

出國報告（出國類別：國際學術會議發表論文及研討）

赴斯洛維尼亞盧布爾亞那大學

參加「從中心到邊緣：比較視野下的中國文物收藏」國際學術研討會(International symposium from Center to Periphery: Collecting Chinese Objects in Comparative Perspectives)出國報告

服務機關：國立故宮博物院圖書文獻處

姓名職稱：副研究員周維強

派赴國家地區：斯洛維尼亞

出國期間：108.9.13-9.24

報告日期：108.12.22

國立故宮博物院出國報告審核表

出國報告名稱：赴斯洛維尼亞盧布爾亞那大學參加「從中心到邊緣：比較視野下的中國文物收藏」國際學術研討會(International symposium from Center to Periphery: Collecting Chinese Objects in Comparative Perspectives)出國報告

出國人姓名 (2人以上，以1人為代表)	職稱	服務單位
周維強	副研究員	圖書文獻處

出國類別 考察 進修 研究 實習 視察 訪問 開會 談判
 其他：國際學術會議發表論文及研討(本案並未使用任何預算，故無法依預算書之計畫預算類別填列)

出國期間：108年9月13日至24日 報告繳交日期：108年12月22日

出國人員 自我檢核	計畫主辦 單位審核	審 核 項 目
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.依限繳交出國報告
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2.格式完整(本文必須具備「目的」、「過程」、「心得及建議事項」)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3.無抄襲相關資料
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4.內容充實完備
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5.建議具參考價值
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6.送本機關參考或研辦
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.送上級機關參考
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8.退回補正，原因：
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(1) 不符原核定出國計畫
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(2) 以外文撰寫或僅以所蒐集外文資料為內容
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(3) 內容空洞簡略或未涵蓋規定要項
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(4) 抄襲相關資料之全部或部分內容
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5) 引用相關資料未註明資料來源
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(6) 電子檔案未依格式辦理
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9.本報告除上傳至出國報告資訊網外，將採行之公開發表：
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(1) 辦理本機關出國報告座談會(說明會)，與同仁進行知識分享。
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(2) 於本機關業務會報提出報告
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(3) 其他：會議論文經送審後，將於歐洲出版
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	10.其他處理意見及方式：

出國人簽章(2人以上，得以1人為代表)			審核人員簽章	單位主管簽章
	計畫主辦機關	計畫主辦單位	本案無計畫，未使用公務預算。係國際邀請。	
		秘書室(研考單位)簽章	機關首長或其授權人員簽章	

說明：

一、本表可依需要增列審核項目內容。

二、審核作業應儘速完成，以不影響出國人員上傳出國報告至「公務出國報告資訊網」為原則。

三、組團出國執行同任務者，報告得共同署名提出；出國人員應自我檢視，出國報告內容嚴禁抄襲，若發現有涉及抄襲情形者，署名者併送考績委員會議處。

摘要

由斯洛維尼亞盧布爾亞納大學（以下簡稱盧大）亞洲學系所承辦的「從中心到邊緣：比較視野下的中國文物收藏」國際學術研討會(International symposium from Center to Periphery: Collecting Chinese Objects in Comparative Perspectives)，於 2019 年 9 月 19-22 日，在斯洛維尼亞民族學博物館(Slovene Ethnographic Museum, SEM)¹舉辦。會議主旨在回應針對在全球背景下，中國和其他東亞文物的收藏史及其文化內涵的挑戰，特別是中歐和東歐地區的收藏品以及周邊地區的收藏品，與其他較大中心的主要收藏品之間的相互聯繫。筆者受邀發表北京觀象臺天文儀器被劫與歸還史事論文，並參與工作坊，提供相關的博物館數位行銷策略。

關鍵詞：東亞文物、中國文物、歐洲博物館、文物歸還、斯洛維尼亞

¹ Metelkova ulica 2, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia.

目次

一、目的.....	1
二、行程.....	2
三、會議紀要.....	3
四、研討會發表論文	19
五、心得及建議事項	45
五、附件.....	46

一、目的

由斯洛維尼亞盧布爾亞納大學（以下簡稱盧大）亞洲學系所承辦的「從中心到邊緣：比較視野下的中國文物收藏」國際學術研討會(International symposium from Center to Periphery: Collecting Chinese Objects in Comparative Perspectives)，於 2019 年 9 月 19-22 日，在斯洛維尼亞民族學博物館(Slovene Ethnographic Museum, SEM)²舉辦。會議主旨在回應針對在全球背景下，中國和其他東亞文物的收藏史及其文化內涵的挑戰，特別是中歐和東歐地區的收藏品以及周邊地區的收藏品，與其他較大中心的主要收藏品之間的相互聯繫。

斯洛維尼亞位於中歐，是緊鄰阿爾卑斯山的小國。它北接奧地利，西鄰義大利，西南是亞得里亞海，東部和南部與克羅埃西亞相鄰，東北方為匈牙利。國土面積為 2 萬平方公里，首都為盧布爾雅納。全國人口約 200 萬人，居民多信仰羅馬天主教。第一次世界大戰前屬奧匈帝國，戰後併入南斯拉夫王國。第二次世界大戰期間，該國被軸心國佔領，戰後又回歸南斯拉夫。其文化上深受周邊的義大利、克羅埃西亞和塞爾維亞影響。1991 年之前，是前南斯拉夫社會主義聯邦共和國的一個加盟共和國（斯洛維尼亞社會主義共和國）。1991 年 6 月 25 日獨立。斯洛維尼亞與中國有接觸的歷史人物，是乾隆朝來華的耶穌會士天文學家劉松齡 (Augustin Ferdinand von Hallerstein, 1703-1774)。

主辦者盧大亞洲學系主任范舒娜教授(Nataša Vampelj Suhadolnik)規劃此次會議，共包括了 4 天的議程。議程中包括了 3 個專題講座，24 篇學術報告，還有 4 個工作坊。筆者於 5 月 27 日收到邀請函，由於與相識多年，加以曾在耶穌會士劉松齡研究上曾有合作，范舒娜教授除邀請我擔任學術報告外，並特別表示希望我能談談臺灣的博物館數位經驗，因此決定參與會議發表論文。

從個人的研究而言，前往斯洛維尼亞參與會議也有特殊的意義。近年利用多種文獻寫成的〈天文儀器、外交與科學社群：北京觀象臺天文儀器的掠奪與歸還〉(Astronomical Instruments, Diplomacy and Scientific Community: The looting and returning of Peking Ancient Observatory's Instruments)一文，因史事涉歐美各國，撰有英文版本，擬往歐美國家宣讀，盼與與會各國學者交流，或能喚起學術界對於觀象臺天文儀器歸還百年這一歷史事件的注意，並期待能有進一步的發現。而本次與會學者，多半為歐洲各國重要博物館之亞洲藏品主任，因此可以藉此對歐洲的亞洲文物收藏有一定的認識。

² Metelkova ulica 2, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia.

二、行程

參與盧布爾亞納大學亞洲系舉辦學術研討會行程表

會議名稱：International symposium from Center to Periphery: Collecting Chinese Objects in Comparative Perspectives

會議時間：September 19-22, 2019

地點：the Slovene Ethnographic Museum in Ljubljana (Slovenia)

日期 (週次)	旅程
9/13 (五) (補休假)	23:55 搭乘 KL808 飛往荷蘭阿姆斯特丹機場
9/14 (六) 國定假日	06:55 抵達荷蘭阿姆斯特丹機場 10:45 阿姆斯特丹機場搭乘 JP435 飛往盧布爾雅納機場 12:30 抵達
9/15 (日) 國定假日	
9/16 (一) (補休假)	參觀 the Slovene Ethnographic Museum
9/17 (二) (補休假)	拜訪盧布雅爾納大學亞洲學系 與米加教授會面
9/18 (三)	參觀 National Museum of Slovenia
9/19 (四) (公假)	研討會第一日
9/20 (五) (公假)	研討會第二日
9/21 (六) 國定假日	研討會第三日
9/22 (日) 國定假日	研討會第四日
9/23 (一) (公假)	07:00 自盧布雅爾納機場搭乘法航 AF6281 飛往巴黎戴高樂機場 09:00 抵達巴黎戴高樂機場 13:25 巴黎戴高樂機場搭乘法航 AF552 飛往桃園
9/24 (二) (公假)	08:15 抵達桃園機場

三、會議紀要

「從中心到邊緣：比較視野下的中國文物收藏」國際學術研討會(International symposium from Center to Periphery: Collecting Chinese Objects in Comparative Perspectives)係由蔣經國基金會(CCK)和斯洛維尼亞研究機構(ARRS)所資助。它是「斯洛維尼亞的東亞收藏：將斯洛維尼亞納入物品和觀念的全球交流中的東亞」(*East Asian Collections in Slovenia: Inclusion of Slovenia in the Global Exchanges of Objects and Ideas with East Asia*) (2018-2021, 編號 J7-9429) 計畫的一部分。

本會議組織者認為，儘管大多數與東亞藏品有關的研究都是基於西歐和北美的收藏品的分析，但是在中歐尤其是東歐對東亞藏品的研究仍然有限，因此是可積極拓展研究的藍海。同時，目前學術界在討論西歐收藏的思想和實踐的過程中，著作大多指向與東方主義話語有關，以歐洲中心論的框架和殖民主義的收藏和類別的再詮釋。通過探索歐洲周邊地區在東亞-歐洲交流的全球交流參與，對此一廣泛忽視的地區的收集趨勢進行更詳細的分析，將有助於填補收藏史的空白，並重新評估當前的學術視野。

本研討會試圖引起人們對中歐和東歐與前殖民地藏品的關注。與會者的論文著重介紹了南歐外圍國家（主要是斯洛維尼亞，奧地利，匈牙利，意大利和捷克共和國，它們以前都是奧匈帝國的一部分）的收藏史；以及北外圍國家（例如，蘇格蘭和北歐國家）的收藏史。西歐和北美與周邊地區一起進行收藏工作，使人們能夠進一步討論周邊地區與先前的殖民中心的收藏趨勢的相互關係。這些案例研究通過各種館藏的鏡頭突出了不同物質文化之間的相互影響。同時，也討論了全球博物館藏品的形成趨勢，並研究了與中國和東亞藝術有關的獨特審美欣賞方式的形成，尤其是在中心與周邊關係的更廣闊視野中。

本次會議有兩場專題講座，第一場是倫敦大學亞非學院教授 Stacey Pierson 通過比較 1500-1900 年間，歐洲和中國對中國物品的收藏和解釋，在更廣泛的背景下介紹收藏史。第二場則是由蘇黎世大學教授 Hans Bjarne Thomsen，他提出從全球藝術以及對中國和東亞藝術收藏品的未來研究方面，重新思考歐洲統一的方式。

研討會計劃還將包括四個工作坊，每個工作坊都是在該領域知名專家的指導下進行的。有兩個是檢試斯洛維尼亞館藏的東亞藏品（例如中國錢幣組合，佛教和其他宗教物品或中國瓷器和瓷器），並討論應用資料庫和資料庫開發等博物館數位化課題。

- Simpoziji
- Konference
- Arhiv vseh dogodkov
- 100 let FF - Oddelek za azijske študije
- Mediji

International Symposium

From Centre to Periphery: Collecting Chinese Objects in Comparative Perspective

19–22 September 2019

Venue: Slovene Ethnographic Museum (SEM)



Alma M. Karlin with her collection (source: Department of Manuscripts, National and University Library, Slovenia)

會議官網：http://as.ff.uni-lj.si/dogodki/collecting_chinese_objects



范舒娜教授(Nataša Vampelj Suhadolnik)



盧大人文學院院長 Roman Kuhar 教授



斯洛維尼亞民族學博物館館長 Tanja Roženberger

研討會第一天 九月十九日（週四）

下午 13:00-14:00 於斯洛維尼亞民族學博物館註冊。會議於下午二時正式開始，由斯洛維尼亞民族學博物館館長 Tanja Roženberger、盧大人文學院院長 Roman Kuhar 教授，亞洲學系主任范舒娜教授(Nataša Vampelj Suhadolnik)致歡迎詞。

下午二時半至四時半，進行第一個主題研討，主題是「收藏者的時程和藏品的命運」共有四篇論文宣讀：格拉斯哥博物館亞洲部主任鍾諭平(Yupin Chung)發表The Minds of Three Collectors: Lever, Burrell and Gulbenkian，講述三個英國收藏家 Sir William Hesketh Lever(1851–1925)、Sir William Burrell(1861–1958)和 Calouste Gulbenkian's(1869–1955)和其藏品。義大利威尼斯福斯卡里宮大學(Ca' Foscari University)Sabrina Rastelli教授發表義大利傑出的收藏家與東亞藏品。格拉斯哥大學Minna Törmä教授發表北歐的收藏家與其藏品。大英博物館研究員 Helen Wang發表中國錢鈔的西方收藏家。



格拉斯哥博物館亞洲部主任鍾諭平(Yupin Chung)



大英博物館研究員 Helen Wang

下午五時，進行第一場專題講座，由倫敦大學亞非學院Stacey Pierson教授主講，他的講題是收藏中國：1500至1900年中國和歐洲藏品的收藏和詮釋的比較研究。



倫敦大學亞非學院Stacey Pierson教授

下午六時，於民族學博物館咖啡廳舉行歡迎晚宴。

研討會第二天 九月二十日（週五）

上午九時至十一時，進行第一場主題研討，由柯佩爾研究中心(Science and Research Centre Koper, Slovenia)研究員Helena MOTOH主持，主題是「斯洛維尼亞

的收藏家和藏品」，共有四篇論文宣讀：斯洛維尼亞民族學博物館的赤雷夫教授 (Ralf Čeplak Mencin) 發表：斯洛維尼亞收藏家伊萬·斯庫謝克二世的中國明清時代藏品 (Ivan Skušek Jr.) 盧大亞洲學系范舒娜教授 (Nataša Vampelj Suhadolnik) 發表伊萬·斯庫謝克二世的中國古典家具收藏。斯洛維尼亞采列地區博物館 (Regional Museum of Celje) Barbara Trnovec 研究員發表采列地區博物館中來自收藏家 Alma M. Karlin 的收藏。斯洛維尼亞國家博物館研究員 Tina Berdajs 發表國家博物館所藏東亞瓷器。



柯佩爾研究中心 (Science and Research Centre Koper, Slovenia) 研究員 Helena MOTOH

上午十一時三十分至下午一時三十分，舉行第二場主題研討，由格拉斯哥大學教授 Minna Törmä 主持，主題是：收藏實踐。共有四篇論文宣讀：德國漢堡工藝美術館 (Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe Hamburg, Germany) 研究員 Maria Sobotka，發表漢堡工藝美術館的東亞藝術收藏：收藏實踐、殖民地類別和比較觀點。米德爾伯里學院 (Middlebury College) Sarah Laursen 教授發表品味邊緣：George Eumorfopoulos, Johan Carl Kempe 和 Paul Singer 三位收藏家的黃金藏品。荷蘭國立世界文化博物館 (National Museum of World Cultures, Netherlands) 研究員 Willemijn van Noord 發表過去和現在的荷蘭中國物質文化收藏策略。美國伯明翰藝術博物館研究員 Katherine Anne Paul 發表〈採集的載體：從遠方收集物品〉 (Vectors of Acquisitions: Collecting Objects from Distant Lands)。



格拉斯哥大學 Minna Törmä 教授



Maria Sobotka



Sarah Laursen



荷蘭國立世界文化博物館(National Museum of World Cultures, Netherlands)研究員
Willemijn van Noord



美國伯明翰藝術博物館研究員 Katherine Anne Paul

下午三時至五時，在斯洛維尼亞民族學博物館展廳舉行工作坊，由美國伯明翰藝術博物館研究員 Katherine Anne Paul 介紹斯洛維尼亞民族學博物館所藏的佛教和其它宗教造像。五時半舉行第二場專題講座，由蘇黎世大學 Hans Bjarne Thomsen 教授演講「傾塌之牆：歐洲對東亞藝術收藏的反思」(Collapsing Walls: Rethinking East Asian Art Collections in Europe)。下午六時半於民族學博物館，由赤雷夫研究員負責參觀導覽。

研討會第三天 九月二十一日（週六）

上午九時至十時三十分，進行第一場研討，由蘇黎世大學 Hans Bjarne Thomsen 教授主持，主題是：東亞的博物館表述(Museum Representations of East Asia)。共有四篇論文宣讀。柯佩爾研究中心 Helena Motoh 研究員發表「斯洛維尼亞博物館中的古今中國宗教表述」(Representations of Chinese Religions in Slovenian Museums, Past and Present)。奧地利世界博物館(Weltmuseum Wien, Austria) Bettina Zorn 研究員發表「東亞的博物館表述和單一博物館藏品的表述議題(Museum Representation of East Asia and the Issue of Representativeness of Individual Museum Objects)」匈牙利羅蘭大學 Beatrix Mecsi 教授發表「一個不尋常的藏品：匈牙利所藏朝鮮 Anak 3 墓壁畫的真人大小副本 (An Unusual Collected Item: The Life-Size Copies of the Anak 3 Tomb Paintings from North Korea in Hungary)」。



Hans Bjarne Thomsen 教授



奥地利世界博物館(Weltmuseum Wien, Austria) Bettina Zorn 研究員



匈牙利羅蘭大學 Beatrix Mecsi 教授

上午十一時至十二時三十分，舉行第二場研討，由盧大 Klara Hrvatin 教授主持，主題是：明信片照片和書籍(Postcards, Photographs, and Books)。共有三篇論文宣讀。盧大 Maja Veselič 教授發表：「在全球趨勢和個人品味之間： Skušek 和 Karlin 收藏的二十世紀初中國明信片 and 照片」(Between Global Trends and Personal Tastes: The Skušek and Karlin Collections of Early 20th Century China Postcards and Photographs)。布拉格表演藝術學院 Filip Suchomel 教授發表「老式攝影是收藏的主題，也是了解通往 19 世紀遠東國家的途徑」(Vintage Photography as a Subject of Collection and a Path Towards Learning about Far Eastern Countries in the 19th Century)盧大 Chikako Shigemori Bučar 教授發表「斯洛維尼亞收藏的日本光書」(Old Japanese Books Wakosho in the Slovenian Collections)。



盧大 Klara Hrvatin 教授主持



盧大 Maja Veselič 教授

下午二時至三時三十分，舉行第三場研討，由匈牙利羅蘭大學Beatrix Mecsí教授主持，研討主題是「東亞特殊藏品一」，共宣讀三篇論文。勞倫斯大學Brigid E. Vance教授發表「以外圍為中心：勞倫斯大學弗里斯頓美術館東亞博物館簡介」(Centering the Periphery: An Introduction to the East Asian Collection at Lawrence University's Wriston Gallery)德國艾福特大學(University of Erfurt, Germany)Emily Teo發表「德國外圍的中國：哥達的中國櫥櫃」(China in the German Periphery: Gotha's Chinese Cabinet)。捷克科學院民族學研究所(Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic – Institute of Ethnology, Czech Republic) Marcela Suchomelová教授發表「巴洛克布拉格概念下的“東方”博物館：揚·魯道夫·史波克的描寫」(Baroque Prague Concept “Oriental” Museum /Delineationes of Jan Rudolf Špork, 1696?–1759)。

下午四時至六時，舉行工作坊，由大英博物館研究員Helen Wang主講「斯洛維尼亞民族博物館的中國錢幣收藏」(The Chinese Numismatic Collection of the Slovene Ethnographic Museum)結束後由Helena Motoh帶領認識盧布爾亞那市史蹟。



Helen Wang 介紹中國的錢幣文化



各國學者會後參訪盧布爾雅納市的史蹟



難得輕鬆的合影

研討會第四天 九月二十二日（週日）

上午九時至十時三十分，進行第一場研討，由盧大日裔Chikako Shigemori Bučar 教授主持，主題是：「東亞特殊藏品二」共宣讀三篇論文。盧大Nataša Visočnik教授發表「扇子：斯洛維尼亞博物館中的東亞藝術微型作品」(Collections of Hand Fans – Miniature Works of East Asian Art in Slovenian Museums)。盧大Klara Hrvatin教授發表「斯洛維尼亞東亞收藏中的樂器和戲劇物品」(Musical Instruments and Theatrical Objects in the East Asian Collections in Slovenia)。筆者發表「天文儀器、外交與科學社群：北京觀象臺天文儀器的被劫與歸還」(Astronomical Instruments, Diplomacy and the Scientific Community: The Looting and Return of the Peking Ancient Observatory's Instruments)

稍後舉行兩個工作坊，上午十一時至下午一時，第一個工作坊由Stacey Pierson和Sabrina Rastelli 擔任解說，講解「斯洛維尼亞國家博物館的東亞陶瓷和瓷器」(East Asian Ceramics and Porcelain at the National Museum of Slovenia)。第二個工作坊則於下午二時三十分至四時三十分舉行，由荷蘭國家博物館的Richard van Alphen和筆者，帶領與會者討論「中國收藏的資料庫、數位化和視覺化」(Database, Digitalisation and Visualisation of Chinese Collections)。

下午四時三十分主辦方致閉幕詞。



Stacey Pierson解說各種東方瓷器



檢視大型瓷器的底部



在當地中國餐館賦歸

四、研討會發表論文

Astronomical Instruments, Diplomacy and the Scientific Community: The Looting and Return of the Peking Ancient Observatory's Instruments

Chou Wei-chiang (周維強) *

Abstract

In the incidents of plunder cultural relics by foreigners in China, the looting of astronomical instruments of Beijing (Peking) Ancient Observatory was the most dramatic. On December 2, 1900, the German-French troops stationed in Beijing privately carried out this looting action. This action not only caused embarrassment in the expeditionary forces of various countries in China, but was immediately promoted by the Anglo-American newspaper to all over the world. France returned the astronomical instruments to China under international pressure, but Germany insisted on the proceeds and transported the relics to the Garden in the Sans Souci of Potsdam, and later became the trophy of the Orangerieschloss. Not until the end of World War I (1919) that the astronomical instruments were returned to China under the Versailles Peace Treaty signed in the Peace Conference by the warring countries in Paris. The looting and return of the astronomical instruments of Beijing (Peking) Ancient Observatory was a complex international political event. There are still many doubts about this incident that have not been clarified. This article intends to integrate the historical archives and newspapers discovered in recent years to show some supplemented information.

Keywords: Astronomical Instruments, Beijing Ancient Observatory, American Astronomical Society, German Reichstag, Paris Peace Conference (1919), Treaty of Versailles (Versailles Peace Treaty)

* Associate Curator, department fo Rare books and Historical Documents, National Palace Museum.

Email: fence.chou@gmail.com.

1. Foreword

The history of the Qing Beijing Observatory can be traced back to the Ming observatory built during the Zhengtong reign (1436-1449). This observatory used to have eight massive bronze observation instruments on the top floor and an armillary sphere and an abridged armilla, two historical instruments, on the floor. These ten massive bronze observation instruments had made this institution Qing's most prestigious official observation and a world-class science heritage. The Westerners first visited this observatory in 1867, or the same year when the Inspector-General of Chinese Maritime Customs Service was moved from Beijing to Shanghai. In 1873, the Office in Charge of Foreign Affairs had to forbid visitors because of vandalism committed by American tourists.³

During the Boxer Rebellion of 1900, Beijing's boxer began to attack Beijing's diplomatic sector. On August 14, the Eight-Nation Alliance started to invade Beijing. They took the city the next day. Empress Dowager Cixi and Emperor Guangxu fled and the international soldiers began to loot the city. German reinforcement troops arrived in October and field marshal Alfred Graf von Waldersee (1832-1904), the head of the alliance, reached Beijing in November. Unimaginably, he and the German forces began to steal the astronomy instruments of Beijing's observatory.

On December 2, 1900, Waldersee and Henri-Nicolas Frey (1847-1932), a French general, conspired to split the loot. These massive instruments were sent to German and French embassies. From the loot of 1900 to their return on April 21, 1921, the loss of the observatory's instruments took more than two decades to resolve.⁴ This event was a major international fiasco of the early 20th century. However, this event was documented by relatively few Chinese sources.⁵ Many critical questions are left unanswered. Here we are using documents and Western World newspaper reports as the basis to reconstruct the story about this looting in order to present a more complete narration.

2. The Looting and Its Reports in the Western World

³ *The North-China Herald and Supreme Court & Consular Gazette (1870-1941)*, Feb 12, 1874; p. 131.

⁴ 常福元撰,《天文儀器志略》(北平:京華印書局,鉛印本,1932),頁4a-4b。

⁵ 崔石竹,〈北京古觀象台上天文儀器被掠奪史實考〉,載崔振華主編《北京天文館文集 1957-1997》(北京:科學技術出版社,1997),頁118-119。李元,〈古台蒙難百年祭〉,《天文愛好者》,2000年1期,頁2-3。天琪,〈古觀象臺遭劫紀實〉,《世紀》,2000年5期,頁8-10。李元,〈古觀象臺蒙難整百年——“科學美國人”世紀初專刊報導〉,《科學時報》2000,12月29日。陳久金、崔石竹、李東生撰,《北京古觀象臺》(太原:山西教育出版社,2008.1),頁135-137。

(1) The Looting and Waldersee's Personal Story

Waldersee has presented a report on this looting. Ever since his arrival to Beijing, he had learned the existence of this observatory.⁶ He claimed the looting was proposed by the French embassy. Since the observatory was in German occupation zone, they proposed the loot to German chief of staff. Upon hearing this, Waldersee believed that the instruments are not of scientific value but they are valuable as articles of art. Subsequently, Émile Jean François Régis Voyron (1838-1921), commander of the French expedition, contacted Waldersee to request the return of a theodolite, which could have been a gift from Louis XIV, to the French forces.⁷

Waldersee claimed these astronomical instruments originally belonged to the Qing Empire. Since they are inside the German occupation zone, they are supposed to be German war trophy. Because it was believed China could hardly pay for the war's damages, Germany was prioritized to take these instruments to secure its rights. Not to displease the French, the German chief of staff agreed to work out a plan to divide the instruments with Lt. Jean-Baptiste Marchand (1863-1934) of the French army. Philipp Alfons Freiherr Mumm von Schwarzenstein (1859-1924), Germany's minister to China, took photos of their removal of these instruments.⁸

(2) The Rise of Media Coverage

The plunder of the astronomical instruments by the German and French armies were widely reported by British and American papers. The media coverage quickly made this looting a major international issue. On December 3, 1900, The New York Times ran an article titled "Peking Observatory Looted—French and Germans Remove Instruments—other Powers Protest" and cited a telegram by Dr. George Ernest Morrison (1862-1920) to the Times of London on the looting of the astronomical instruments. It mentioned German and French armies took the instruments regardless of other countries' protest. Germany and France claimed, "The explanation of this act of vandalism is that inasmuch as the return of the Court is so improbable, such beautiful instruments should not be exposed to the possibilities of injury when Peking is no longer the capital".⁹

The Boston Evening Transcript pointed out that the plunder by the German and French forces started all the lootings of Beijing. It also mentioned that the beginning

⁶ 瓦德西，《瓦德西拳亂筆記》（上海：上海書店出版社，2000.1），頁73-74。

⁷ Our Own Correspondent, "Peking," *The North China Herald and Supreme Court & Consular Gazette* (1870-1941), Apr 13, 1888, p. 414.

⁸ Philipp Alfons Freiherr Mumm von Schwarzenstein, *Ein Tagebuch in Bildern*, Berlin: 1902, p. 29-32.

⁹ "Peking Observatory Looted," *The New York Times*, 3 December 1900, p. 1.

of talking was the removal of silver accessories from the astrolabe by the Russian forces in order to deter further looting.¹⁰

According to a telegram dated December 2 from Tianjin, several American papers reported the looting by German and French forces in Beijing. The astronomical instruments were packed and shipped to Tianjin by railway to be delivered to Berlin and Paris. It was reported that the Chinese did not complain because LI Hongzhang's advisors believed complaints could only harvest uncivil treatment. It further said these astronomical instruments were seen as Beijing's most attractive sights. Many of them were cast in bronze and over 150 years in age. They were already outdated but still could be used for astronomical observation.¹¹ These reports were widely circulated in the English-speaking world. Many papers of New Zealand and Australia cited wired sources including London correspondence of the Press Association and the Hong Kong correspondence of the United Press International.

(3) The Actual Losses of the Observatory

The actual losses of the observatory were not limited to its instruments. According to Qing records, the observatory had been disabled since July 1900. On August 25, 1901, Qing investigators reported that the officers could only take away a copy of the Imperial Edition of Astronomy (欽定天文正義, *Qinding Tianwen Zhenyi*) and four pieces of the official stamps. All other books, printing plates, and records were destroyed by fire. The buildings were occupied by foreigners. The land of the observatory was taken by foreign embassies. The foreigners left the place in the summer of 1901. They took away 10 massive astronomical instruments and destroyed the observatory's buildings. Remained smaller instruments, timers, printing plates and books were stolen by criminals.¹² Since the site of the observatory was occupied by foreign embassies, officers had to work elsewhere. The destruction of the observatory's buildings denied daily scheduled observation. Officers in charge had to observe eclipses in other office buildings.¹³ The observatory ceased to be functional

¹⁰ "Pekin Observatory Loot," *Boston Evening Transcript*, 3 December 1900, p. 9.

¹¹ "The Peking Observatory," *The Evening Record*, 3 December 1900, p. 4. "Vandals in Peking," *The Meriden Daily Journal*, 3 December 1900, p. 5. "Protesting Pillaging," *The Evening News*, 5 December 1900, p. 12. "The Powers Protest," *Fredericksburg Daily Star*, Vol. 8, Number 13, 3 December 1900, p. 6. "Powers Will Agree to American Plan," *Meriden Morning Record*, 3 December 1900, p1.

¹² 恩祿，〈奏報洋人佔踞衙署並遺失儀器書籍等情形〉，《軍機處檔奏摺錄副》，光緒 27 年 7 月 12 日，文獻編號：143060（故機 143840）。《清德宗景皇帝實錄》，卷 485，頁 415-1。光緒二十七年七月丁亥日(24)。

¹³ 恩祿，〈奏報觀象台房屋均已拆毀本監暫在公所照常辦事〉，《軍機處檔摺件》，光緒二十七年

from mid-1900 to 1901. ¹⁴

3. Chaffee and Waldersee Affair

(1) The Conflicts between Waldersee and Chaffee

The looting did cause much of the alliance's internal conflicts. In the book 瓦德西拳亂筆記, he wrote that General Adna Romanza Chaffee (1842–1914), commander of the American expedition, saw this as a case of robbery and wrote to Waldersee on behalf of the U.S. government and the American expedition on December 3. However, Waldersee ducked this issue. According to Waldersee, Prince Qing (慶親王) had sent Yinchang (蔭昌), a German speaker, to negotiate in the hope that the Germans could stop looting. He failed. ¹⁵

The conflicts attracted much press coverage. On December 6, *The Fostoria Review Dispatch* ran a December 3 correspondence from Tianjing on the latest development of this issue. The looting caused much conflict within the alliance. Many countries requested Waldersee not to take the astronomical instruments. ¹⁶ Many papers reported the conflicts between American and German officers. On December 10, the *New York Times* cited an article of the same day by a correspondent of London's *Morning Post* that reported Chaffee's complain letter to Waldersee against the robbery committed by German and French forces. However, Waldersee rejected the letter and claimed its rejection was "owing to its tone".

In addition to support Chaffee's complain, the *New York Times* also reported German papers' reactions. For example, here's a comment made by the *Vossische Zeitung*: "Whatever the cause, Gen. Charfeenhad in no case a right to use such rough language in a letter to the Commander in Chief" and another one made by *Berliner Tageblatt*: "We must: of course, reserve a definite judgment until reliable German reports have been received. Whoever knows, however of generally acknowledged diplomatic tact of Count von Waldersee will not doubt that he would not have employed such a brusque procedure without the strongest kind of provocation." ¹⁷

七月十二日，文獻編號：143062（故機 143842）。

¹⁴ 恩祿，〈奏報本監各官生考試因衙署被洋人入城佔據迄未辦理情形〉，《軍機處檔摺件》，光緒二十七年七月十二日，文獻編號：143063（故機 143843）。

¹⁵ 瓦德西，《瓦德西拳亂筆記》（上海：上海書店出版社，2000.1），頁 74-75。

¹⁶ "Germans and French Removed the Astronomical Instruments from the Observatory at Pekin, Preparatory to Sending them to Europe," *The Fostoria Review-Dispatch*, 6 December 1900, p. 4.

¹⁷ "To support Gen. Chaffee: War Department Likely to Approve Protest to von Waldersee has no

(2) The Termination of French Looting

On December 10, the *New York Times* cited a personal telegram delivered to Berlin by Capt. Dannhauser of Waldersee's army which says, "The French have abandoned their operations to remove astronomical instruments from the wall of Peking, presumably in order to impress the Chinese with their comparative " The termination of French looting gave them the hope to end this fiasco. ¹⁸

Another welcomed turn since media exposure was a statement made by the French government. On December 12, the *New York Times* ran a message from Paris, which was the French government's official response to Chaffee's complaint. Even though the French army had stopped looting, they still saw Chaffee as an uncooperative partner. The French would keep on claiming its own rights. The French government claimed, "The fact is principally regrettable because it is likely to result in a break of the concord under Field Marshal von Waldersee. Either von Waldersee is the international commander of all the forces in China, or his position is an imaginary one. As the present status has apparently been quite satisfactory, anything which might occasion a break in the ranks is disagreeable." As to the termination of packaging of instruments, the officers believed the French must learn to use its rights properly whether or not they are entitled to own the instruments. ¹⁹

On December 13, *The Age* of Australia ran a correspondence article wired from Beijing in which Chaffee admitted that it was "inappropriate" of him to assert, in respect to the removal of the instruments, that "this looting was committed by men who had done nothing for the relief of Peking". The article further mentioned that the City of Beijing was taken mostly by British and American troops. Japanese and Russian troops came subsequently while French and German troops were just late comers. ²⁰

On December 20, the *New York Times* openly criticized the absence from fighting of German troops and their disregarding of Chaffee's complaint on the ground that the French government refused to take the loot. Their report not just put Chaffee and the U.S. troops under a very positive filter; it also differentiated French and German troops. It appreciated French government's condemnation to looting and called French

particulars yet," *The New York Times*, 11 December 1900, p. 1.

¹⁸ "Chaffee offends Envoys," *The New York Times*, 1900.12.10, p. 1.

¹⁹ "Gen. Chaffee's Powers in Peking Restricted," *The New York Times*, 12 December 1900, p. 1.

²⁰ "Position in China," *The Age*, 13 December 1900, p. 3. "The War in China," *The Tuapeka Times*, Vol. XXXII, Issue 4814, 15 December 1900, p. 1. "Science Notes," *Scientific American*, Vol. 83, No. 24 (DECEMBER 15, 1900), p. 375.

troops brave and efficient under fire. More interestingly, the *New York Times* used international law to justify the French collection of war trophy gained during the Second Opium War by placing the two wars under different lights. The Second Opium War was against China. It was legal to take and keep war trophy. However, the enemy was not the Chinese government in the pacification of the riot. Therefore, it was brutal and criminal to plunder official properties including the astronomical instruments.²¹

The French government began to return the loot to China. On May 5, 1901, it was reported that General Freneyof declared that 50 pieces of the loot would be returned which included a royal bronze lion.²² In the summer of 1904, China received a French official letter that they would return the astronomical instruments stored in the French embassy. Chinese officers subsequently received 28 items back. In order to thank the French government, SUN Baoqi (孫寶琦, 1867-1931), China's ambassador to France, went to the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs to express China's gratitude.²³ The Qing also planned a new observatory building to house these instruments. France also informed China to take back another more than 20 boxes of ritual ware.²⁴ Finally, France returned all the taken items.²⁵ Germany became the lone defendant of this case.

(3) The Raised Interest by American Scholars

The news coverage of the loot also initiated public interest to the Chinese astronomical instruments. On December 16, the *New York Tribune* ran a pictorial supplement titled *Unique Chinese Relics: Astronomical Instruments Two Centuries Old* to introduce these instruments to the public. This paper hired Prof. John Krom Rees (1851-1907),²⁶ Dean of the Department of Astronomy of Columbia University and head of its observatory, as its advisor in the making of this supplement. Prof. Rees learned the existence of the Beijing observatory and its instruments many years ago. He also urged American minister to Beijing to collect its pictures. He was already

²¹ "Looting in China," *The New York Times*, 20 December 1900, p. 8.

²² "Handing Back Spoils," *The Colonist*, Volume XLIV, Issue 10100, 7 May 1901, p. 3.

²³ 奕劻，〈奏為收回法國使臣交還觀象台儀器由（摺片）〉，《軍機處檔摺件》，光緒三十年七月初六日，文獻編號：161808。

²⁴ 奕劻，〈奏報洋兵退盡法國交還祭器情形〉，《軍機處檔摺件》，光緒二十七年七月二十二日（1901.09.04），文獻編號：143290。

²⁵ 中央研究院近代史研究所藏，〈法使交還儀器已赴外部致謝由〉，《總理各國事務衙門檔》，光緒三十年八月二十二日（1904.10.01），編號：02-12-022-01-025。

²⁶ "Professor J. K. Rees," *Columbia Daily Spectator*, Volume L, Number 123, 11 March 1907, p. 1. H. Jacoby, "John Krom Rees," *Popular Astronomy*, vol. 16, pp.639-642.

quite familiar with these instruments.

Prof. Rees noted Chinese astronomers learned the inventions of Tycho Brahe (1546-1601) via the Jesuits. They then began to build and use these instruments. He introduced to the public Tycho Brahe's instruments and Chinese instruments as well. It was noted that these Chinese instruments were heavily decorated unlike Tycho Brahe's ones which were abstract and very functional. Chinese instruments were not just scientific tools; they were also works of art. This report contained a series of pictures of the instruments taken away by the Germans.²⁷ Another paper, the *Toledo Blade*, covered the same issue. This report not just cited words of Rees, it also pointed out the observatory's instruments were not properly maintained and without covering to shield them from the elements.²⁸

As the looting of the instruments became widely known, the U.S. government had made good use of publications and reports to inform the public about this disaster. For example, *Scientific American* covered this issue on its December 29 issue, which said, "The scientific world has been shocked at the looting of Peking observatory by the French and German troops". It reported the status of the loot and General Chaffee's complaint. The publication stated that civilized combatants must view an observatory as a sacred institution. It had made a point that wars were not supposed to harm human's historical heritages. In order to let readers know more about these instruments, this publication obtained five pictures licensed from a French periodical *L'illustration*.²⁹ The *Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institute* also used these pictures.³⁰

4. The Prince Chun's Visit of Germany and the German Whitewash of the Loot

(1) Prince Chun's Visit of Germany

²⁷ "Unique Chinese Relics," *The New York Tribune*, 16 December 1900, Illustrated Supplement p. 1. 此一報導的文字部分後來又經《迪比克每日先驅報》和《托雷多刀鋒報》全篇刊登報導。"Some Relics From Peki: Astronomical Instruments Show European Influences," *Dubuque Daily Herald*, 27 December 1900, p. 3. "Unique Chinese Relics," *Toledo Blade*, 3 January 1901, p. 3.

²⁸ "untitled," *Toledo Blade*, Jan 3, 1901, p. 3.

²⁹ "The looting of the Peking Observatory," *Scientific American Supplement*, Vol. L No. 1304, p. 20895-20897.

³⁰ *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, showing The Operations, Expenditures, and Condition of the Institution for The Year Ending June 30, 1900*. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1901), p. 185-186. Fig 1-5.

The Waldersee-bashing of U.S. and U.K. papers had enraged this German commander. Among all the reporters, he took George Ernest Morrison (1862-1920)³¹ of the *Times* of London as his personal enemy. However, not just British and American papers were against him, many of Germany's opposition politicians joined the bandwagon of Waldersee-bashing.³² This movement was initiated by the visit of Qing's Prince Chun.

On July 12, 1901, Prince Chun, 18, went to Germany to apologize for the killing of Clemens Freiherr von Ketteler (1853-1900), Germany's minister to China, during the Boxer Rebellion. While he was on the road, he learned that the Kaiser demanded Prince's attaché to kneel down before the German Emperor. To avoid further loss of honor, the Prince said that he was exhausted by travelling and must take a rest in Basel, Switzerland on August 25.³³ On September 2, the negotiation turned out to be fruitful that they were only required to bow before the Kaiser. He then reached Germany to meet Kaiser in September and then return to China in November.

(2) About Germany's National News Coverage

The Fleet Street began to monitor German press's responses to Prince Chun's visit. On August 26, 1901, while the Prince was still in Basel, Switzerland, the *Times* of London examined Germany's disagreement views. Groups such as socialists, Ultramontane and the National Liberal Party were most outspoken naysayers to the loot. Pro-Catholic *Kölnische Volkszeitung* and *National Zeitung* also proposed to send back and restore these instruments.³⁴ As Germany's voice of opponents began to rise, many international news agencies started to believe that Germany really could return these instruments. The *Strait Times* of Singapore ran a wired correspondence from London, saying some German papers urge to return these instruments.³⁵ The Shanghai *Shun Pao* translated this message.³⁶ However, on September 9, news from

³¹ 瓦德西，《瓦德西拳亂筆記》（上海：上海書店出版社，2000.1），頁 92-93，1901 年 1 月 3 日；頁 115-116，1901 年 2 月 25 日。

³² 瓦德西，《瓦德西拳亂筆記》（上海：上海書店出版社，2000.1），頁 115-116。1901 年 2 月 25 日。

³³ 愛新覺羅·載灃撰，《醇親王日記》（北京：群眾出版社，2014.4），頁 55。法語：Grand Hotel Les Trois Rois，德語：Hotel drei Könige

³⁴ “untitled,” *The Times*, Issue 36543, Monday, Aug 26, 1901; p. 7.

³⁵ “The Astronomical instruments at Peking,” *The Straits Times*, 27 August 1901, p. 2. “The Peking Observatory,” *The Singapore Free Press and Mercantile Advertiser*(Weekly), 29 August 1901, p. 16.

³⁶ 《申報》（上海：上海書店，1983 年，影印本），第 68 冊，頁 723。第 10188 號，光緒二十七年七月十六日（1901.8.29），第二版。《申報》，（上海：上海書店，1983 年，影印本），第 69 冊，

Berlin indicated that these instruments had reached Potsdam, a city near Berlin.³⁷

The instruments arrival in Potsdam did not stop the press from opposing. On September 13, the *New York Times* cited an Associated Press article, which pointed out that the majority of Berlin papers urged the government to return them. For example, *Vossische Zeitung*, “fought the Boxers and not the Chinese State. Accordingly, under international law, these instruments are not the spoil of war. They ought to be returned”.³⁸ A Berlin correspondent of the *Times* of London said, “It is a curious coincidence that the appropriated Peking astronomical instruments are to be placed in the park of Sans Souci, once the scene of vandalism for which German historians have never ceased the reproach the first Napoleon.” “The news that the instruments are to remain here has been received with a chorus of indignation from press and public, which do not understand how the Government of a great civilized nation could stoop to such an act. Even the *Berliner Neueste Nachrichten* quotes strong protests with apparent approval.”³⁹

(3) Pressure on Qing’s Foreign Office by German’s Minister of Beijing

Since Germany’s political opponents and international news agencies both were against German looting, the German Government began to spread fake news by forcing the Chinese government to admit the instruments were China’s gifts to Germany in order to create a false impression that Germany returned the instruments by choice.

On September 25, 1901, Baron von der Goltz of the German Minister in Beijing wrote to Yikuang, Prince Qing, which enclosed two letters. The first one was a translated copy of Germany’s letter to China’s Foreign Office that stated the signing of the Boxer Protocol enabled Germany to return the astronomical instruments. The other one was a letter written by the Germans on behalf of Prince Qing to Germany, which stated that the Qing Empire wished to give Germany these instruments as gifts because shipping back to China was very inconvenient.⁴⁰ These letters have shown that Germany planned to force China to create a fake impression that Germany was pleased to return the instruments and China did want to give them to Germany.

頁 23。第 10229 號，光緒二十七年八月二十七日(1901.10.9)，第二版。

³⁷ “Astronomical Instruments,” *Los Angeles Herald*, Volume XXVIII, Number 345, 10 September 1901, p. 7.

³⁸ “untitled,” *The New York Times*, 13 September 1901, p. 1.

³⁹ “German Took Peking Astronomic Instruments,” *The New York Times*, 13 September 1901, p. 1.

⁴⁰ 中央研究院近代史研究所藏，〈為觀象台天文儀器函送物改轉慶親王函稱由〉，《總理各國事務衙門檔》，光緒二十七年八月十三日(1901.09.25)，編號：01-14-012-01-019。

Upon receiving the letters, the Foreign Office replied the next day, saying that Prince Qing was not authorized to determine the ownership of these instruments and China was always pleased to receive these instruments from Germany. The letter also stated that the Foreign Office did not want to answer German's requests because they did not have a chance to report to Prince Qing in person.⁴¹ In the Foreign Office meeting, Prince Qing pointed out that, "Your government did not want to refuse to return. On the other hand, if your government really wants to return, the Chinese government certainly would not say no. Furthermore, I am not authorized to give them to your country."⁴² The Foreign Office delivered Prince Qing's reply to Germany. Being rejected, German embassy changed the excuse by telling the Chinese Foreign Office, "We are pleased to return them. However, the long distance shipping could damage these instruments."⁴³ In order to keep peace between the two countries, Yikuang replied, "Since the shipping is too long to be convenient, we are not going to demand return."⁴⁴

Three days later, news came out that China refused to accept the instruments.⁴⁵ According to the Berlin correspondent of the *Times* of London, the German offer to return was equivalent to the condemnation to the looting. The Chinese refusal did not clear the name of the looters. On October 4, the *New York Times* cited London on the updated status of the loot. The *North German Gazette* stated the taking of instruments was viewed by many as shameful plunder. However, the *Cologne Gazette* said these instruments were purchased instead of plundered. The *New York Times* debunked this theory. *Vossische Zeitung* held that "A country that fights for international law and civilization can never be brutally overriding the laws of other countries" It further commented that these instruments were taken to Germany disregarding China's legal rights. Therefore, Germany has the obligation to return them to China. If China

⁴¹ 中央研究院近代史研究所藏，〈儀器送與本國原年慶邸之心穆大臣即收此美意領收至發送函稱不能更改由〉，《總理各國事務衙門檔》，光緒二十七年八月十五日(1901.09.27)，編號：01-14-012-01-021。

⁴² 中央研究院近代史研究所藏，〈儀器慶邸王未敢作主奉送由〉，《總理各國事務衙門檔》，光緒二十七年八月十五日(1901.09.27)，編號：01-14-012-01-022。

⁴³ 中央研究院近代史研究所藏，〈儀器作為獲勝物運到德國本擬交還惟路遙不便由〉，《總理各國事務衙門檔》，光緒二十七年八月十八日(1901.09.30)，編號：01-14-012-01-023。

⁴⁴ 中央研究院近代史研究所藏，〈儀器以途遙不便中國亦不索回由〉，《總理各國事務衙門檔》，光緒二十七年八月十八日，編號：01-14-012-01-024。

⁴⁵ "China has declined an offer by Germany," *The New York Times*, 3 October 1901, p. 1. "Germany makes an offer, willing to return astronomical instruments to Peking," *The Deseret News*, 3 October 1901, p. 3. "untitled," *The Times* (London, England), Issue 36576, Oct 03, 1901; p. 7.

refused to accept them, Germany still bears the responsibility to all legal consequences.⁴⁶

On October 6, the *San Francisco Call* had reported an overview of Germany's home opinions and stated that all papers asserted that these instruments were taken from China illegally. For instance, the *Kreuz Zeitung* said, "These astronomical instruments were certainly unlawfully taken away. The culprit was not intended to commit a crime. However, good intention could hardly save him. So far all we could do was to deduct the costs of these instruments from China's payments to Germany." The *Neueste Nachrichten* pointed out, returning was not enough.⁴⁷ Germany must pay for all the related costs including shipping to their original location. If China did not want to take them, then Germany must reduce China's damages to Germany. The *Thames Star* cited a socialist paper of Bremerhaven that stated the instruments were stolen property and the German army was a robber. They were not war trophy. Since Germany was not at war with China, the government of German cannot keep the stolen property. Taking these astronomical instruments to another place was simply barbaric.⁴⁸

The Beijing observatory was built by the Jesuits of the Roman Catholic Church. The looting was certainly not acceptable to Germany's Catholic members. On December 19, the New Zealand edition of the *Catholic World* pointed out the instruments were already installed in Berlin. Dr. Karl Josef Emil Bachem (1858-1945), a pro-Catholic politician delivered a speech in the Catholic Congress held in Osnabrück, Germany, which expressed the idea that the looting disqualified Germany as a civilized country. He then said sarcastically, "Germans hate the Jesuits but love the instruments made by them. Please let the Germans return the Jesuits to us and the Jesuit instruments to China".⁴⁹ German Catholic members also openly protest the looting of the instruments.

(4) Conflicts within the Reichstag

The Reichstag became the next battleground of the dispute. On January 8, 1902,

⁴⁶ "The German Loot from China: Action Regarding Astronomical Instruments Severely Criticised-Germany Paid Chun's Bill," *The New York Times*, 14 October 1901, p. 7.

⁴⁷ "Germany May Return Loot: Chinese Astronomical Instruments Cause Protest," *San Francisco Call*, Volume 90, Number 128, 6 October 1901, p. 14.

⁴⁸ "untitled," *Thames Star*, Volume XXXIX, Issue 10079, 12 October 1901, p. 3. "untitled," *Thames Star*, Volume XXXIX, Issue 10097, 4 November 1901, p. 2.

⁴⁹ "Germany-A protest," *Catholic World, New Zealand Tablet*, Volume XXIX, Issue 51, 19 December 1901, p. 24.

Dr. Albert Oskar Wilhelm Südekum (1871-1944, SPD), member of the Reichstag, pointed out several opposing press comments on the Prince Chun's rites controversy issue and the looting. He believed that these issues could damage German people's collective image and urged the government to pack up the stuff as quickly as possible and send it back.⁵⁰ On the next day, another Reichstag member argued that the German army did not have any right to take these instruments and Germany must return these instruments to China at its own costs.⁵¹

On January 10, 1902, two more Reichstag members opined. Ernst Bassermann (1854-1917) of the Nationalliberale Partei (NLP) pointed out that the theory that instruments were legally held by Germany to help collection of damages was just a bad excuse.⁵² Max Liebermann von Sonnenberg (1848-1911) of the Deutschsoziale Reformpartei (DSRP) quoted a French saying "À la guerre comme à la guerre" (A war is a war)⁵³ as his background to criticize the German government. He said when Bonaparte Napoleon occupied Berlin; he took the statue of Victoria from the Brandenburg Gate and shipped it to Paris. This was written into Germany's textbooks to teach students to hate France. Now Germany has done something very similar.⁵⁴

The voices from the critics were mostly ignored by the German Empire. Ferdinand August Bebel, (1840-1913), another member of the Reichstag and one of the founders of the Social Democratic Workers' Party of Germany (SDAP), changed his way of attack. On January 11, 1902, he asked General Heinrich Wilhelm Martin von Goßler (1841-1927), Minister of War, if the order to plunder was from Field Marshal Waldersee. He claimed the order to loot violated Articles 129 and 131 of

⁵⁰ Deutsche Reichstag, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstages* (Berlin: Norddeutschen Buchdruckerei und Verlagsanstalt, 1902), X. Legislaturperiode, II. Session., Vierter Band, 112. Sitzung, p. 3219-3220.

⁵¹ Deutsche Reichstag, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstages* (Berlin: Norddeutschen Buchdruckerei und Verlagsanstalt, 1902), X. Legislaturperiode, II. Session., Vierter Band, 113. Sitzung, p. 3229-3230.

⁵² Deutsche Reichstag, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstages* (Berlin: Norddeutschen Buchdruckerei und Verlagsanstalt, 1902), X. Legislaturperiode, II. Session. Vierter Band, 114. Sitzung, p. 3264.

⁵³ 原文用的是法文「À la guerre comme à la guerre」，指戰爭使一切手段合法，以隨遇而安的態度對待不利的局面。

⁵⁴ Deutsche Reichstag, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstages* (Berlin: Norddeutschen Buchdruckerei und Verlagsanstalt, 1902), X. Legislaturperiode, II. Session. Vierter Band, 114. Sitzung, p. 3275.

*Militär-Strafgesetzbuch für das Deutsche Reich.*⁵⁵ The Minister stated that he did not agree with Bebel because these astronomical instruments were not private-owned stolen goods, they were confiscated by the government.⁵⁶ In order to demand China to pay for the war losses, Waldersee had properly ordered to take the instruments, which are legally owned by Germany.

On January 14, 1902, Dr. Georg Gradnauer, 1866-1946, member of the Reichstag, pointed out that Graf von Blumenthal (1810-1900) refused to obey Chancellor Otto von Bismarck's (1815-1898) order to bombard Paris during the Franco-Prussian War. He did not take art from Paris during occupation. During some previous wars in China, German soldiers were also ordered not to steal. However, when German army took these precious instruments home, the Minister of War failed to correct this unjust. The Hague Peace Conferences, effective as of September 4, 1900, ordered not to confiscate, destroy and/or willfully damage historic relics. German army broke the treaty no more than three months after signing it. This violation gave Germany a very bad name. He said Germany was already too involved into this fiasco that it must return the instruments to China on its own money. He threatened if the government of Germany failed to comply, his party would initiate a vote for the return the instruments.⁵⁷

On March 3, Dr. Gradnauer asked why the instruments were in the royal garden.⁵⁸ If they were war trophy, they were not supposed to become Kaiser's private items.⁵⁹ These instruments were not properly valued and used to deduct China's reparations. In addition to the instruments, Dr. Gradnauer disclosed German army

⁵⁵ Deutsche Reichstag, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstages* (Berlin: Norddeutschen Buchdruckerei und Verlagsanstalt, 1902), X. Legislaturperiode, II. Session., Vierter Band, 115. Sitzung, p. 3311-3312.

⁵⁶ Deutsche Reichstag, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstages* (Berlin: Norddeutschen Buchdruckerei und Verlagsanstalt, 1902), X. Legislaturperiode, II. Session. Vierter Band, 115. Sitzung, p. 3320.

⁵⁷ Deutsche Reichstag, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstages* (Berlin: Norddeutschen Buchdruckerei und Verlagsanstalt, 1902), X. Legislaturperiode, II. Session. Vierter Band, 117. Sitzung, p. 3373-3374.

⁵⁸ Deutsche Reichstag, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstages* (Berlin: Norddeutschen Buchdruckerei und Verlagsanstalt, 1902), X. Legislaturperiode, II. Session. Fünfter Band, 156. Sitzung, p. 4544.

⁵⁹ Deutsche Reichstag, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstages* (Berlin: Norddeutschen Buchdruckerei und Verlagsanstalt, 1902), X. Legislaturperiode, II. Session. Fünfter Band, 156. Sitzung, p. 4545.

even took eighty 17th century guns including several made by Ferdinand Verbiest, a Jesuit, based on modern-day research.⁶⁰ This looting was not just a case about Germany's national image; it was a violation of international criminal law.

After Dr. Gradnauer's speech, Bernhard Heinrich Karl Martin von Bülow (1849-1927), Chancellor of the German Empire, criticized him and his allies as being more like Chinese than real Chinese are. Bülow denied any possibility to return the instruments and the Chinese government did not want them, "They are simply government-to-government gifts. This is not unusual."⁶¹ Bülow tried to reframe the whole looting issue into a healthy give-and-take issue.

Congressman Georg Ledebour (1850-1947, SPD) disagreed and debunked the official story. He said, "Based on the Chancellor's words, we are more like Chinese than real Chinese are. He was using a Chinese-style thinking to reach this conclusion. I have to say to him that his way of thinking belongs to a Chinese Chairman, instead of a German statesman."⁶²

The Chinese refusal to take back these instruments undermined the collective efforts of the socialists. Some of them began to compromise because if China officially gave up trying to regain them, they could be legally become Germany's national property.⁶³ Many Reichstag members had determined not to waste time to against the government.

Unwilling to compromise, Dr. Gradnauer kept on fighting:

Gentlemen, the Chancellor was somewhat inconsistent yesterday. He called these instruments gifts government-to-government gifts. They look more like government-to-emperor gifts to me. ... If the majority of the Reichstag refused

⁶⁰ Deutsche Reichstag, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstages* (Berlin: Norddeutschen Buchdruckerei und Verlagsanstalt, 1902), X. Legislaturperiode, II. Session. Fünfter Band, 156. Sitzung, p. 4545.

⁶¹ Deutsche Reichstag, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstages* (Berlin: Norddeutschen Buchdruckerei und Verlagsanstalt, 1902), X. Legislaturperiode, II. Session. Fünfter Band, 156. Sitzung, p. 4545-4546.

⁶² Deutsche Reichstag, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstages* (Berlin: Norddeutschen Buchdruckerei und Verlagsanstalt, 1902), X. Legislaturperiode, II. Session. Fünfter Band, 156. Sitzung, p. 4547.

⁶³ Deutsche Reichstag, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstages* (Berlin: Norddeutschen Buchdruckerei und Verlagsanstalt, 1902), X. Legislaturperiode, II. Session. Fünfter Band, 157. Sitzung, p. 4554-4560.

our proposal, we are not the ones to feel sorry for our failure. On the contrary, we believe that we have done our duty to uphold international law. ... I believe the majority of our people would appreciate our position and agree with us. ⁶⁴

Finally, the majority of the Reichstag rejected the proposal for the government to return the instruments to Beijing and surrender all of its power over these items. ⁶⁵ On the same day of the vote, the Press Association and the *Electric Telegraph* ran Chancellor Bülow's speech to the Reichstag from Berlin. In addition to the Anglo-Japanese Alliance and the status of South Africa, he presented a new story on the instruments. He said these instruments were government-to-government gifts. Return them to China would be very impolite and would enrage Empress Dowager Cixi. People burst into laughter upon hearing his words. This story was reported by many papers later.

As the urge to return these instruments faded away, British atrocity during the Second Boer War became a new target to the German papers. In order to lower British anti-German sentiment, Paul Wolff Metternich (1853-1934), Germany's ambassador to the U.K., proposed to let Waldersee openly give speech to tone down the war issues. The Kaiser accepted this proposal. On June 22, British Field Marshal Frederick Sleigh Roberts (1832-1914) invited Field Marshal Waldersee to a dinner. Waldersee was there reading a speech given to him by the German Embassy saying that the British treatment to the Boers was humane. The German step back was intended to lower both countries' mutual media attack. The new British Prime Minister Arthur James Balfour (1848-1930), as well as Germany's Chancellor Bülow, did not want the mutual hate to get out of control. ⁶⁶Therefore, British papers stopped chasing this instrument looting case anymore.

However, things were not done on the American side. On June 24, the *New York Times* used British Field Marshal Roberts' words to praise "Distinguished Services" as a title to joke on the meeting between the two Field Marshals. The report said

⁶⁴ Deutsche Reichstag, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstages* (Berlin: Norddeutschen Buchdruckerei und Verlagsanstalt, 1902), X. Legislaturperiode, II. Session. Fünfter Band, 157. Sitzung, p. 4566.

⁶⁵ Deutsche Reichstag, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstages* (Berlin: Norddeutschen Buchdruckerei und Verlagsanstalt, 1902), X. Legislaturperiode, II. Session. Fünfter Band, 157. Sitzung, p. 4577 °

⁶⁶ John C. G. Röhl, *Wilhelm II: Into the Abyss of War and Exile, 1900–1941*(Cambridge: Cambridge university Press, 2014), p. 202-203.

sarcastically, “Even they must have been aware that the Commander in Chief of the Allied Forces in China arrived there too late to do any of the fighting. The “distinguished services” can scarcely have consisted in the capture of the astronomical instruments.”⁶⁷ The American report plainly noted that the Germans did not enter the battles and all they had ever done was to steal. Probably in order to get even, Waldersee mentioned American plunders during the Boxer Rebellion time after time in his Personal Memoirs.

Knowing that it was hopeless to regain the instruments, the Qing Empire began to rebuild a new observatory. In late 1903, a new observatory with very limited capacity was proposed. It was completed in the winter of 1905-1906.⁶⁸

5. The Breakout of the World War I and American Astronomers’ Involvement

(1) The Breakout of the World War I and the Resurface of the Looting Issue

As the memory of the loot was fading, a disaster had brought it under the spotlight again. On June 28, Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria (1863-1914) and his wife were assassinated in Sarajevo, Serbia. The subsequent diplomatic failure resulted in the Austria-Hungary Empire’s invasion of Serbia, which was supported by Germany. The invasion mobilized Russia to defend Serbia. Germany requested France to stay neutral, which was rejected. Germany then invaded Belgium in order to take on France. The U.K. declared war against Germany. An assassination had become the start of a Great War known as the First World War today.

Since the breakout of the Great War, the U.S. had adopted an isolationist approach to avoid entering any conflicts. On May 1, the British ocean liner RMS Lusitania was sunk by a German U-boat. Many Americans aboard were killed. This disaster fired a raging anti-Germany sentiment in the U.S. The subsequent U-boat warfare resulted in the destruction of many American ships. The U.S. and the Republic of China declared war against Germany in April and August of 1917. The entrance of the U.S. had brought an almost inexhaustible supply of men to Europe. The status of the war suddenly became unfavorable to Germany.

Ever since the U.S. entrance of the Great War, German-bashing was all-out.

⁶⁷ “Distinguished Services in China,” *The New York Times*, 24 June 1902, p. 8.

⁶⁸ 陳久金、崔石竹、李東生撰，《北京古觀象臺》（太原：山西教育出版社，2008.1），頁 136-137。
《申報》（上海：上海書店，1983 年，影印本），第 77 冊，頁 347。第 11197 號，光緒三十年五月初七日（1904.6.20），第二版。

Politicians used Chaffee and Waldersee's conflicts to promote hate. On November 14, 1917, the *New York Times* ran a piece titled *Teutons as Looters* to demonstrate that German atrocity displayed during the war had made it impossible to be an ally of other countries. When the conflict between Chaffee and Waldersee started, Germany filed a complaint to the U.S. However, Chaffee had already submitted evidence back home. Elihu Root (1845-1937), the Secretary of War, decided that he was right. The article had interviewed several soldiers who had seen the Boxer Rebellion and exposed what happened between Chaffee and Waldersee. The author had found Chaffee's original letters in the War Department's archives and published them under the authorization of Newton Diehl Baker Jr. (1871 -1937), then the Secretary of War.⁶⁹

(2) The Two Senior American Astronomers' Trip to East Asia

Even though the U.S. government was still attacking German plunder issue, it was still an outsider. America could criticize. It could hardly get in the way between China and Germany. Media has the privilege to comment, which is not allowed for the government.

The Far East trip of two old American astronomers accidentally opened a new route to force Germany to return the instruments. In early October 1916, John Alfred Brashear (1840-1920) went to Cleveland, OH to meet his old friend Ambrose Swasey (1846-1937)⁷⁰ to spend a weekend. Swasey was also an excellent astronomer who had donated money to China's Canton Christian College and University of Nanking.⁷¹ He was then invited to visit China by University of Nanking. He asked his friend Brashear to join him. The two of them determined to went to China together.

On December 1, 1916, they and John Ripley Freeman (1855-1932) with two of Freeman's sons went aboard a ship to China from Vancouver, Canada. They reached Yokohama, Japan on December 14, and then stopped by Busan and Seoul of Korea, which was under Japanese occupation then. When they finally reached Beijing, they visited the observatory and took pictures in front of the new instruments. After the visit of Beijing, they went to visit Hankou's steel works and then visited, Jiujiang, Nanjing and Shanghai.⁷² On January 15, 1917, they had a dinner party at Shanghai's

⁶⁹ "Teutons As Looters In Boxer Campaign," *The New York Times*, 14 Nov. 1917, p. 4. ◦ *The Shanghai Times* (1914-1921); 18 December 1917, p. 9.

⁷⁰ Campbell, W. W, "Ambrose Swasey, 1846-1937," *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, Vol. 49, No. 290, p.179.

⁷¹ 冷天、趙辰,〈原金陵大學老校園建築考〉,《東南文化》,2003年3期,頁53-58。

⁷² W. Lucien Scaife ed., *John A. Brashear: the Autobiography of A Man who Loved the Stars*(New

Palace Hotel of No. 19, the Bund held by the Saturday Club and the University Club. The host of the party was TANG Shaoyi, formerly China's Premiere. Swasey, Brashear, and Freeman were the party's main guests. They were invited to speak before the audience. Swasey, the builder of four of the world's greatest observatories, said that astronomers of his era were appreciative to the works by the Jesuits. As a scholar interested in the history of astronomy, he hoped the stolen instruments would be returned to the place where they belonged one day together with a modern observatory. Brashear told the audience that he had been watching the skies for 68 years. When the astronomers were calculating the orbit of the Halley's Comet, they had consulted the data collected by Chinese astronomers 4000 years ago. He said that he had written to WU Tingfang (1842-1922), China's Minister of Foreign Affairs, to help the Chinese take back these instruments.⁷³ They had promised to take back the instruments.

They went to Manila, Hong Kong and Kobe, and returned to San Francisco via Honolulu. While they were in California, they visited Lick Observatory and Mount Wilson Observatory⁷⁴ and had met William Wallace Campbell (1862-1938),⁷⁵ the head of Lick who had seen the instruments in Germany. Subsequently, Campbell published an article on the *San Francisco Chronicle* about the German looting issue.⁷⁶ On January 6, 1918, Campbell wrote another commentary titled, Kaiser Wilhelm as a Pillager in Boxer days: He refused to Return China's Astronomical Instruments, though France Set an example, and used them to Ornament Potsdam Palace Grounds, on the *New York Times*. The second article mentioned Chaffee's complaint and Kaiser's speech. He said the spirit of Christ was not evident in Kaiser's treatment of China, and it seems to have no abiding place in the German War Lord's mind in the past three years.⁷⁷ Campbell's articles paved the road to future struggle by American astronomers.

York: The American Society of Mechanical Engineers, 1924), p. 181-194.

⁷³ "The Saturday and University Clubs: Monday's Dinner," *The North China Herald and Supreme Court & Consular Gazette (1870-1941)*; Jan 20, 1917, p. 127.

⁷⁴ W. Lucien Scaife ed., *John A. Brashear: the Autobiography of A Man who Loved the Stars* (New York: The American Society of Mechanical Engineers, 1924), p. 215.

⁷⁵ "Ambrose Swasey, 1846-1937," *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, Vol. 49, No. 290, p.179-185.

⁷⁶ "Kaiser's Peking Loot: Ruler Who Stole Valuables Now On Potsdam Lawns," *The Shanghai Times* (1914-1921); May 18, 1917, p. 8.

⁷⁷ W. W. Campbell, "Kaiser Wilhelm as a Pillager in Boxer Days," *The New York Times*, 6 Jan. 1918, p. 71.

(3) The Involvement of the American Astronomical Society (AAS)

The American Astronomical Society was established on September 6-8, 1899 as the Astronomical and Astrophysical Society of America (AAS),⁷⁸ which was renamed as the American Astronomical Society (AAS) in 1914.⁷⁹

As to the research of American scholars Brant L. Sponberg and David H. DeVorkin, American astronomers and the AAS contributed much to the return of Chinese instruments. Freeman, a friend who travelled with Swasey and Brashear wrote to the German Minister in Peking to complain. He also wrote to George Ellery Hale (1868-1938), a friend to the President Woodrow Wilson, to urge him to help. Hale took the responsibility to use the AAS to promote this issue and wrote to the AAS. The AAS agreed and sent to meet the Chinese Minister of the U.S. The Society then drafted an official resolution to take necessary measurements to urge Germany to return the instruments “transferred” from Beijing to Potsdam.

Hale knew that the word transfer was too soft. However, he was reluctant to use the word “stolen” as it was certainly not acceptable by the Germans. As the Society waited for Chinese approval, the movement was halted. The final version of the resolution was passed by late February with a modification. The word “taken” was replaced by “transfer”. However, most other responses suggested the use of even stronger words.

As noted by many historians, this resolution was powered by an anti-German sentiment. However, this resolution also reflected the trend for the science community to reject totalitarian regimes. Many American, British and French scientists joined the cause. For instance, on behalf of the Society, Campbell did not want the culprit go away easily. In November 1918, he had mailed Robert Lansing (1864-1928), Secretary of the State, to take care of the Chinese instrument issues during the Paris Peace Conference.

The financial value of the instruments is small, but the moral value of the incidents is far from insignificant. It seems to me that the subject might be brought to the attention of the Peace Conference and of the whole world in

⁷⁸ Donald E. Osterbrok, “AAS Meetings before There was an AAS: The Pre-History of the Society,” David H. DeVorkin ed., *The American Astronomical Society’s First Century*, (Washington D. C.: The American Astronomical Society, 1999), pp. 3-19.

⁷⁹ David H. DeVorkin, “The Pickering Years,” David H. DeVorkin ed., *The American Astronomical Society’s First Century*, (Washington D. C.: The American Astronomical Society, 1999), pp. 20-36.

such a way as to make it teach an extremely valuable lesson in morality and idealism

In December 1918, Breckenridge Long, Assistant Secretary of State, had told Campbell this issue has been in the government's agenda.

6. The Return of the Astronomical Instruments

(1) The Chinese Proposal at the Paris Peace Conference

On October 4, 1918, Germany, Austria, and Turkey collectively initiated a truce negotiation. Hope to end the killings finally arrived after four years of war.⁸⁰ Being victorious, China expected to overturn certain past unjust. On December 11, Wellington Koo (顧維鈞, 1888-1985), Chinese minister to the U.S., and Alfred Sao-ke Sze (施肇基, 1877-1958), Chinese minister to the U.K., arrived Paris to be China's delegation to the Paris Peace Conference.⁸¹ On December 14, Woodrow Wilson, U.S. President, reached Paris.⁸² On January 1, 1919, Dr. Westel W. Willoughby (1867-1945), Chinese advisor, arrived Washington, D.C. and claimed that the Chinese government would want Germany to return the Chinese instruments.⁸³ Lou Tseng-Tsiang (陸徵祥, 1871-1949), the leader of the Chinese delegation, arrived on January 11.⁸⁴ On January 22, the Chinese delegation held a meeting whose issues included the demand to Germany to return looted instruments.⁸⁵

Sao-ke Sze drafted an English letter, which was China's first official request of its kind, to demand Germany to return these astronomical instruments on February 25. He used precise legal words to demand Germany to return full and well-preserved relics with care to the place where they belonged. On March 8, Lou Tseng-Tsiang

⁸⁰ 《密笈錄存》，頁 34。〈駐義王公使電〉，七年十月六日。

⁸¹ 《密笈錄存》，頁 64。〈駐英施公使電〉、〈駐美顧公使電〉，七年十二月十一日。

⁸² 《密笈錄存》，頁 64。〈駐美顧公使電〉，七年十二月十一日。

⁸³ “Chinese Ask Return of Boxes, War Loot,” *Los Angeles Herald*, Volume XLIV, Number 52, 1 January 1919, p. 1.

⁸⁴ 《密笈錄存》，頁 66。〈法京陸專使電〉，八年一月十一日。

⁸⁵ 《申報》(上海：上海書店，1983 年，影印本)，第 162 冊，頁 360。民國 9 年(1920)1 月 23 日，第六版。

⁸⁶ 近代史研究所檔案館藏，北洋政府外交部全宗，巴黎和會，巴黎和會雜件，施公使交來函稿，編號：03-37-022-02-001。文件以「出席和平代表大會中國代表團」(délégation chinoise au congrès de la paix)信箋書寫，內容有四，「一、要求歸還天文儀器一份」、「二、稅則問題二份」、「三、鴉片問題二份」和「四、外國郵局問題二份」

submitted China's demands to return the instruments in multiple parts to Germany and Austria, which would later become the Article 131 of the Versailles Treaty.⁸⁷ However, the clause that demanded Chinese government had the right to appoint qualified personnel to Berlin to check and monitor the instruments' packaging and shipping, originally drafted by Sao-ke Sze, was not included. On March 20, Shanghai *Shun Pao* ran an article based on a March 18 Reuters wired article to disclose this message.⁸⁸

According to a report on March 21 from Copenhagen, Denmark, German government had determined to return the instruments to China, shortly after China submitted the demand.⁸⁹ Since China ceased to have a diplomatic relationship with Germany, German government tried to reach China to work out a return plan via the Netherlands in February 1919.⁹⁰ The change of Netherlands' minister in Beijing during this period delayed the return.

On April 18, *Science* reported that the German government had determined to return the instruments taken from China in 1900 and negotiations were ongoing.⁹¹ On May 19, the *Times* of London ran a piece of the Wireless Press saying that a German official radio station had disclosed the shipping negotiations had started.⁹² On May 24, the *Portsmouth Daily Times* published a picture of an instrument in a Kaiser's palace and introduced to the reader relative articles to demand the return of

⁸⁷ 《密笈錄存》，頁 109-114。〈法京陸專使等電〉，八年三月十一日。

⁸⁸ 《申報》（上海：上海書店，1983 年，影印本），第 157 冊，頁 307。民國 8 年(1919)3 月 20 日，第三版。

⁸⁹ 《申報》（上海：上海書店，1983 年，影印本），第 157 冊，頁 530。民國 8 年(1919)4 月 2 日，第六版。

⁹⁰ 北洋政府外交部 4 月 7 日辰字第四千七十四號，收有荷蘭公館歐登科(Willem Jacob Oudendijk, 1874-1953)致函北洋政府外交部次長中文函件一封，參見中央研究院近代史研究所藏，〈交還觀象台儀器事〉，《北洋政府外交部檔案》，民國八年四月七日，編號：03-37-008-02-004。

⁹¹ "Summary of Peace Treaty given to Germany, restitution to China," *The Milwaukee Journal*, 8 May 1919, p. 181. "China," *The Madison County Monitor*, 9 May 1919, p. 3. 《申報》（上海：上海書店，1983 年，影印本），第 158 冊，頁 134。民國 8 年(1919)5 月 9 日，第六版。"Scientific Notes and News," *Science*, Vol. XLIX, No. 1268, 18 April 1919, p. 377. W. W. C., "General Notes," *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, Vol. 31, No. 181 (June, 1919), pp. 200-202.

⁹² "German Loot To Be Given Back To Peking," *The Times* (London, England), Wednesday, Mar 19, 1919; p. 9; Issue 42052. Jill Hills, *The Struggle for control of Global Communication: The Formative century*(Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002), p. 122-123.

instruments in the Treaty of Versailles.⁹³

(2) The Return of the Astronomical Instruments

On June 10, 1920, the shipment was loaded on a Japanese cargo ship *Nankai Maru* and was scheduled to reach Tianjin via Kobe, Japan. According to a *Guangzhou Times* report based on the *Japan Chronicle*, on August 1, the ship reached Japan and was confiscated by the Japanese government. Japan demanded China to accept the transfer of former German concessions in Shandong province to Japan. Since German government wanted to restore diplomatic and economic relationships with China⁹⁴, the Dutch government helped negotiation once again.⁹⁵

On January 25, 1921, five pieces of instruments reached Tianjin aboard *Sakurajima Maru*. On April 7, the instruments finally returned to the observatory after a twenty-year departure. The Beijing *Chenbao* reported, “The Beijing observatory would hold a meeting and publish a pictorial for the return of astronomical instruments. We have learned that it has taken much effort to negotiate for the return of these instruments. **The including** of the instruments’ return in the Treaty of Versailles has much to do with China’s past national frustrations.⁹⁶ This has been seen as a major event.” Many Chinese papers, probably saw it as a national disgrace, chose to limit their coverage on this issue.

On April 16, the *Shun Pao* reported the Ministry of Interior and the Ministry of Education were arguing over the control over the instruments. The Ministry of Education finally obtained these instruments and transferred them to the Central Observatory.⁹⁷ On May 6, the instruments were installed in their original place by A. Thiele, a Dutch engineer, and formally accepted by an officer of the Ministry of Education. Even though China turned out victorious in the Great War, Japan took over much of German privileges in China’s Shandong Province.⁹⁸ On July 4, the *Shun*

⁹³ “Germany forced to Return Scientific Instruments Stolen from the Chinese,” *The Portsmouth Daily Times*, 24 May 1919, p. 3.

⁹⁴ “The Peking Astronomical Instruments: Arrive By Nankal Maru,” *The Canton Times* (1919-1920), Aug 17, 1920, p. 6.

⁹⁵ 陳久金等，《北京古觀象臺》（太原：山西教育出版社），頁 137。

⁹⁶ 陳久金等，《北京古觀象臺》（太原：山西教育出版社），頁 137。

⁹⁷ 《申報》（上海：上海書店，1983 年，影印本），第 169 冊，頁 793。民國 10 年(1921)4 月 16 日，第七版。

⁹⁸ Rainer Schwarz, "Raub und Rückgabe astronomischer Instrumente des alten Peking Observatoriums durch das imperialistische Deutschland", in: *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin* (Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe), Jg. 16.

Pao ran an article titled “On the Return of Our Astronomical Instruments by Germany” that began with, “History has shown us many examples of the return of national treasures. However, when we think of what’s happening in Shandong Province, it’s still sad to see how a victory could be so bitter.”⁹⁹

Campbell wrote an article for the *Chico Record* on May 15 that mentioned that he had received a letter from China saying the instruments were already in China and installed in their original location. He noted that after the signing of the truce on November 11, 1918, American astronomers had worked very hard to urge the American delegation to force Germany to return these instruments at the Paris Peace Conference.¹⁰⁰ On October 7, he published another article on the *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific* and summarized with a touching paragraph, “Financial values concerned in this subject are small, but the principle involved is very important to modern civilization.”¹⁰¹

7. Conclusion

The observatory was originally a Jesuit strategy that used modern science to promote Christianity in China. However, the rites controversy caused China’s total ban of Christianity that marked the end of missionary science importation. The West’s forced entry of China since the mid-1850s opened the doors of the observatory. The invention of photography allowed taking of pictures to these monuments of past glory. The entrance of a newer generation of scientists not just brought updated science to China; they also wanted to investigate the past of their forerunners. China’s traditional astronomy began to unfold before their eyes. The observatory’s instruments, having a historical inheritance of the Yuan Empire and Tycho’s sciences, became the focus of many researchers. Unfortunately, they had also attracted invaders’ attention.

(1967), H. 3, S. 453-462. 其實此人可能是在京德人，在管理使館界事務公署(The Administrative commission of the Diplomatic Quarter)擔任職員，只是受聘於荷蘭公使館。參見 Alex Ramsay, *The Peking Who’s who, 1922* (北京：通商行名編輯處，1922)，頁 50、89。

⁹⁹ 《申報》(上海：上海書店，1983年，影印本)，第 171 冊，頁 70-71。民國 10 年(1921)7 月 4 日，第十至十一版。“The Return of Astronomical Instruments by the German Government in 1921. A text from the Chinese daily *Shen-Bao* of that time,” in Yi Shitong (伊世同) and Jerome Heyndrickx (韓德力), *The Verbiest Celestial Globe: A symbol of China-Europe Cooperation*, Leuven: S. Vloeberghs, CEI, Cultural Centre Atrechtcollege, 1989, p. 17-18.

¹⁰⁰ “Loot Is Returned To China,” *Chico Record*, Number 271, 15 November 1921, p. 2.

¹⁰¹ William Wallace Campbell, “Return of Astronomical Instruments to China,” *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, vol. 33(1921), No. 195(Oct), pp. 272-273.

The Westerner's intervention of the Boxer Rebellion of 1900 was originally a rescue mission to save those foreigners under mob attack. However, the occupation of the Beijing City turned a military issue to a complex game of international profit sharing. German army entered the scene two months after the end of the battles. Having the highest rank of all, the late arrival of Field Marshal Waldersee turned him to be the chief of the joint forces. A meritless commander with a meritless army entered the scene. They did nothing but to work out a plan to split the steal of the observatory instruments with the French army. A just rescue mission in the beginning had become an international robbery. In order to keep the mission justifiable, General Chaffee of the U.S. army wrote to Waldersee to complain.

The looting had been a closely watched issue by the mass media since the very beginning. The real time reporting enabled by radio and telegram helped to change the fate of these instruments. British and American journalism was especially helpful in the early days. Even though the Second Boer War silenced the British press, their American counterparts kept on doing the good job and even promoted public awareness on this issue. Many German papers dared to challenge the Kaiser by presenting balanced and just views. Many foreign language papers published by China-based foreigners closely followed international news sources. They helped to increase many readers' awareness. Many Chinese papers chose to cover Shandong issues instead because Chinese readers cared more about the deprivation of vital national interests.

After the looting, Qing had ordered Yinchang to negotiate. However, in front of the German hardball attitude, China could do very little. Prince Qing's refusal to the German demand to give false testimony also saved China in the end. The demand to return, drafted by Alfred Sao-ke Sze of the China delegation became Article 131 of the Versailles Treaty. Even though finally the Chinese delegation refused to sign the treaty because of the unfair Shandong issue, the return was still enforced. Chinese government's diplomatic efforts were reasonably good.

Academic organizations were very helpful for the return of the instruments. The Royal Central Asian Society and the Royal Society of Arts were enthusiastic on this issue. American astronomers were the most important helpers behind the return. They had visited the observatory in person and used their connections in scientific and politics circles to help. Their efforts kept this issue from becoming a bargain token in the game of power. Even though Campbell's conclusion was simple, these words most properly concluded the meaning of this effort to save an invaluable scientific relic.

後記：謹以此文紀念巴黎和會百年，天文儀器歸還九十八年。

Afterword: This article is dedicated to the 100th anniversary of the Paris Peace Conference and the 98th anniversary of the return of the Chinese astronomical instruments.

四、心得及建議事項

(一) 鼓勵研究員出國發表學術研討以免人才斷層

交流和研究是博物館策展內容的重要活水，可以保持博物館的國際競爭力，筆者多年來亦得益於此，完成了許多國際研究和策展合作。建請院方多鼓勵研究人員出國發表論文，並簡化相關程序，滾動管理公務出國經費之學術效益，以鼓勵本院研究員團隊成長和進步。

(二) 歐洲文物界的新話題：歸還文物

法國總統馬克宏於 2018 年 11 月正式宣布，向法國前殖民地，現今西非國家貝寧(Benin)歸還 26 件法軍於 1892 年戰爭掠奪的文物。由法國總統府委託的藝術歷史學家和經濟學家，亦發表報告，建請法國政府應將國內博物館收藏的以萬計非洲文物，歸還給原屬國。由於西歐和北美都保存有大量的掠奪文物，這一決策，再次掀起前西方殖民國家歸還文物的討論。諸如大英博物館(British Museum)、羅浮宮(Louvre)、柏林博物館島(Museum Island)以及紐約大都會藝術博物館(Metropolitan Museum of Art)等博物館均成為關注的對象。誠然，歸還文物的議題極為複雜，牽涉到歷史、法律和政治等相關議題。從筆者此次在研討會中宣讀的論文因涉及文物歸還問題，獲得了許多學者的迴響，並受邀於即將出版的英語專著收錄。此外，奧地利和德國等地學者，也紛紛表示其國內此種呼聲甚高，拙文或可以石激浪。除文物典藏單位的研究外，研考單位應當密切注意此一國際議題，客觀掌握國際歸還文物的形勢及相關國際法環境，以使我國不致於默聲於清宮文物歸還議題。

(三) 博物館數位化工作的趨勢

本次受邀與會，亦主持一個工作坊，代表各國學者對於故宮數位化工作成果的重視，從與會學者的提問來看，歐洲各國的數位化建設較保守，但新一代的研究人員已對此一發展趨勢即為關注。故筆者以在南院使用社交媒體，並詳細監看分析 Facebook 觸及率的策略，有效傳播泥土的座標展覽訊息成功為例，向各國學者說明時，獲得眾多迴響。

五、附件

邀請函

Dr. ZHOU WEIQIANG
Associate Curator
National Palace Museum
Taipei, Taiwan

Ljubljana, May 27, 2019

Dear Dr. Zhou Weiqiang,

We are pleased to invite you to the international symposium *From Center to Periphery: Collecting Chinese Objects in Comparative Perspectives*, held on September 19-22, 2019, at the Slovene Ethnographic Museum in Ljubljana (Slovenia), organized in cooperation with the Department of Asian Studies at the University of Ljubljana. In addition to your individual presentation about the astronomical instrument and its collecting history, we would like to carry out the workshop on *Database, digitalisation and visualisation of Chinese collections* on September 22 under your guidance. All expenses (flight ticket and accommodation) will be covered by the conference organizers.

Please take this as an official invitation to take part at the above mentioned symposium in order to apply for necessary support and all other formalities regarding your trip to Ljubljana.

Sincerely Yours!

Assoc. Prof. Nataša Vampelj Suhadolnik
Head of organising team

Head of the Department of Asian Studies, University of Ljubljana


UNIVERZA V LJUBLJANI
UNIVERSITY OF LJUBLJANA
Filozofska fakulteta
Faculty of Arts
ODDELEK ZA AZIJSKE ŠTUDIJE
DEPARTMENT OF ASIAN STUDIES
Ljubljana, Aškerčeva 2, p.p. 580