in Europe, the U.S., and Japan in 1905. After their return from the eight month long mission, the Commissioners recommended constitutional monarchy as a future political system of China. As a result, the Empress Dowager declared in the edict of September 1, 1906 that the Qing government would embark on constitutionalization. As a result, the following year, 1907, saw the trial establishment of *Zizhengyuan* 資政院, or National Assembly, and *Ziyiju*, or the Provincial Assembly. In the wake of the deaths of both the Guangxu Emperor and the Empress Dowager in 1908, even the Protect the Emperor Society came to operate legally in China under the new name *Xianzhengdang* 憲政黨, or the Constitutional Party. In 1910, three major petition campaigns were launched to press the Qing government to inaugurate an actual national parliament; it became the epoch of publicizing constitutionalism as the focus of national politics "in an unprecedented way by public telegrams and newspaper editorials and reports."<sup>338</sup>

Under such circumstances, *Shenbao* also came to support constitutionalism publicly in 1909, when its ownership passed into the hands of Xi Zipei 希子佩.<sup>339</sup> On November 4<sup>th</sup>, three days before the above-mentioned editorial was carried in *Shenbao*, an official edict was announced that parliament would be convened in 1913, conceding

---

<sup>338</sup> Zhou, 124-125. Zhou defines "public telegram" as messages intended for a broad audience, often having multiple recipients. Zhou, 55.

<sup>339</sup> Mary C. Wright, *China in Revolution: The First Phase, 1900-1913* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), 157.

to the public opinion that the establishment of parliament in 1917, which was proposed by the Qing court in 1909, would be too late. Thus, not only *Shenbao* but also other Chinese newspapers such as *Shibao* and *Zhongwai ribao*, which supported the constitutional government, hardly had a reason to provoke the Qing government by critically associating the defects of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition with the incompetence of the Qing government.

As a matter of fact, as Nozawa pointed out, many people engaged in the organization of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition were also active supporters of the constitutional movement.<sup>340</sup> For instance, Zhang Jian, a leading figure of the constitutional movement, who became the vice president of *Xianzheng chobeihui* 憲政籌備會, or the Preliminary Constitutional Consortia founded in December, 1906 in Shanghai, organized *Xiezan zonghui* 協贊總會, or the Cooperative Association for the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, as the nexus of the collaboration of officials, gentry, and merchants. Zhang also organized *Nanyang quanyehui yanjiuhui* 南洋勸業會研究會, or the Research Society of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, of which 790 members studied and analyzed the exhibits of the exposition to publish a final report.<sup>341</sup> Moreover, Zhang, who would eventually take over *Shenbao* in 1912 with some other elites from the Jiangsu and Zhejiang provinces, was exerting personal influence on *Shenbao* at that time through his friendship with Xi Zipei, then owner of *Shenbao*.

---

<sup>340</sup> Nozawa, 2477.

<sup>341</sup> Wang (1989), 132. Zhang Jian was one of the most significant figures in Chinese history of the world exhibitions during the late Qing period. In addition to his personal visit to the Osaka Exhibition of 1903, he played a leading role in preparing the Chinese exhibits at the Universal Exposition of Milan of 1906 as the representative of the civilian side centered on the businessmen of the coastal areas of China. For more details, refer to Xie Hui 謝輝. “Zhang Jian Yu Zhongguo Jindai Bolanhui Shiye 張謇與中國近代博覽會事業,” *Anhui Shixue* 安徽史學. No. 4 (2002), 43-47.



In this light, it is not surprising that *Shenbao* carried an editorial titled, “The Nanyang Industrial Exposition and Constitutionalization,”<sup>342</sup> which claimed that the indirect goal of the exposition was to help the establishment of the constitutional government, while the direct one was to improve industry. It primarily argued that the constitutional government was the government by people. Thus, unless the people had a sense of political responsibility, the constitutional government could not have been completed. Unfortunately, with little political sense, the Chinese people assumed that politics had nothing to do with them. On the other hand, they could be quite keen about economics because it dominated their lives directly. Thus, in order to cultivate political sense among the Chinese people, the inseparable relation between politics and economy of the present age had to be recognized. The first conclusion drawn from this situation was that the desire for a better society or country was an extension of the individual desire for a better life based on material affluence. Secondly, wealth was the basis of a country. Thirdly, economic growth would create more internal revenue, which was required for the expansion of education, the military, diplomacy, international commerce, and administration, all necessary preliminaries to constitutional government. Finally, the enhanced competitiveness of the Chinese economy could lead to its entrance into the international arena of commerce, through which Chinese people would develop

---

<sup>342</sup> *Shenbao*, “*Quanyehuiyu lixian 勸業會與立憲*”(The Nanyang Industrial Exposition and Constitutionalization), January 7 and 9, 1910. Another noteworthy editorial of *Shenbao* was about the relation between the Nanyang Industrial Exposition and protective trade policies. Its gist was that particular circumstances of China prevented practicing protective trade policies for the economic growth of China at the burgeoning stage. (For instance, because the Maritime Customs was under the direction of foreigners, even protective duties couldn’t be adopted.) Thus, the exposition could be the only alternative way to achieve the economic growth of China in the absence of protective trade policies. *Shenbao*, “*Lun Bolanhuiyu Baohu Maoyi Zhengce 論博覽會與保護貿易政策*” (Discussing the Exposition and Protective Trade Policies), April 11, 1910.

consciousness of international issues. In this sense, the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, which would develop economic sense among the Chinese people, could ultimately contribute to the establishment of constitutional government in China.

Toward the end of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, *Shenbao* carried an essay written by Zhang Yuanji, “Opinions on the Preparation Methods for China’s Participation in Overseas Expositions,” which had originally appeared in *Dongfang zazhi*.<sup>343</sup> Then, some other Chinese newspapers such as *Minlibao* (Nov. 13), *Shuntian shibao* (Nov. 20, 22, and 23), and *Hong Kong huazi ribao* (Dec. 7 & 8) also carried the same essay. Zhang Yuanji, an important figure of the Chinese publishing world, was also a member of the Preliminary Constitutional Consortia along with his colleagues of the Commercial Press of Shanghai, which was under the direction of Zhang himself.<sup>344</sup> As Zhang was traveling abroad in 1910, he couldn’t visit the Nanyang Industrial Exposition. Instead, he had an opportunity to visit both the Japan-British Exhibition and the Brussels Universal Exposition. Thus, his essay was not a commentary evaluating the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, but it is still worth paying attention in that it suggested a long-term plan to prepare for future international exhibitions by making the best use of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition:

---

<sup>343</sup> Zhang Yuanji 張元濟, “Zhongguo Chuyangsaihui Yubeibanfayi 中國出洋賽會預備辦法議” (Opinions on the Preparation Methods for China’s Participation in Overseas Exposition) in *Dongfang zazhi* 東方雜誌 Vol. 7, no. 9 (October 1910).

<sup>344</sup> Zhang also compiled *Lixian Guomin Duben* 立憲國民讀本 or *A Reader of Constitutional Government for the People* to be published by the Commercial Press of Shanghai in 1907. Zhang Renfeng 張人鳳 ed., *Zhang Jusheng Xiansheng Nianpu* 張菊生先生年譜 (Taipei: Taiwan Shangwu Yinshuguan, 1995).

China should stop participating in any international exhibitions for ten years in order to achieve thorough preparation. First, a constant showroom displaying excellent products selected from the Nanyang Industrial Exposition should be established by utilizing the existing facility of the exposition. Those products, as well as the income from this showroom, could be used for China's next participation in an international exhibition. Secondly, the constant showroom should recruit students who would train themselves in practical business during the daytime and study at night. Then, they would contribute to a successful participation of China in any international exhibition.

Finally, he concluded that ten years' preparation as such would enhance the knowledge of Chinese businessmen to the extent that they could manage affairs related to the exhibition in general without the involvement of the government. This implies that the business sector eventually should take control of the exhibitions from the government. He probably meant his simple desire for the growth of economic sector in China, but the beginning of his essay hinted at his dissatisfaction with the poor performance of China at the world exhibitions under the direction of the Qing government: "No one intends to hide their merit, but to display their defects to be mocked. However, China's performance at the Western exhibitions so far shows that China is exceptional in this point." This also reveals that the world exhibitions were deeply associated with the trauma of national shame on the mind of the Chinese elites.

## **V. The Last Dream of Harmony and Unification**

As other exhibitions in the West did, the Nanyang Industrial Exposition attracted its fellow countrymen from all walks of life to the site of exposition. For instance, some

counties selected farmers with reading ability, who would be sent to the exposition to learn new knowledge of agriculture.<sup>345</sup> Many students, particularly from Jiangsu and Zhejiang provinces, headed to Nanjing for a field trip. Among them were Lu Xun, Mao Dun, and Ye Shentao, the great figures of the 20th century Chinese literature.<sup>346</sup> While Mao and Ye visited the Nanyang Industrial Exposition as a student of Huzhou 湖州 Secondary School and Caoqiao 草橋 Secondary School respectively, Lu Xun, who was teaching biology at Shaoxingfu 紹興府 Middle School, led over two hundred students of his school to exposition. One of Lu's students later recollected, "The trip to the Nanyang Industrial Exposition was a series of exciting encounters with modern civilization; for instance, electric lights, steamships, trains, and cars. It left a profound impression on us!"<sup>347</sup> Later in his biography, Mao Dun also wrote of his impression after his visit to the Nanyang Industrial Exposition: "The prospects of China's industry are infinite because the land of China is enormous and its products are abundant."

The Nanyang Industrial Exposition brought together not only the mainland Chinese people but also the overseas Chinese people. As mentioned earlier, the "Nanyang" in the title of the exposition didn't refer to Southeast Asia, but many people, including Mao Dun thought, the exposition was arranged to attract those overseas Chinese businessmen of Southeast Asia: "The overseas Chinese people of Southeast Asia with large capital are eager to contribute to industrial development of their fatherland.

---

<sup>345</sup> *Shenbao*, July 8, 1910.

<sup>346</sup> Cui Shi'gang 崔石崗, "Luxun, Mao Dun, Ye Shengtao Cangan Nanyang Quanyehui 魯迅茅盾葉聖陶參觀南洋勸業會" in *Wenshi zazhi* 文史雜誌 Vol. 4 (April 1998). 56-57.

<sup>347</sup> Shao Luzhi 邵魯智, "Lu Xun Shuai Shaoxingfu Zhongxuetang Shisheng Fu Ning Cangan Nanyang Quanyehui 魯迅率紹興府中學堂師生赴寧參觀南洋勸業會始末" in *Lu Xun Shengping Shiliao Huibian* 魯迅生平史料匯編 Vol. 1 (Tianjin: Tianjin Renmin Shubanshe, 1981), 453-454.

Thus, the exposition was held in order to invite those overseas Chinese, whose investment would be used to build factories and whose knowhow of industrial management will educate our businessmen.”<sup>348</sup> Apart from the matter of the name of the exposition, the commitment of the Chinese businessmen from Southeast Asia to the exposition was quite acknowledgeable. As a preliminary stage of their participation in the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, they had held exhibitions of local products in various areas such as Surabaya, Semarang, Java, Batavia, and Singapore.<sup>349</sup> Zhang Yu’nan 張煜南, a Chinese merchant from Sumatra, donated 100,000 taels to the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, and Lian Bingnong 梁炳農, who headed a group of Chinese businessmen from Southeast Asia to Nanjing, purchased the first admission ticket of the exposition for 10,000 taels on the opening day.<sup>350</sup> Their pavilion, *Ji’nanguan*, which opened on June 17<sup>th</sup>, attracted many visitors not only with their exhibits but also with splendid fireworks every night, elevating the atmosphere of the exposition.<sup>351</sup>

The enthusiastic participation of the overseas Chinese from Southeast Asia in the Nanyang Industrial Exposition was probably motivated by their spontaneous patriotism, but Duanfang’s previous attempt to embrace the overseas Chinese community of this area also should be noticed. Duanfang, then Governor-General of Liang-Jiang, built schools for the descendants of the overseas Chinese and dispatched his deputies to the ports of Southeast Asia in order to promote *guo’en* 國恩, or Kindness of Nation. Duanfang’s efforts as such succeeded in winning the hearts of overseas Chinese people

---

<sup>348</sup> Mao Dun 茅盾, *Wo Zouguode Daolu* 我走過的道路 (上) (Beijing: Remin Wenxue Chubanshe, 1981), 73.

<sup>349</sup> Zhu, 69.

<sup>350</sup> *Hong Kong huazi ribao*, June 27, 1910.

<sup>351</sup> *Shuntian shibao*, June 30, 1910.

of Southeast Asia.<sup>352</sup> For the purpose of industrial tours and investment, some of the overseas Chinese businessmen who participated in the Nanyang Industrial Exposition visited Hankou and Wuhan, where they were cordially received by the local leaders.<sup>353</sup> When Xu Boxing 徐博興, a Chinese merchant from Southeast Asia, passed away while he was staying in Nanjing for the exposition, a memorial service for Xu was held by the Office of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition and, furthermore, Zhang Renjun, the president of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, submitted a memorial to the Qing court to request special grants to the deceased.<sup>354</sup> In this light, the Nanyang Industrial Exposition provided an important opportunity in which the overseas Chinese community in Southeast Asia and mainland Chinese people could consolidate their relations.<sup>355</sup>

The Nanyang Industrial Exposition served as a venue to bring together the overseas Chinese community of Southeast Asia as well as the Chinese people from all social standings of mainland China -- officials, businessmen, farmers, soldiers, and students. Francis Hawks Pott, a Protestant Episcopal Church missionary in China, who was the president of St. John's University in Shanghai, also perceived the exposition in this light: "The holding of the exhibition was a sign of growing unity and increasing

---

<sup>352</sup> *Shenbao*, "Nanyang Huaqiao Qing Qiyong Duandu 南洋華僑請起用端督" (The Overseas Chinese people of Southeast Asia requested the appointment of Duanfang as the Governor-General), April 11, 1910. In their petition submitted to the Qing court, the overseas Chinese people asked for the reappointment of Duanfang as the Governor-General of Liang-Jiang.

<sup>353</sup> *Shenbao*, "Nanyang Huashang You'e Xiangzhi 南洋華商遊鄂詳誌" (Report on the visit of the overseas Chinese merchants from Southeast Asia to Hubei Province), July 22, 1910.

<sup>354</sup> *Shenbao*, "Nanyang Quanyehui Zhuidao Huaqiao Xujunboxing Jishi 南洋勸業會追悼華僑徐君博興紀事" (The Nanyang Industrial Exposition mourned over Xu Boxing, an overseas Chinese merchant), Sep. 5, 1910.

<sup>355</sup> Eventually, in early 1911, the Chinese Consul General was established in Java for the overseas Chinese community of Java, Borneo, and neighboring areas for the first time.

coherence in the country, and showed the breaking down of barriers of separation.”<sup>356</sup>

The previously cited article of *The World To-Day* also concluded, “The Exposition will be a big step toward breaking up the provincial prejudice which leads the different provinces, already speaking dialects as unintelligible to each other as French to Italians, to boycott each other’s coinage and hate each other with a racial hatred that prevents any national patriotism.”<sup>357</sup>

The Nanyang Industrial Exposition was not probably as sophisticated as its Western counterparts, but, as the first national exposition, it was satisfactory or even impressive. Such evaluation is clearly articulated in the following passage:

It was China’s first attempt in this line, and although compared with the great world fairs with which we of the West are familiar, much seemed primitive and on a small scale, yet taking everything into consideration, it was a wonderful exhibition of progress and to the visitor could not fail to be full of significance. The large grounds were well laid out, and the grouping of the buildings was picturesque. At night there was the usual scene of fairyland, the white buildings being illuminated by many-colored electric lamps. As one passed from the streets of the city into the borders of the exposition, it was stepping out of the fifteenth into the twentieth century.<sup>358</sup>

The relative success could explain why the coverage of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition by the Chinese newspapers was not as critical as that of the Osaka Exhibition and the St. Louis Exposition, although various problems such as the construction delays,

---

<sup>356</sup> Pott, 103.

<sup>357</sup> Holmes, 916.

<sup>358</sup> Pott, 102.

the burden of *Lijin* or local tax on the exhibitors, and the backwardness of Chinese industry were revealed through the exposition. However, there are other factors to be considered. In the case of the Osaka Exhibition and the St. Louis Exposition, the coverage had to rely on the reports of the Chinese community, particularly, Chinese students in the host countries, who had a strong anti-government bias after the failure of Hundred Days' Reforms of 1898 and the disturbance of the Boxer Uprising. By taking advantage of their presence in the host country of the exhibition, they could reflect their political inclination in their coverage of the performance of China at the exhibition, which was sometimes incorrect, exaggerated, or even distorted. On the other hand, the coverage of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition was led by the domestic Chinese newspapers in a different political landscape, one shaped to a certain degree by the Qing government's agreement to the establishment of a constitutional government. From the perspective of the Chinese newspapers, which supported the constitutional movement, there was little reason for them to provoke the Qing government, even if it was not the Qing government per se that they supported. This attitude of the Chinese newspapers could be interpreted as their tacit agreement to the role of the Qing government as the agency of the future constitutional government. In this sense, one year before the Xinhai Revolution, the Nanyang Industrial Exposition was a splendid but momentary display portending the possible changeover of the Qing dynasty into a modern state based on industrial development and constitutional government.



## Conclusion

This dissertation has investigated how, through China's participation in world exhibitions, its hosting of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition of 1910, and the rhetoric of the Chinese publishers covering them, these exhibitions served as sites for staging contentions and negotiations over the transformation of China into a modern state between the Qing government and reformist or revolutionary elites during the late Qing period. By critically furthering the general assumption that the Qing government sought to demonstrate its willingness to become a modern state or, at least, to project a modern image of China by participating in the world exhibitions and hosting its own national exposition, I've argued that the Qing government's original objective as such was mostly interrupted and criticized by the transnational Chinese publications led by Chinese reformers, particularly, the followers of the Protect the Emperor Society, revolutionaries, and Chinese students under the influence of the former, whose relationship with the Qing government had been badly estranged since Empress Dowager's coup d'état to suppress Hundred Day's Reformation in 1898.

The world exhibitions served as rare venues in which the Qing government and Chinese intellectuals directly confronted each other over how to represent China. The Qing government, which was desperately seeking reconciliation with foreign powers during the post-Boxer era, perceived its official participation in the world exhibitions as a manifestation of its recognition among the international community as a modern state. By extension, the Qing government regarded the world exhibitions as an exclusive

diplomatic arena, in which it had the sole authority about how to represent China through both exhibits and the public relation activities of the imperial commissioners. On the other hand, the Chinese intellectuals, who pursued transforming China into a modern nation-state and, thereby, considered themselves “citizens” rather than traditional subjects, believed in their right to have a voice in how China as a nation should be represented at the world exhibitions. They actually demonstrated their belief as such through various protests, negotiations, and publications regarding the Chinese exhibits at the world exhibitions. In this sense, it can be argued that the critical voices of the Chinese intellectuals regarding the way China was represented at the world exhibitions challenged the traditional prerogative of the government on how to stage its statehood.

In due course, those Chinese intellectuals projected their contentious relationship with the Qing government when covering the Chinese representations at the international exhibitions, particularly the Osaka Exhibition of 1903 and the St. Louis Exposition of 1904. They associated the problems revealed through the Chinese exhibits with the incompetence and corruption of the Qing government, thereby undermining the Qing government’s attempt to assert its image of modern statehood. In their coverage, shortcomings were more often than not exaggerated, distorted, or even fabricated, whereas the Qing government’s efforts deserving positive evaluations were ignored. Such coverage could be circulated among the Chinese reading publics, both domestic and overseas, through the transnational Chinese publications operating beyond the control of the central government.

When the world exhibitions had been first introduced to Chinese reading publics

by reformist thinkers such as Kang Youwei, nurturing national strength through industrial development was constant rhetoric in understanding them. However, since the Osaka Exhibition, national shame or humiliation was added as the primary rhetoric of reformist and revolutionary publishing. The term *guochi* 國恥, or “national humiliation,” came to be used by Chinese nationalists to mobilize anti-imperialist campaigns in the wake of the Boxer Uprising. As James L. Hevia argues, commemorating this sense of collective shame served as a motivation for reclaiming China’s sovereignty and a foundation on which a modern Chinese national consciousness was built.<sup>359</sup> Here, the rhetoric of national humiliation was mobilized against the imperial powers, the external opposite. However, in the case of Chinese publishing regarding the Chinese exhibit at the world exhibitions, the same rhetoric inwardly aimed at the Qing government. In other words, the Qing government was considered the cause of national humiliation. It is quite noteworthy that the Chinese intellectuals mobilized the rhetoric of “national humiliation” to criticize the Qing government rather than foreign powers, even though it was the latter that had arranged those humiliating displays: foreign staffers collected and submitted controversial items such as opium tools and the Euroamerican and Japan hosts of the world exhibitions manipulated Chinese people as “uncivilized” exotic objects.

However, by the time the Nanyang Industrial Exposition took place in 1910, the political landscape of China had so changed that the Qing government agreed to convene a parliament in 1913 and to form a cabinet some time before that, signaling the forthcoming transformation of China into a modern, constitutional government. The

---

<sup>359</sup> James L. Hevia, *English Lessons: The Pedagogy of Imperialism in Nineteenth-Century China* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), 333-334.

Chinese intellectuals leading the press, who had supported the constitutional movement, refrained from using the problems of the Nanyang Industrial Exposition as pretexts to criticize the Qing government in their coverage of the exposition, and, moreover, some of them were actively engaged in organizing and managing the Nanyang Industrial Exposition. Thus, this Exposition embodied a tacit acknowledgement of the role of the Qing government as the legitimate agency of the constitutional government by the Chinese press. In this sense, if Liang Qichao's novel, *The Future of New China* (1902), is considered to be a "prophecy," it is not only because it presented a Great Exhibition taking place in China, but because it articulated that the Constitutional Party had eventually contributed to the establishment of the modern constitutional monarchy at the time China held the Great Exhibition.

To disappointment of those constitutionalist reformers, however, the new cabinet assembled by Zaifeng 載灃, the regent, in the spring of 1911 featured a preponderance of Manchus, including five imperial princes and four Han. Moreover, as the Prince Qing was appointed to be the prime minister and the most important positions were assigned to imperial relatives, critics disapprovingly called the cabinet "the imperial kinsmen's cabinet." By doing so, Zaifeng clearly manifested his volition to reassert the authority of the Qing court under the control of Manchu. As well known, this drove many frustrated constitutionalist reformers to support the Xinhai Revolution of 1911, which overthrew the Qing dynasty. Therefore, the Nanyang Industrial Exposition, which gathered together progressive Manchu official such as Duanfang, conservative Han-Chinese official such as Zhang Renjun, common Chinese people of all the walks, and the overseas Chinese

from South Asia, momentarily portended an integrated China under a constitutional government, but such hopes faded away in vain alongside the last dynasty of China.

As we have seen, the rhetorical tone adopted by the Chinese publishers toward Chinese exhibits and the operation of the Qing government at the world exhibitions and the Nanyang Industrial Exposition varied depending on the political landscape of China. Yet, this also means that the discourses on the world exhibitions were formed among the Chinese intellectuals on their own regardless of the objectives of the Western host countries of the early world exhibitions, thereby not fitting squarely to any existing theories on the world exhibitions. The Western scholarship has two opposing critical theories on the early world exhibitions from the perspective of producer and audience respectively. The cultural hegemony school, which examines world exhibitions through the objectives of their organizers, argues that the world exhibitions served to generate popular support for national-imperial policies.<sup>360</sup> The other school has developed a sort of counter-hegemony argument claiming that the people exploited as objects for display, such as Native Americans, could use the exhibitions to their own advantage.<sup>361</sup>

Although these two theories approach the phenomenon from opposing perspectives, both draw on the binary configuration of the producers of the world exhibitions with hegemonic power against the “uncivilized,” particularly colonial subjects, manipulated by the former. However, China occupied an ambiguous position at the world exhibitions, which didn’t correspond to such dichotomous demarcation. While China served as an object of exotic voyeurism and discriminatory racism at the site of the

---

<sup>360</sup> Rydell, Findling, and Pelle eds., 5.

<sup>361</sup> Rydell, 6.

world exhibitions, it asserted no counter-hegemonic influence, because the Qing government and the Chinese intellectuals by and large agreed with the fundamental premise of the world exhibition that those who could demonstrate their superiority through competition were exclusively eligible for modern civilization. Likewise, Chinese intellectuals didn't criticize the imperialist practice of reifying racial hierarchies through the world exhibitions per se, although they strongly disapproved of the application of such practices to China. Furthermore, when discoursing upon the problematic presentations of China at the world exhibitions, the rhetoric of the Chinese intellectuals tended to develop internally, referring to China's own political context rather than externally targeting the imperialist objectives of the producers of the world exhibitions. In other words, their responses to the world exhibitions unfolded in more complicated ways than analysts of the world exhibitions might presume. Thus, overall, the case of China at the early world exhibitions suggests that the existing theories of the Western scholarship on the world exhibitions should overcome their binary configuration pitting the producers with hegemonic power against the "uncivilized" subject to the former, instead developing various audience-oriented approaches in order to understand the dynamics and historical significance of the early world exhibitions more deeply.

By extension, China and Japan, which added a culturally and racially heterogeneous texture to the landscape of early world exhibitions at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, deserve more attention in the Euro-centered studies of world exhibitions. The early world exhibitions are well known to have served as venues of rivalry between the Western powers. The success of the French Industrial Exposition of 1844 stimulated

Great Britain to hold its first world exhibition, the 1851 Great Exhibition of London, which in turn led to the Exposition Universelle of 1855 in France. Also, one of the primary motivations for the World's Columbian Exposition of Chicago (1893) was to prove that "American culture was not only equal to, but had surpassed European culture."<sup>362</sup> Thus, at first glance, the early world exhibitions seem to be solely a stage for Western competition. However, the contests between China and Japan to demonstrate dominance in East Asia and their qualifications as a member of the international community through their glamorous displays complicated the competitive structure at the sites of the world exhibitions. Moreover, being neither Western powers nor their colonies, participating in exhibitions held to rationalize and promote colonial order, China and Japan also independently held their own national / international exhibitions at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, relocating the world exhibitions in the East.<sup>363</sup>

Both China and Japan possessed local cultural practices through which they could understand the world exhibitions. This also means that, at first, each nation perceived the world exhibitions through their own distinct cultural lens, although as time passed they became closely related to each other via their mutual experiences of world exhibitions and their own domestic exhibitions. In the case of Japan, there had been various social events centered on visual attractions such as artworks, acrobatics, animals,

---

<sup>362</sup> Wim de Wit, "Building an Illusion: The Design of the World's Columbian Exposition," in Neil Harris, Wim de Wit, James Gilbert, and Robert W. Rydell eds., *Grand Illusions: Chicago's World's Fair of 1893* (Chicago: Chicago Historical Society, 1993), 46.

<sup>363</sup> The Indo China Exposition Francaise et Internationale or the Hanoi Exposition of 1902, which was briefly mentioned in Chapter Two of this dissertation, is a good example of colonial exhibition. Michael G. Vann argues the Hanoi Exposition, which intended to be a metaphor for the entire colonial order of Indo-China, was nothing but a disguise masking the chaos of French Indo-China. Michael G. Vann, "All the World's a Stage, Especially in the Colonies: The Hanoi Exposition of 1902" in Martin Evans ed., *Empire and Culture: The French Experience, 1830-1940* (Macmillan/Palgrave Press, 2004), 182.

and freaks during the Tokugawa period. Also, in the seventeenth century, events called *Yakuhin'e* 藥品會 or *Hakubutsue* 博物會 displayed not only medical supplies but rare articles in major cities of Japan. Therefore, Kuni Takeyuki argues, Japan could accept world exhibitions originating in Europe without trouble.<sup>364</sup> In fact, when Léon Roches, the French Minister to Japan, first introduced the Paris Exposition to Kurimoto Joun in 1864, Kurimoto understood the concept of exposition or “showing extensively” through the above-mentioned *Yakuhin'e*.<sup>365</sup>

Conversely, China had practiced *Yingshensaihui* 迎神賽會 or, shortly, *Saihui* 賽會, a mass gathering in honor of a deity, which included such various activities as parades equipped with pompous costumes and ornaments, acrobatics, performances, and displays of rare and valuable articles, to the extent that it might be better defined as a mass cultural entertainment. Therefore, when the notion of a world exhibition was first introduced to China, it was generally translated as *Saihui* among Chinese intellectuals.<sup>366</sup> However, while using *Saihui* for “exhibition” and “exposition,” Chinese reformers such as Zheng Guanying, Liang Qichao, and Chen Chi, who advocated modern exhibitions as a means of promoting Chinese industry, considered the transnational *Yingshensaihui* wasteful and insisted on its discontinuation. For instance, Zheng Guanying wrote, “Nowadays every city and port holds *Yingshensaihui*, wasting a huge amount of money without any benefits. If this expense can be used for a modern exhibition, the benefits

---

<sup>364</sup> Kuni (2010), 22-25.

<sup>365</sup> Yoshida, 7-8.

<sup>366</sup> The other early Chinese translations of world exhibition were *Bowuhui* 博物會 and *Bolandahui* 博覽大會. Li Shuchang used *Aikesibaoxixiang* 哀克司包息相, a transcribed term of French “exposition,” which was barely used by other people.



would be numerous and, at the same time, the corrupt practice would vanish soon.”<sup>367</sup> However, this doesn’t mean all the reformers negated Chinese traditional practices or ideas in understanding modern exhibitions. Liu Zhenlin, a reformer who was introduced in Chapter One, quoted *Guanzi* 管子 in his article, “China Should Hold an Exhibition to Enhance its Commerce” in order to demonstrate the existence of ideas similar to the keynote of modern exhibitions in ancient China: “To bring all property and products of entire country together (at one place) and to manage their goodness and badness through currency would be national benefits.”<sup>368</sup>

Finally, further study of the exhibitions contributes to understanding the unique dynamics of the “public sphere” of the late Qing period, which has been vigorously debated among Chinese historians, as it is often taken to be indicative of the existence of a “civil society” in China. Regarding this question of the public sphere in China, many scholars have referred and responded to Jürgen Habermas argument in his *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* that the development of capitalism in Western Europe in the eighteenth century brought about a public sphere where the bourgeois classes communicated their opinions and promoted their interests against state domination. However, by taking Habermas’s public sphere as a particular practice resulting from historical developments in Western Europe rather than a universal practice found in any civil society, scholars have gone beyond questioning whether or not a

---

<sup>367</sup> Zheng (1965), 791.

<sup>368</sup> *Guanzi* is a compilation of Chinese philosophical materials named after Guan Zhong 管仲 (BCE 720-645), Prime Minister of Qi 齊, whose successful reformist policies enabled Duke Huan of Qi to become the first hegemon of the vassal alliance. Liu Zhenlin quoted *Zhouli* 周禮 and *Xunfangshi* 訓方氏 other than *Guanzi* (Zhongyang yanjiuyuan ed., 711).

public sphere fitting Habermas's definition actually existed in (early) modern China.<sup>369</sup> Scholars such as Eugenia Lean focus on how new urban institutions, particularly print media, operated in configuring a space of Chinese "publics" during the late Qing and early Republic era.<sup>370</sup> Joan Judge also understands the media of the late Qing period shaping a particular dynamic or "middle realm," a space where Chinese reform publicists mediated between "those above" (the state) and "those below" (common people) rather than as an evidence of structural similarity between bourgeois European society and Chinese society at the turn of the twentieth century.<sup>371</sup>

Thus, it is clear that understanding the dynamics of print media is a key to elucidating the nature of the Chinese "public sphere" or "middle realm" during the late Qing period. However, scholars have not paid enough attention to transnationality, a distinctive feature of the Chinese print media. As noted in this dissertation, late Qing China saw the emergence of a transnational network of publishers that connected the reading publics of China proper and those of overseas Chinese communities. As a result, reformist or even revolutionary ideas circulating in the overseas Chinese community could be introduced to domestic reading publics to channel public opinion on specific issues. Thus, the public sphere of late Qing China was actually configured beyond the national boundary of China, a phenomena requiring further research.

---

<sup>369</sup> Some scholars such as Guo Wu tend to admit the existence of a "public sphere" or, at least, a prototype of public sphere in China during the late Qing period by focusing on the fact that the urban elites articulated their opinions, often challenging the authority of state, via the print media as a primary channel at that time. Guo Wu, *Zheng Guanying: Merchant Reformer of Late Qing China and his influence on Economics, Politics, and Society* (New York: Cambria Press, 2010).

<sup>370</sup> Eugenia Lean, *Public Passions: The Trial of Shi Jianqiao and the Rise of Popular Sympathy in Republican China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007).

<sup>371</sup> Joan Judge, *Print and Politics: Shibao and the Culture of Reform in Late Qing China* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996).

## Bibliography

### Newspapers and Periodicals:

#### A. Chinese

*Beiyang guanbao* 北洋官報

*Dagonbao* 大公報

*Dongfang zazhi* 東方雜誌

*Gezhihuibian* 格致彙編

*Hong Kong huazi ribao* 香港華字日報

*Hubei xueshengjie* 湖北學生界

*Jiangsu* 江蘇

*Jingzhong ribao* 警鐘日報

*Minlibao* 民立報

*Qingyibao* 清議報

*Shenbao* 申報

*Shengjing shibao* 盛京時報

*Shibao* 時報

*Shuntian shibao* 順天時報

*Waijiaobao* 外交報

*Wanguo gongbao* 萬國公報

*Xinmin congbao* 新民總報

*Youxue yibian* 遊學譯編

*Zhejiangchao* 浙江潮

*Zhongwai ribao* 中外日報

## **B. Japanese (Japan & Taiwan)**

*Asahi shimbun* 朝日新聞

*Fūzoku gaho* 風俗畫報

*Mainichi shinbun* 毎日新聞

*Nihon* 日本

*Osaka Asahi shimbun* 大阪朝日新聞

*Taiwan jihō* 臺灣時報

*Taiwan kyōkai kaihō* 臺灣協會會報

*Taiwan nichinichi shimbo* (=Taiwan riri xinbao) 臺灣日日新報

*Taiyō* 太陽

*Tokyo jinruigakkai zasshi* 東京人類學會雜誌

*Yorozuchōhō* 萬朝報

## **C. English**

*Los Angeles Times*

*St. Louis Post-Dispatch*

*The Baltimore Sun*

*The Chinese Repository*

*The New York Times*

*The San Francisco Chronicle*

*The Times*

*The Wall Street Journal*

*The Washington Post*

## **Published Sources:**

Alcock, Rutherford. *Art and Art Industries in Japan*. London: Virtue and Co., 1878.

- Benedict, Burton. *The Anthropology of World's Fairs: San Francisco's Panama Pacific International Exposition of 1915*. Berkeley: Lowie Museum of Anthropology, 1983.
- Bennett, Tony. *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, and Politics*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Bennitt, Mark, ed. *History of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition: Comprising the history of the Louisiana territory, the story of the Louisiana purchase and a full account of the great exposition, embracing the participation of the states and nations of the world, and other events of the St. Louis world's fair of 1904*. Saint Louis: Universal Exposition Pub. Co., 1905.
- Biggerstaff, Knight. "The Chinese Mission of Investigation Sent to Europe." *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 6, No. 4 (Dec., 1937): 307-320.
- Bin Chun 斌椿. *Chengchabiji 乘槎筆記* in Zhong Shuhe 鍾叔河 ed. *Zou xiang shijie congshu 走向世界叢書* Vol. 1, Changsha: Hunan renmin chubanshe, 1980.
- Breitbart, Eric. *A World on Display: Photographs from the St. Louis World's Fair 1904*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997.
- Brunero, Donna. *Britain's Imperial Cornerstone in China: The Chinese Maritime Customs Service, 1854-1949*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Campbell, Robert Ronald. *James Duncan Campbell: A Memoir by his son*. Cambridge: East Asian Research Center, Harvard University, 1970.
- Cao Congpo 曹從坡 ed. *Zhang Jian Quanji 張謇全集* (Vol. 6: Riji 日記). Jiangsu: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1994.
- Carl, Katharine. *With the Empress dowager of China*. New York: The Century, 1906.
- Chen Baoliang 陳寶良. *Zhongguo di she yu hui 中國的社與會*. Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chubanshe, 1996.
- Chen Chi 陳熾. *Yongshu 庸書* in Zhongyang yanjiuyuan 中央研究院 ed., *Jindai zhongguo dui xifang ji lieqiang renshi ziliao huibian 近代中國對西方及列強認識資料彙編*. Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo, 1972-1990.
- Chen Jitong 陳季同. *Bali Yinxiangji 巴黎印象記* (Impressions of Paris). trans. Duan Yinghong 段映虹. Guilin: Guangxi shifandaxue chubanshe, 2006.

- Christ, Carol Ann. "The Sole Guardians of the Art Inheritance of Asia: Japan and China at the 1904 St. Louis World's Fair." *Positions*, 8:3 (Winter 2000): 675-708.
- Chinese Imperial Maritime Customs, ed. *Inspector Circulars in Documents Illustrative of the Origin, Development, and Activities of the Chinese Customs Service*. Shanghai: Statistical Department of the Inspectorate General of Customs, 1937.
- Cobbing, Andrew. *The Japanese Discovery of Victorian Britain: Early Travel Encounters in the Far West*. Richmond: Japan library, 1998.
- Cohen, Paul A. *Between Tradition and Modernity: Want T'ao and Reform in Late Ch'ing China*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Committee of the Osaka Exhibition, ed. *The Osaka Exhibition Guide Book for Tourists in Japan*. Yokohama: The Obun Printing Co., 1903.
- Conger, Sarah Pike. *Letters from China: With Particular Reference to the Empress Dowager and the Women of China*. Chicago: A.C. McClurg & Co., 1910.
- Cortinovis, Irene E. "China at the St. Louis World's Fair," *Missouri Historical Review*, Vol. LXXII No. 1 (Oct. 1977): 59-66.
- Cui Shi'gang 崔石崗. "Luxun, Mao Dun, Ye Shengtao Canguan Nanyang Quanyehui 魯迅茅盾葉聖陶參觀南洋勸業會" (Luxun, Mao Dun, and Ye Shengtao Visiting the Nanyang Industrial Exhibition.). *Wenshi Zazhi* 文史雜誌, Vol. 4 (April 1998): 56-57.
- Dai An'gang 戴鞍鋼. "Shibohuiyu Wanqing Jiangzhe Jingji 世博会与晚清江浙经济" (The World Exhibitions and the Economy of the Jiangsu and Zhejiang Areas during the Late Qing Period). *Lishi Jiaoxue Wenti* 历史教学问题, January (2010).
- Daigokai Naikoku Kangyō Hakurankai Kyosankai 第五回内国勸業博覧会協賛会, ed. *Osakato Hakurankai* 大阪と博覧會 (Osaka and its Exhibition). Osaka: Daigokai Naikoku Kangyō Hakurankai Kyosankai, 1902.
- Davis, George Breckenridge. *Elements of International Law with an account of its origin, sources and historical development*. New York: Harper & brothers, 1903.
- Eco, Umberto. *Travels in Hyperreality* trans. William Weaver. San Diego: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1986.

- Dollar, Robert. *Private diary of Robert Dollar on his recent visits to China*. San Francisco: W.S. Van Cott & Co., 1912.
- Engeki 「Jinruikan」 Jōenwo Jiggensasetaikai, ed. *Jinruikan: Fūinsareta Tobira* 人類館: 封印された扉 (*Jinruikan: The Sealed Door*). Tokyo: Atto Wokusu, 2005.
- Evans, Martin, ed. *Empire and Culture: The French Experience, 1830-1940*. Basingstoke: Macmillan/Palgrave Press, 2004.
- Fairbank, John K., ed. *The I. G. in Peking: letters of Robert Hart, Chinese Maritime Customs, 1868-1907*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Fuchinobe Tokuzō 淵辺徳蔵. “Ōkō nikki 欧行日記,” in Ōtsuka Takematsu 大塚武松 ed. *Kengai shisetsu nikki sanshū* 遣外使節日記纂輯 Vol. 3. Tokyo: Nihon Shiseki Kyōkai, 1930.
- Findling, John E. *Chicago's Great World's Fairs*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994.
- Frodsham, J.D. *The First Chinese Embassy to the West: The Journals of Kuo sung-t'ao, Liu his-hung and Chang te-yi*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974.
- Gen Ansei 嚴安生. *Nihon Ryūgaku Seishinshi: Kindai Chūgoku Chishikijin no Kiseki* 日本留学精神史: 近代中国知識人の軌跡(The History of Studying in Japan: The Traces of Modern Chinese Intellectuals). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1991.
- Godley, Michael R. “China’s World’s Fair of 1910: Lessons from a Forgotten Event.” *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 12, No.3 (1978): 503-522.
- Gu Weiying 古偉瀛, “Cong ‘Xuanqi’ ‘Saizhen’ Dao ‘Jiaoliu’ ‘Shangzhan’ 從‘街奇’ ‘賽珍’到‘交流’ ‘商戰’” (From ‘the Marvelous’ and ‘the Rare’ to ‘Interaction’ and ‘Commercial War’). *Si Yu Yan* 思與言, Vol. 24, No.3 (1986): 1-18.
- Guo Songtao 郭嵩燾, et al. *Guo Songtaodeng shixiji liuzhong* 郭嵩燾等使西記六種 (Six Records of Missions to Europe by Guo Songtao and Others). Beijing: Jingxiao xinhua shudian, 1998.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: an inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. Trans. Thomas Burger. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991.
- Hage, Ghassan. *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

- Haiguan zong shui wu si shu ed. *Documents Illustrative of the Origin, Development, and Activities of the Chinese Customs Service*. Shanghai: Statistical Dept. of the Inspectorate general of customs, 1937-1940.
- Hanson, John W. *The Official History of the Fair, St. Louis: the Sights and Scenes of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition*. Chicago: Monarch Book Co., 1904.
- Harrell, Paula. *Sowing the Seeds of Change: Chinese Students, Japanese Teachers, 1895-1905*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- Harris, Neil, Wim de Wit, James Gilbert, and Robert W. Rydell eds., *Grand Illusions: Chicago's World's Fair of 1893*. Chicago: Chicago Historical Society, 1993.
- Harvey, Penelope. *Hybrids of Modernity: Anthropology, the Nation State and the Universal Exhibition*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Hevia, James L. *English Lessons: The Pedagogy of Imperialism in Nineteenth-Century China*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.
- Holmes, Ernst R. "The First Exposition in China." *The World To-Day: A Monthly Record of Human Progress* (August 1910): 914-916.
- Hotta-Lister, Ayako. *The Japan-British Exhibition of 1910: Gateway to the Island Empire of the East*. Richmond, Surrey: Japan Library, 1999.
- Hsu, Madeline Yuan-yin. *Dreaming of Gold, Dreaming of Home: Transnationalism and Migration between the United States and South China, 1882-1943*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Hu Jiayu 胡家瑜. "Boranhui yu taiwan yuanzhumin: shimin shiqide zhanshi zhengzhi yuazhe yixiang" 博覽會與臺灣原住民: 殖民時期的展示政治與他者意象(The Great Exhibitions and the Taiwan Indigenous Peoples: The Politics of Representation and the Images of Others in the Colonial Period). *Kaogurenleixuekan* 考古人類學刊 (Feb. 2005): 3-39.
- Huang Fu-ch'ing 黃福慶. *Qingmo Liurixuesheng* 清末留日學生 (Chinese Students in Japan in Late Ch'ing Period). Taipei: Institute of Modern History Academia Sinica, 1975.
- Hummel, Arthur W. ed. *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period (1644-1912)*. Taipei: Ch'eng Wen Publishing Company, 1972.



Iriye, Akira, ed. *Mutual Images: Essays in American-Japanese Relations*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Ito Mamiko 伊藤真実子. “Daigokai Naikokukangyo Hankurankai to manhaku kaisaieno mosaku—taiwanto Jinruikan” 第五回内国勸業博覧会と万博開催への模索--台湾館と人類館 (The Fifth Domestic Industrial Exhibition and the Attempt to Host the International Exhibition – the Taiwan Pavilion and *Jinruikan*). *Nihhon Rekishi* 日本歴史, no. 686 (July, 2005): 69-84.

Judge, Joan. *Print and Politics: Shibao and the Culture of Reform in Late Qing China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.

Kansai Daigaku Bungakubu Chūgokugo Chūgokubungakuka, ed. *Buankajishōtoshiteno Chūgoku* 文化事象としての中国. Osaka: Kansai University Press, 2002.

Karl, Rebecca. *Staging the World: Chinese Nationalism at the Turn of the Twentieth Century*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.

Karp, Ivan and Steven D. Levine, eds. *Exhibiting Cultures: the Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1991.

Kuni Takeyuki 國雄行. *Hakurankai to Meiji no Nihon* 博覧会と明治の日本 (Exhibitions and Meiji Japan). Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2010.  
----- . *Hakurankai no Jidai: Meiji Seifu no Hakurankai Seisaku* 博覧會の時代: 明治政府の博覧會政策 (The Age of Exhibitions: The Policy of the Meiji Government on Exhibitions). Tokyo: Iwata Shoin, 2005.

Kurimoto Joun 栗本鋤雲. *Hōan ikō* 匏菴遺稿. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1975.

Lean, Eugenia. *Public Passions: The Trial of Shi Jianqiao and the Rise of Popular Sympathy in Republican China*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

Lee, Sang and Ruth Baumeister, eds. *The Domestic and the Foreign in Architecture*. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2007.

Li Gui 李圭. *Huanyoudiqiuxinlu* 環游地球新錄. Changsha: Hunana renmin chubanshe, 1980.

Li Gui. *A journey to the East: Li Gui's a New Account of a Trip around the Globe*. Charles Desnoyers, trans. Ann Arbor: the University of Michigan Press, 2004.

Li Shuchang 黎庶昌. *Xiyang zazhi* 西洋雜誌. Changsha: Hunan renmin chubanshe, 1981.

- Li Yansheng 李焱勝. *Zhongguo baokan tushi* 中国报刊图史. Wuhan: Hubei renmin chubanshe, 2005.
- Liang Qichao 梁啟超. *Xinzhongguo weilaiji* 新中國未來記 (The Future of New China). Nanchang Shi : Bai hua zhou wen yi chu ban she, 1996.
- London. *International Exhibition 1862: Reports by the Juries on the Subjects in the Thirty Classes into which the Exhibition was Divided*. London: William Clowes & Sons, 1863.
- Lü Shaoli 呂紹理. “Zhanshi taiwan: 1903nian daban neiguo quanye bolanhui Taiwanguanzhi yanjiu” 展示臺灣: 1903年大版內國勸業博覽會臺灣館之研究 (Exhibiting Colonial Taiwan: the Taiwan Pavilion and the Fifth National Exhibition for Encouraging Trade and Industry at Osaka). *Taiwan Historical Research* 臺灣史研究, Vol. 9, No. 2 (Dec., 2002): 103-144.
- Ma, L. Eve Armentrout. *Revolutionaries, Monarchists, and Chinatowns: Chinese Politics in the America and the 1911 Revolution*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1990.
- Ma Min 馬敏. “Zhongguo Zouxiang Shijiede Xinbufu – Qingmo Shangpinsaihui Huodong Shuping 中國走向世界的新步幅--清末商品賽會活動述評” (China’s New Step toward the World -- Evaluation of the Commercial Exhibitions of the Late Qing). *Jindaishi Yanjiu* 近代史研究, No. 43 (1988-1): 115-132.
- Mao Dun 茅盾. *Wo Zouguode Daolu* (Shang) 我走過的道路 (上). Beijing: Remin Wenxue Chubanshe, 1981.
- Matsuda Kyōko 松田京子. *Teikoku no Shisen: Hakurankai to Ibunka Hyōshō* 帝国の視線: 博覧会と異文化表象 (The Gaze of Empire: Exhibition and Representation of Other Cultures). Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2003.
- Matsukata Fuyuko 松方冬子. *Oranda fūsetsugaki : "sakoku" Nihon ni katarareta "sekai"* オランダ風説書: 「鎖国」日本に語られた「世界」 (Dutch fūsetsugaki: An Account of World told to Closed Japan). Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Shinsha, 2010.
- Michie, Alexander. *The Englishman in China during the Victorian era: as illustrated in the career of Sir Rutherford Alock*. Edinburgh: W. Blackwood & Sons, 1900.
- Mittler, Barbara. *A Newspaper for China? Power, Identity, and Change in Shanghai’s NewMedia, 1872-1912*. Cambridge: Harvard Univeristy Press, 2004.

- Mutsu Hirokichi. *British Press and the Japan-British Exhibition of 1910*. Victoria: Melbourne Institute of Asian Languages and Societies, 2001.
- Nagai Michio, ed. *Fukuzawa Yukichi* 福澤諭吉. Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha, 1969.
- Osakafu 大阪府, ed. *The Souvenir Guide to Osaka*. Osaka: Hakurankai Kyosankai, 1903.
- Osakashi Yakusho 大阪市役所, ed. *Daigokai Naikoku Kangyō Hakurankai Hōkokushu* 第五回内国勸業博覧会報告書 (The Report on the 5<sup>th</sup> Domestic Encouragement of Industry Exhibition). Osaka: Osakashi Yakusho, 1904.
- Qiandan Shili 錢單士厘. *Guimao Lǔxingji* 癸卯旅行記 (Travelogue of the Year of *Guimao*). Changsha: Hunan Renmin Chubanshe, 1981.
- Pitman, Jennifer. "China's Presence at the Centennial Exhibition, Philadelphia, 1876." *Studies in the Decorative Arts*. Vol. X, No. 1 (Fall-Winter 2002-2003): 35-73.
- Prisco, Salvatore. *John Barrett, Progressive Era Diplomat: A Study of a Commercial Expansionist, 1887-1920*. Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1973.
- Pott, Francis Hawks. *The Emergency in China*. New York: The Presbyterian Department of Missionary Education, 1913.
- Rhoads, Edward. *Manchus & Han: Ethnic Relations and Political Power in Late Qing and Early Republican China, 1861-1928*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2000.
- Rosenbaum, Arthur L. "Gentry Power and the Changsha Rice Riot of 1910." *Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. XXXIV, No. 3 (May 1975): 689-715.
- Rydell, Robert. *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916*. Chicago: the University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Rydell, Robert, John E. Findling, and Kimberly D. Pelle, eds. *Fair America: World's Fairs in the United States*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000.

- Sakamoto Hiroko 坂元ひろ子. “Chugoku Minzokushugino shinwa: shinkaron, jinshukan, hakurankai jiken 中國民族主義の神話: 進化論, 人種觀, 博覽會事件” (Myths of Chinese Nationalism: Evolution, Race, and the Osaka Exhibition Incident). *Shiso* 思想, no. 849 (March, 1995): 61-84.
- , *Chugoku Minzokushugino Shinwa: Jinshu, Shintai, Zenda* 中國民族主義の神話: 人種・身体・ジェンダー (Myths of Chinese Nationalism: Race, Body, and Gender). Tokyo: Iwanami, 2004.
- Sakano Tōru 坂野徹. “Kōzukano seijigaku--Tsuboi Shōgorōto Meijiki jinruigakuno kiseki 好事家の政治學--坪井正五郎と明治期人類學の軌跡” (Tsuboi Shōgorō and the Traces of Anthropology during the Meiji Period). *Shiso* 思想, no. 907 (Jan., 2000): 162-184.
- , *Teikoku Nihonto Jinruigakusha: 1884~1952* 帝國日本と人類學者: 一八八四-一九五二年 (Japanese Empire and Anthropologists: 1884~1952). Tokyo: Keisō Shobō, 2005.
- Seagrave, Sterling. *Dragon Lady: The Life and Legend of the Last Empress of China*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992.
- Sergeant, Philip W. *The Great Empress Dowager of China*. London: Hutchinson, 1910.
- Sekkō Daigaku Nihon Bunka Kenkyūjo 浙江大学日本文化研究所, ed. *Edo・Meijikino Nicchū Bunka Kōryū* 江戸明治期の日中文化交流 (The Cultural Exchange between Japan and China during the Edo and Meiji Periods). Tokyo: Nōsangyoson Bunka Kyōkai, 2000.
- Shanghai Tushuguan 上海圖書館, ed. *Zhongguoyu Shibo: Lishi Jilu 1851-1940* 中國與世博: 歷史記錄 1851-1940 (China and the World Exposition: Historical Records). Shanghai: Shanghai Kexuejishu Wenxian Chubanshe, 2002.
- Shao Luzhi 邵魯智. “Lu Xun Shuai Shaoxingfu Zhongxuetang Shisheng Fu Ning Cangan Nanyang Quanyehui 魯迅率紹興府中學堂師生赴寧參觀南洋勸業會始末”(Lu Xun Leads the Teachers and Students of Shangxingfu Middle School to Nanjing to Visit the Nanyang Exhibition). *Lu Xun Shengping Shiliao Huibian* 魯迅生平史料匯編, Vol. 1. Tianjin: Tianjin Renmin Shubanshe, 1981: 448-454.
- Shen Diancheng 沈展成, ed. *Zhongguoren Liuxue Riben Bainianshi 1896-1996* 中國人留學日本百年史1896-1996 (Centennial History of Chinese Students in Japan 1896-1996). Shenyang: Liaoning Jiaoyu Chubanshe, 1997.

Shen Yunlong 潘雲龍, ed. *Duanzhongmingong Zougao* 端忠敏公奏稿 (Collection of Duanfang's Draft Memorials). (*Jindai Zhongguo Shiliao Congkan Dishiji* 近代中國史料總刊第十輯 Vol. 94 (1) ~ (4)). Taipei: Wenhai Chubanshe, 1966-1973.

Shibusawa Eiichi 澁澤榮一. *Kōsei nikki* 航西日記. Tokyo: Taikan Dōsha, 1871.

So, Billy K. L. and Gungwu Wang, eds. *Power and Identity in the Chinese World Order*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2003.

Takahashi Kunitarō 高橋邦太郎. *Hana no Pari e syōnen shisetu: Keiō 3-nen Pari bankokuhaku funtōki* 花のパリへ少年使節: 慶応三年パリ万国博覧會記. Tōkyō: Sanshūsha, 1979.

Ting, Lee-hsia Hsu. *Government Control of the Press in Modern China 1900-1949*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Tsai, Shih-shan. *China and the Overseas Chinese in the United States, 1868-1911*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1983.

Tsai, Weipin. *Reading Shenbao: Nationalism, Consumerism and Individuality in China 1919-37*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Wang Tao 王韜. *Manyoushuilu* 漫游随录. Changsha: Yuelu shu she, 1985.

Wang Xiang 王翔. "Zhongguo Jindaihuade Yige Lichengbei 中國近代化的一個里程碑"(A Milestone of Chinese Modernization). *Jianghai Xuekan* 江海學刊, No. 3 (1989): 129-136.

Wang Zhenghua 王正華. "Chengxian 「Zhongguo」: Wanqing Canyu 1904 nian Meiguo Shengluyi Wanguo Bolanhuizhi Yanjiu" 呈現「中国」: 晚清參與 1904 年美國聖路易萬國博覽會之研究" (Representing China: A Study of Late Qing Participation in the St. Louis Exposition of 1904). *Huazhong Youhua: Jindai zhongguode Shijue Biaoshu Yu Wenhua Goutu* 畫中有話: 近代中國的視覺表述與文化構圖, Dec. 2003: 421-475.

Weimann, Jeanne M. *The Fair Women: The Story of The Woman's Building, World's Columbian Exposition Chicago 1893*. Chicago: Academia Chicago, 1981.

Willcock, Hiroko. "Japanese Modernization and the Emergence of New Fiction in Early Twentieth Century China: A Study of Liang Qichao." *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 4 (Oct., 1995): 817-840.

- Wright, Mary C. *China in Revolution: The First Phase, 1900-1913*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.
- Wu, Guo. *Zheng Guanying: Merchant Reformer of Late Qing China and his influence on Economics, Politics, and Society*. New York: Cambria Press, 2010.
- Wu Jianren 吳趸人. *Xin shitouji 新石頭記* (The New Story of the Stone). Guangzhou Shi: Hua cheng chu ban she chu ban fa xing, 1987.
- Xia Dongyuan 夏東元. *Zheng Guanying 鄭觀應*. Guangzhou: Guangdong renmin chubanshe, 1995.
- Xie Hui 謝輝. “Zhang Jian Yu Zhongguo Jindai Bolanhui Shiye 張謇與中國近代博覽會事業” (Zhang Jian and Modern Exposition of China). *Anhui Shixue 安徽史學*, No. 4 (2002): 43-47.
- Yamaji Katsuhiko 山路勝彦. *Kindai Nihonno Shokuminchi Hakurankai 近代日本の植民地博覧会* (The Exhibitions of Japanese Colonies). Tokyo: Fukyosha Publishing Inc., 2008.
- Ye Zaisheng 葉再生. *Zhongguo Jindai Xiandai Chubantongshi 中國近代現代出版通史* (History of Chinese Modern Publishing). Beijing: Huawen Chubanshe, 2002.
- Yoshida Mitsukuni 吉田光邦. *Bankoku Hakurankai: Gijutsu Bunmeishitekini 万国博覧会: 技術文明史的に* (The World Exhibition in Terms of the History of Technology and Civilization). Tokyo: NHK Books, 1985.
- Yoshimi Shunya 吉見俊哉. *Hakurankaino Seijigaku 博覧会の政治學* (The Politics of Exhibition). Tokyo: Chūshinsho, 1992.
- Zaizhen 載振. *Yingyao Riji 英軺日記* (Yingyao Diary) in *Jindai Zhongguo Shiliao Congkan 近代中國史料叢刊*. Vol. 734. Shanghai: Wenhai Chubanshe, 1903.
- Zeng Jize 曾紀澤. *Shixi Riji 使西日記*. Changsha: Hunan renmin chubanshe, 1981.
- Zhang Deyi 張德彝. *Oumei huanyouji 歐美環游記*. Changsha: Hunan renmin chubanshe, 1980.
- Zhang Renfeng 張人鳳, ed. *Zhang Jusheng Xiansheng Nianpu 張菊生先生年譜* (A Chronological Record of Zhang Jusheng). Taipei: Taiwan Shangwu Yinshuguan, 1995.

- Zheng Guanying 鄭觀應. *Shengshiweiyan zengding xinbian* 盛世危言增訂新編 (*Words of Warning in a Flourishing*). Taipei: Taiwan xuesheng shuju, 1965.
- Zheng Shiling 鄭時齡. *Shanghai Jindai Jianzhu Fengge* 上海近代建築風格 (The Evolution of Shanghai's Architecture in Modern Times). Shanghai: Shanghai jia yu chubanshe, 1999.
- Zhongguo di 1 lishi dang'anguan 中國第一歷史檔案館, ed. *Guangxuchao Zhupi Zouzhe* 光緒朝硃批奏摺 Vol. 112. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1995-1996.
- Zhongguo di 1 lishi dang'anguan 中國第一歷史檔案館, ed. *Qing Gong Wanguo Bolanhui Dang'an* 清宮萬國博覽會檔案. Vol. 1. Beijing: Guangling Shushe, 2007.
- Zhonghua Shuji Bianjibu, ed. *Jinian Xinhai Geming Qishinian Xueshutaolunhui Lunwenji* 紀念辛亥革命七十年學術討論會論文集. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1983.
- Zhongyang yanjiuyuan 中央研究院, ed. *Jindai zhongguo dui xifang ji lieqiang renshi ziliao huibian* 近代中國對西方及列強認識資料彙編. Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo, 1972-1990.
- Zhou Yongming. *Historicizing Online Politics: Telegraphy, the Internet, and Political Participation in China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006.
- Zhu Ying 朱英. "Duanfang Yu Nanyang Quanyehui 端方與南洋勸業會" (Duanfang and the Nanyang Industrial Exposition). *Shixue Yuekan* 史學月刊, Vol. 1 (1988): 68-70.