At a scientific reflection of today’s “globalization”, current studies in global history deal with the worldwide influence of former empire nations such as Great Britain or France. The classic studies on the Habsburg era have so far largely ignored the global impact of the former Austro-Hungarian monarchy. This is where the present publication, written from the viewpoint of a global architectural history, comes in. A major blind spot in existing research is Austria-Hungary’s participation in the “International Settlement” of Tientsin (today Tianjin/China), where, as one of nine nations, it planned its own trading settlement (“concession”) from 1900 onwards. The First World War brought this episode to an abrupt end.

The present book pursues the approach of linking historical insights with questions of contemporary relevance. The main part deals with the urban planning and architectural implementation of the Austro-Hungarian Concession in Tientsin (1901-1917), bringing to light more than 200 historical maps, sketches, plans, and photographs of previously unknown archival material. It then examines the strategies of the city government of present-day Tianjin to promote the architectural relics of the imperialist era as Chinese cultural heritage. In addition, an introduction (by Georg Lehner) sheds light on the historical process of rapprochement of Austria-Hungary with the “Middle Kingdom” over the 19th century, while an extensive appendix provides further valuable visual sources and references.

Michael FALSER is an architectural historian at the Chair of Theory and History of Architecture, Art and Design (Department of Engineering & Design), Technical University of Munich/Germany.
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Preface — Observations and Work Agenda

International ‘concessions’ or ‘settlements’ were strictly delimited enclaves within key trading cities, ceded to and governed by foreign powers after ‘unequal treaties’ as a consequence of military defeats. Concessions also came into being in China, from the mid-nineteenth century to the first half of the twentieth. They are currently being rediscovered as a field of research about the entangled histories between whole continents as the preconditions of what we today call ‘globalisation’.

In this context, the International Settlement of Shanghai (with its beginnings in the 1840s and ending shortly after the Second World War) certainly counts today as the most prominent and best-known example of the concession era in China. From today’s perspective, this is not surprising: the French and British quarters, in particular, were massive construction sites at that time and their built fabric has survived in a rather good shape until today. Additionally, access to archival material was comparatively easy for a long time. As a consequence, both Chinese and international research into Shanghai’s urban and architectural concession history are well developed and have produced some fascinating publications.

The situation of Shanghai’s arguably most relevant counterpart, Tianjin — or Tientsin as it was pronounced during the concession era itself — is rather different. Although the concessions of the city, situated to the south-east of Beijing close to the Bohai Sea, did span the globe — involving nine nations (Japan, the USA, and seven European countries including Russia) — international scholarship is still fragmented and not well interconnected. From a ‘Western perspective’, only a handful of British, French, Italian or US-American authors have produced monographs about their concessions, most often drawing on archival sources available in the former mother countries’ capitals — from London, Paris, and Rome to Washington D.C. On the other hand, Chinese scholars have already produced a considerable range of publications primarily based on material from Tianjin’s Municipal Archives or from various archives in the capital Beijing — archives that are increasingly difficult to access for international researchers. The British, French, or Italian quarters were in use until WWII and have survived to a considerable extent until today; they can thus be used as built primary (both visual and physical) sources in their own rights. However, their recently initiated, extremely touristic commodification, reinvention (through in-style additions) or even reconstruction by the Tianjin Municipal Government into a cultural heritage site endowed with a supposedly ‘cosmopolitan flair’ has created an additional challenge for research about the ‘original’ fabric. Last but not least, internal political agendas go hand in hand with powerful super-developers on the spot; facts and official strategies are most often shielded from any broader civil society-oriented discussions, not to mention grassroots initiatives or even resistance from local population groups against enforced relocation from their pulled-down housing.

Within this complex global configuration of fragmented (inter)national historiographies and limited archival access to Tianjin’s ambivalent imperialistic past (see the detailed discussion of the state of research in the central chapter of this publication), one particular concession had fallen into deep oblivion: the Austro-Hungarian concession. Filling this scientific gap is the overall goal of this book. Tientsin’s Austro-Hungarian concession existed only for some short sixteen years, between 1901 and 1917, and its urban and architectural history will be contextualised in great detail for the first time, making use of hitherto unknown published and unpublished material, both written and visual, that has been kept in the Austrian State Archives and the Austrian National Library (both in Vienna). These historical sources provide a solid foundation, to which a visit of the site of the former Austro-Hungarian concession in Tientsin was added. During a short stay in Tianjin in 2018, I was able to map out the concession’s last physical remains and set them in relation to a set of preliminary observations and open questions about today’s local heritage industry from a contemporary perspective.

Overall structure of this publication

While the episode of the Austro-Hungarian concession (from 1901 until 1917) and its afterlife, both of them read through the lens of architectural history, stand at the centre of this book, the historical account is framed by two additional sections: first, a Historical Introduction will provide the reader with a unique overview of the ‘many roads’ taken by Austrian (and, later, Austro-Hungarian) relations with China, from the early nineteenth century onwards, which ultimately led to the concession project
shortly after 1900. One may read them as many ‘intangible’ connections predating the ‘tangible’ and physical, i.e. urbanistic, infrastructural and architectural, impacts on the city of Tientsin/Tianjin. In this complex exploration of numerous historical aspects, it is my great pleasure to have persuaded my present co-author, Georg Lehner, to contribute to this publication. We both consider that our different disciplinary mindsets and their related ways of reasoning — those of a sinologist and historian on the one hand, and of an architectural historian on the other — unequivocally enriched this research project. In this connection, I would also like to thank Georg Lehner for developing a cross-referential glossary for the many English-Chinese-German terms floating around our topic. This glossary, which demanded much hard work, complements our joint effort to produce an index of all relevant names of places, persons, institutions, newspapers, etc.; both are provided in the appendix section of this book.

The second framing element of this publication is the central primary source for this present research, a “Photographic Album of the Austro-Hungarian Concession in Tientsin”, which I was extremely lucky to locate in the Austrian National Library. For the first time, it is reproduced in full and available to readers with my English translations of the original German legends. Along with other rediscovered maps, sketches, and photographs, I am convinced that this appendix will provide fascinating insights into a concession that, until today, was to a large extent handicapped by an absence of visual evidence.

An Austro-Hungarian concession in China rediscovered, or four global reasons for an unknown story

To arouse the curiosity of the reader, we shall ask right away about the reasons for this remarkable lacuna in historical knowledge. Why has the Austro-Hungarian part played during the Tientsin concession period been overlooked? I believe that four reasons can be summoned. With reference to the title chosen for this book — Habsburgs going global — I would like to argue that these four reasons are themselves entangled within a global logic.

- The missing Vienna-Tientsin connection for ‘Habsburgs going global’ and local circumstances

A first reason why the Austro-Hungarian concession was forgotten is to be found in the historical constellation shortly after 1900: at that point in time, the Dual Monarchy had already contributed a few hundred marines to the Allies’ punitive action against the so-called Boxer Uprising, participated in the subsequent capture of Tientsin in July 1900 within the Eight-Nation Alliance (see map below), and was a party to the unequal ‘Peace Treaty’ with local Chinese authorities shortly after (see this context in Georg Lehner’s introduction to this book).

Austria-Hungary was then already part of the Provisional Government of Tientsin that was installed in the summer of 1900 and would, from 1902 onwards, officially administer the city. But in 1900, some eloquent individual Austrian players in China managed — as I will explore at the beginning of my chapter — to drive the Habsburg Monarchy, with its relatively unbriefed ministries back home, into a hurried occupation of the last and ‘least feasible concession slot’ of Tientsin. This was part of a global chain reaction in the ever precipitating competition for imperial outreach and prestige between Paris, London, Rome, Berlin and Vienna. But the Austro-Hungarian settlement itself was an absolute late(s)-comer to the international “scramble for concessions” (to use a famous expression which is attributed to British Prime Minister Lord Salisbury) in the city of Tientsin, whereas more powerful nations, such as Great Britain and France, had already installed their concessions from the 1860s onwards in much more suitable, almost vacant areas along the Hai River to the east of the older, traditional ‘Chinese City’. By occupying the last available spot — arguably the least practicable one, because it was de facto already heavily populated by some 30,000 Chinese — an effective new development, both in urbanistic, infrastructural and architectural terms, was therefore extremely difficult from the beginning. Not only did ‘local’ resistance from, and constant negotiation with this population leave little space and energy for construction projects during the short Austro-Hungarian intermezzo. Also at the ‘global’ other end of the world, in far-away Europe, things were not much easier: political decision-makers in Vienna and Budapest were extremely sceptical and hesitant about all ‘colonial’ experiments (the Dual Monarchy never had ‘real’ colonies overseas before or after, nor any real experience in ‘world trade’ in overseas), and Austrian and Hungarian entrepreneurs in trade, industry, and manufacturing also showed little courage when it came to investing into this project. This ‘local-global handicap’ meant that — in comparison to more efficient building projects by other
concession powers — only a very small amount of urban structure and architectural fabric was finally realised, a fact that only contributed to the Austro-Hungarian project’s fading into oblivion in the following decades.

In the global dynamics of Tientsin’s international concession area, from today’s perspective, it is no less important that it be chronicled. I am convinced that exploring the ambivalent role and far less prominent story of Austro-Hungary as a rather reluctant coloniser in the ‘scramble for China’ (or, more precisely, a belated and hesitant actor within the ‘international concession game’) will help us a) to scrutinise (i.e. correct, differentiate and periodise) the present, all-too-easily adopted, homogenised, and one-dimensional narrative of one coherent Tientsin concession framework (in the singular) as an international success story of modernisation and cosmopolitanism — a storyline that is today strongly nurtured by the Tianjin government itself in its urban self-branding efforts as a reborn global metropolis; and it will help b) to conceptualise global implications for Tientsin/Tianjin from the 1860s to 1940s through the lens of multiple colonialisms (in the plural) — with their different time regimes and institutional agencies, and not necessarily always successful architectural or urban impacts.

Lost in global translation? Repatriated, then divided archival material

These social, political, and economic obstacles notwithstanding, some urban fabric and architectural building stock did take shape during the brief sixteen years of Austro-Hungarian presence in Tianjin — as I will map out thanks to so far unknown archival material. Hence there must be a second reason why virtually no contextual knowledge about the physical reality of the Austro-Hungarian concession exists today. The crucial point here is that, once China had declared war to Austria-Hungary in 1917 and its concession was retroceded (at the latest with the Peace Treaty of St. German in 1919 and the sale of the consulate in 1923), many Austro-Hungarian diplomatic sources, from (hand)written correspondence to plans and photographs, were sent back to Austria (when they were not destroyed on the spot). In what I call here a global process of repatriation, many archival sources were partially ‘lost in translation’: while all the (hand)written correspondence material ended up in the Austrian State Archives in Vienna, crucial visual material (such as plans, maps, and photographs) that was previously attached to it was — and unfortunately still is — separated from it. Hence it is no wonder that comparatively few illustrative sources for the Austro-Hungarian concession of Tientsin were ever systematically identified, scientifically analysed, or published by emerging research into the ‘Habsburgs going global’ episode (from Mexico to China) in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

It was within the framework of the present study that I was able to rediscover — together with other sketches, plans, and photographs sporadically attached to written correspondence — an absolutely unique primary source in the Picture Archives and Graphics Department of the Austrian National Library in Vienna: a bound album from c.1911 entitled “Österreich-ungarische Niederlassung Tientsin” with 115 black-and-white photographs, a fifteen-page typewritten description of a tour through the concession, and a hand-drawn scaled development plan. All this new material is discussed in my chapter and published in full for the first time in an appendix to the book. In this way, I tried to reconnect visual information about architectural and urbanistic achievements with written correspondence material about the creation and development of the concession. I hope that the data provided will be of great scientific benefit for international researchers in the field — above all for Chinese art and architectural historians who often have little knowledge of German and can scarcely find their way amongst Austrian archives.

The global loss of German as a language of science and the hidden ‘national historiographical archival logic’

The third reason why the urban and architectural history of the Austro-Hungarian concession is almost unknown today is that the only comprehensive studies about it were written in the German language — a language which is increasingly ignored by current, primarily English-language international scientific research. These studies, part of PhD theses at the University of Vienna (Wagner 1955, Hörtler 1984, and Lehner 1995; I will discuss and quote these studies in my chapter), were unfortunately not published and therefore ‘out of digital sight’ for international research through many online research engines. Thus, the present book is the first English-language publication to unlock the curious history of the Austro-Hungarian concession to a broader, English-speaking audience. For this task, a wide selec-
tion of original German-language published primary sources (internal reports, newspaper clippings, travel reports, etc.) were translated and therefore made available to English-speaking readers for the first time. In this way, we hope to provide the (Austro-Hungarian) missing link in the chain and gradually complete the entangled history of all nine former Tientsin concession powers and their Chinese counterpart.

However, from a wider perspective, it could be argued that it is precisely the ‘inter-national’ framework of multiple colonialisms around historical Tientsin (nine imperialist nations plus China) that continues to function as a hidden, ‘national historiographical archival logic’ behind the still rather patchworky character of the state of research. In fact, current research clusters and findings can be ascribed to the same ‘inter-national’ configuration: French, British/American, Italian, Japanese and Chinese researchers not only most often elect to write the history of ‘their’ previous national concessions or ‘indigenous quarters’; their knowledge has also been structured by this logic given that they primarily consult the archives and libraries in ‘their’ mother countries before complementing this more sizeable amount of research with visits to other archives (for the Austrian context, see below). It must be admitted that the present publication, to a large extent, has equally followed this logic when analysing historical documents kept in various sections of the Austrian State Archives: in my chapter I will not only provide a critical evaluation of the state of research concerning already published material (secondary sources), but will also present a short overview of the structure of the relevant Austrian archives.

Last but not least, very often the various national historiographies of historical Tientsin have been published in their respective language. Certainly, here as elsewhere, English provides the usual translingual bridge for a conjoint, transnational research field: this undeniable fact motivated us to present our research findings about the Austro-Hungarian concession not in our mother tongue (German) but in this global lingua franca.

- The loss of original ‘colonial’ fabric during the reinvention of Tianjin as a ‘global city’

Finally, a fourth reason is worth noting when we ask why the built legacy of Austria-Hungary in China has remained almost unnoticed until today. Certainly, very little urban fabric was actually completed during the Austro-Hungarian concession era itself; and what little had been built may have been lost owing to political or natural reasons during the post-war era, including ideologically motivated neglect or even demolition during the Maoist period, an earthquake in 1976, and natural decay, followed by the burgeoning urban boom in the post-1990s. Therefore, the approach taken in the final section of the book is from a retrospective viewpoint: not only was little actually built during the concession period, but this limited original fabric seems to have been lost over the following decades. Paradoxically, what I will call a ‘history-cum-heritage turn’ since the early 2000s may be identified as the largest threat. While the present Chinese city of Tianjin is branded as a ‘global city’ through a systematic reinvention of its past as the Tientsin of concessions (which de facto was violent and imperialist) in the name of an international or, even, cosmopolitan legacy, the remaining authentic architecture of the Austro-Hungarian concession seems to be modified beyond recognition. Following the observations made during my first field trip to Tianjin in December 2018, I believe that the current heritagisation process even accelerates — rather than mitigates — this dramatic loss. When walking from over-commodified ‘Little England’ and ‘Little France’ towards ‘Little Italy’, I did notice that ‘Little Austria’ was also undergoing full commodification. Yet only limited heritage research has been invested into the latter to map out concretely what has been preserved, replaced, reconstructed, or simply reinvented, since the historical background and above-quoted visual primary sources had been missing until now as important referential and comparative data. In this sense, it must be noted that what I describe in this book as an process guided by a history to heritage logic is rather meant to raise a first set of open research questions without the pretence to come to a final conclusion or judgement. What will particularly be needed in the near future is a collaborative research effort that at last would bring together international experts and Chinese scholars — who enjoy better access to, and know their way around local archives, and could present their alternative conclusions about this field of imperialist history in China.

To conclude: a personal note

My own personal ‘discovery’ of the Austro-Hungarian concession was in itself a happy incident. With my professional background as a Vienna-trained ar-
architect, art historian, and cultural heritage specialist, I had the privilege to direct a research project in the field of colonial architecture, urbanism, and archaeology within a German Research Foundation-funded Cluster of Excellence, ‘Asia and Europe in a Global Context. The Dynamics of Transculturality’ at Heidelberg University (Germany), for many years. This also gave me the opportunity to travel extensively in South, South East, and East Asia in order to explore how imperial nations such as France (Falser 2020), Great Britain, the Netherlands, and Germany physically engaged with their overseas territories. In this context, I was invited to an international conference on heritage studies in Shanghai in 2018; after the academic event itself, this gave me the opportunity to explore more of the city’s historical concession areas, which are now promoted through manifold nostalgic heritage walks into the supposedly ‘good old times’.

My own extended China travels had started in the late 1990s and brought me from Beijing, along the Silk Road, into the Muslim regions in the deep west, and all the way down south to the former British territory of Hong Kong. This time, I travelled north of Shanghai to the former German marine base of Qingdao (in German Tsingtau, in operation from 1898 to 1914), an important city to be investigated for my new research project on German colonial architecture, which started in 2020 at the Department of Architecture of the Technical University of Munich, Germany (Falser 2021, Falser 2022 forthcoming, Falser 2023 forthcoming). However, after my architectural explorations of the former concession areas in Shanghai, I was also curious about its important historical counterpart: Tientsin. I took one of these miraculously fast bullet trains further north and reached the megacity that today is called Tianjin.

When I explored the city in December 2018 (a selection of my photographs is published in this book as well), I ended up finding myself in what local guide books and Tianjin’s city branding brochures propagate as the Austrian Style Riverfront, and what is called “Austro-Hungarian architecture” by national and local newspapers (Fig.).

However, as a matter of fact — and this was easily discernible for my eyes as an architectural historian from ‘Good Old European Vienna’ — the great majority of the depicted buildings (particularly those on a giant scale) were not originally Austrian at all, but produced as flat ‘in-style additions’ after 2000 and the global investment boom in Tianjin. As an effect of what critical heritage investigators may sum up as a global trend towards ‘Disneyfication’, the few really authentic remains of the Austro-Hungarian concession were dwarfed to small-scale, less ‘perfect’, definitively ‘unspectacular’ leftovers. (Nota bene: China had already replicated a complete Austrian village, Hallstatt, in the southern province of Guangdong in 2012.)

Back in my hometown of Vienna, I discovered the aforementioned photographic album of the Austro-Hungarian concession from c.1911 in the National Library; it constituted a perfect reference for understanding what had happened between 1918 and 2018 in Tientsin/Tianjin. Thus, I gradually deciphered the complex mix of very few original architectural remains on the spot, right next to alterations, later additions, and destructions, all the way to recent restorations, reconstructions, and strange architectural re-inventions à l’Autrichienne. Consequently, I became consumed by this investigation into Austria’s brief episode in East Asia, and then discovered a whole new collection of original material from the period. All of it is now made accessible
by this publication, depicted by a rich amount of illustrations, and listed in an overview in the attached comprehensive bibliography.

Given our parallel European debates about reconstructed city castles (as in Berlin) or over-commodified cultural heritage sites of the Habsburg era, I am convinced that this contemporary hybrid or side-by-side conglomerate remembered as ‘the Austro-Hungarian concession in Tientsin’ and now promoted as an Austrian Style Riverfront in Tianjin is in itself a unique document of our present super-globalisation — one that is definitely worth studying in all its facets.

Finally, I wish to express my gratitude to my dear colleague, the Viennese historian-sinologist Georg Lehner. He has not only contributed to this book, on the basis of his long-standing expertise, by providing a “Historical Introduction” to the — intangible — Austrian-Chinese relations from 1820 until 1900, which altogether opened up ‘many roads’ to the — tangible — impact of the Habsburg Empire within the Tientsin concession. He has also been a competent help for my own investigations into the architectural history of the Austro-Hungarian concession. Many thanks go to the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) and the Mayer-Gunthof-Stiftung for their financial support. Additionally, I would like to thank Thomas Just and Gerhard Gonsa from the Austrian State Archives (Vienna), and Hans Petschar and Peter Prokop from the Austrian National Library (Vienna) for their help. In the production context of the present publication, I would like to thank Katrin Keller and Herbert Karner from the Institute of Habsburg and Balkan Studies at the Austrian Academy of Sciences (Vienna) for their support, as well as Robert Püringer from the Academy’s scientific publishing house and Roxanne Powell for her patient English copy-editing of our texts. Last but not least, I would like to thank the two academics who conducted the blind peer review for their valuable suggestions along the way.
Historical Introduction.
The many roads to Tianjin. Learned curiosity, political disinterest, and imperialist opportunities:
Austria(-Hungary) and China

G e o r g L e h n e r

A lecture tour through the Habsburg Monarchy in the winter of 1910–11 brought the Austro-Hungarian concession in Tianjin 天津 into the consciousness of a wider public for the first time. These lectures were given by Fritz Ehrenfeld, the (former) police chief of the Austro-Hungarian concession in Tianjin. Ehrenfeld, the Czernowitz-Chernivtsi-born son of a journalist, brought around one hundred photographs to each of these lectures:

The remarks of Mr Ehrenfeld are accompanied by 100 large, very excellent photographs. This presentation of rich illustrative material makes the statements of the speaker, who incidentally has a well-trained speaking voice, particularly impressive. The impression that the listener receives from this intimate and close union of images and words is far clearer and richer than that which, for example, could be gained from reading a more extensive book on Chinese conditions.

Ehrenfeld, who first lived in Beijing for six years and then in Tianjin for four years, divided his lecture into two parts. In the first part, he dealt with Beijing, in the second part he focused on the Austro-Hungarian concession in Tianjin. The net proceeds of Ehrenfeld’s lectures went to the Austro-Hungarian Aid Association for Northern China [Oesterreichisch-ungarischer Hilfsverein für Nord-China], which had been founded on the occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of Emperor Francis Joseph’s accession to the throne (1908). After Ehrenfeld had given his lecture several times in Vienna at the public educational institute Urania and at the Scientific Club [Wissenschaftlicher Klub], his tour took him to Graz, Marburg/Maribor, Salzburg, Trieste (March 1911), Klagenfurt and Steyr (April 1911). The newspapers also briefly reported on what could be seen in the photographs shown by Ehrenfeld:

The photographs accompanying the lecture were clear and clean, you could see cities, pagodas, Europeans and locals, even a Chinese woman cycling, and one Chinese whose love for the colony went so far that he put on our tasteful waiter’s clothes and — acquired Hungarian citizenship.

The lively newspaper coverage of Ehrenfeld’s lectures contrasted sharply with widespread lack of interest in China in general, and in the area occupied by Austria-Hungary in Tianjin (February 1901) for the establishment of a concession in particular. This lack of interest was also reflected in the fact that even a decade after the “acquisition” of the concession there were hardly any publications about it on the Austro-Hungarian side:

1 While the term ‘concession’ was/is used in English (cf. Giles 1912, 1463 (No. 11827): “租界 a term used for the ‘Concessions’ at various Treaty ports, under which land is leased in perpetuity to foreign nations”), the terms ‘Konzession’, ‘Niederlassung’ and ‘Settlement’ were generally used synonymously in German-language texts of the early twentieth century. Li 2010, 50–88, offers a comprehensive overview of the development of treaty ports and concessions in China. For the return of the foreign concessions to Chinese administration (1917–1946) see ibid., 84 and the map in Wu 2010 [1999], 95.

2 In this introduction, Chinese terms will be transcribed according to the Pinyin system. Earlier/other renderings for Tianjin include Tientsin (mostly used in nineteenth and twentieth-century sources), T’ien-tsin (Wade-Giles system), Tyanjin (Yale system), Tiån-djin (Lessing-Othmer), and Tiëntsin.

3 Kärntner Tagblatt, 31 March 1911, 3.

4 Villacher Zeitung, 11 April 1911, 4.

5 Der Morgen, 6 February 1911, 7; Neue Freie Presse, 6 February 1911 (A), 9. In quoting from Austrian newspapers the letters attached to the date of publication refer to different editions of newspapers of the same day: (M) for the morning edition, (A) for the afternoon edition and (E) for the evening edition.

6 On Ehrenfeld’s lecture in Trieste (26 March 1911), cf. the note in: L’Osservatore Triestino, 28 March 1911, 2; quoted in Lee 2016, 2.

7 Grazer Tagblatt, 8 March 1911, 5.
It is a striking — and let us frankly admit it — shameful fact that even the commercially and geographically interested circles of our monarchy are barely informed of the existence of our concession [Settlement] in China. [...] It is significant that no publication has been devoted to the concession [Niederlassung] [...] since its establishment — apart from a small article in Das Handelsmuseum, 1907, No. 2. Even our consular reports from Tientsin did not deliver any information about the settlement until 1911.8

Since this state of affairs did not change in the period leading up to China’s declaration of war on Austria-Hungary (August 1917) and the subsequent return of the concession to the Chinese authorities, the reasons for this disinterest need to be investigated more closely.

To this end, this introduction will present some of the most striking features of the relations between Austria(-Hungary) and China: the early commercial voyages to East Asia and the beginnings of Chinese studies in Austria; the first steps taken by the Austrian government to establish consular and diplomatic representations, including the Novara Expedition; the signing of the first treaty with China in 1869; and the participation of China in the Vienna Universal Exhibition of 1873. Furthermore, it will shed some light on the entry of some Austrians and Hungarians into the Imperial Chinese Maritime Customs and the experiences of Austro-Hungarian travellers and explorers in China, as well as the presence of Roman Catholic missionaries. Finally, this introduction will summarise the somewhat reluctant steps taken by Austria-Hungary to join the ‘scramble for China’ after the Sino-Japanese War of 1894–95, and the motives behind Austro-Hungarian participation in the international intervention in northern China in the summer of 1900 and its occupation of a piece of land for an Austro-Hungarian concession in Tianjin. The fourth and last part of this introduction deals with the early history of the Austro-Hungarian concession up to the takeover of the administration by the Austro-Hungarian government.

1. Trade and curiosity

1.1. Commercial voyages before and after the ‘opening up of China’ (1820s to 1840s)

Shortly after the end of the Napoleonic Wars, the Austrian authorities received a plan for a commercial expedition whose purpose was to export mercury from the Idria mines to China. This plan was proposed by Edward Watts, who had experience with Asian trade and from 1807 was invested as the Austrian Consul General for the East Indies and China, and was searching for a way to circumvent the East India Company’s monopoly in the China trade. For this purpose, the Austrian authorities provided him with a man-of-war, the Carolina. Watts should remunerate the expenses. Preparations for the voyage to China were completed by the summer of 1820 (Fig. 1). Starting from Trieste in September 1820 and sailing via Madeira, Rio de Janeiro, Cape Town, Batavia and Singapore, the Carolina finally reached Guangzhou (Canton) in August 1821. During this journey, the spread of cholera after the Carolina left Batavia in June 1821 marked a dramatic culmination on board, causing the death of about a quarter of the crew. In Guangzhou, the Austrian commissioner accompanying this expedition soon found out that the deal proposed by Watts could not be concluded in the intended way. The Austrians managed to sell the mercury at a great loss and to buy some return cargo. Shortly after the return to Austria in the summer of 1822, Watts left the Aus-

---

8 Nemeček 1912, 97. See also Nemeček 1915, 76. On the article published in Das Handelsmuseum (1907) see the main part of this book.
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Two decades later, after the so-called opening up of China had been initiated by the Anglo-Chinese Treaty of Nanjing (August 1842), Austrian merchants took an interest in exploring the opportunities of the China trade. The most remarkable initiatives were the ‘East India Mission’ (1843–45) commissioned by the Trieste Stock Exchange and the voyage of the merchant ship *Airone* (1844–46).

The East India Mission was carried out by two merchants, Peter Erichsen and Alexander Conighi. It travelled via Suez, Bombay, and Singapore to China. In China, Erichsen and Conighi visited all five ports (Guangzhou, Xiamen, Fuzhou, Ningbo and Shanghai) ‘opened up’ to foreign trade by the Treaty of Nanjing. The main task of the two men was to explore market opportunities for Austrian companies in India, South East Asia, and China. A review of their report published in the official *Wiener Zeitung* praised Erichsen for telling “the plain truth” [die ungeschminkte Wahrheit]. Erichsen later became the director [Betriebsdirektor] of the *Donaudampfschiffahrtsgesellschaft* [lit. First Danube Steamboat Shipping Company] and never returned to Asia. Co-nighi later was appointed as the “Provisional Consul at Singapore for H.M. the Emperor of Austria”.

---

10 Lehner 1995, 66–76. For the published report of the Mission, see Erichsen 1846.
11 Wiener Zeitung, 19 February 1847, 408.
While Erichsen and Conighi travelled to the East on foreign ships, the Austrian brig *Airone* set sail for an epic journey that led her to North-Western Europe, South East Asia, China, and the United States. Having left Trieste in September 1844, in London the *Airone* loaded some cargo for China in January 1845 and reached Huangpu near Guangzhou (Canton) in July 1845. Having successfully escaped an attack by Chinese pirates and carrying back a load of tea, the *Airone* arrived in New York after a journey of 139 days via Cape Town and St. Helena. After travelling for approximately 39,900 nautical miles (i.e. about 73,900 kilometres) and without having lost a single man, the brig finally returned to Trieste on 30 May 1846.\(^{13}\)

1.2. **The beginnings of Chinese studies in Austria**

In the late 1820s, the newly appointed director of the Imperial Library in Vienna, Moriz Count Dietrichstein (1775–1864), took a vivid interest in expanding
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the collection by procuring books from all over the world. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Chinese books had been presented to the Habsburg Court by Jesuit missionaries. In 1828, the library purchased a set of illustrations offered for sale by the above-mentioned Edward Watts. These illustrations showed “costumes, court ladies, warriors, workmen, music teachers, ships, plants, birds, insects, sea creatures and also methods of torture and of execution.” In the early 1830s, Dietrichstein managed to purchase Chinese books from French collectors through the mediation of the Paris-based German Orientalist Heinrich Julius von Klapproth (1783–1835). The cataloguing of the considerably augmented collection was done by Stephan Ladislaus Endlicher (1804–1849), a botanist and librarian by profession, who developed a keen interest in the Chinese language. As a result of this interest, Endlicher spared no expense to print the catalogue of the collection — including Chinese characters. For this purpose, he even directed the preparation of Chinese printing types. Following the publication of the catalogue (1837), he began editing an atlas of China (Endlicher 1843) and completed the first grammar of Chinese published in German (1845).

In the early 1840s (Fig. 2), the newly appointed director of the Imperial and Royal Printing Office [k.k. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei] in Vienna, Alois Auer (1813–1869, later ennobled as Auer von Welsbach) not only developed a modernisation programme for printing presses and printing types. Relying on a group of linguists (mostly Orientalists), he directed the casting of types for a wealth of non-Latin scripts. For Chinese types, he relied on the philological expertise of August Pfizmaier (1808–1887). After completing his medical studies, Pfizmaier had delved into the study of Oriental languages (ranging from Turkish to Chinese and Japanese) and soon was able to translate Oriental texts. Before becoming a member of the Imperial Academy of Sciences in Vienna (1848), Pfizmaier helped producing Chinese printing types at the Imperial and Royal Printing Office. These printing types were later mainly used to supply the Chinese characters for Pfizmaier’s own works, published by the Imperial Academy of Sciences.

1.3. The making of ‘China’: China’s participation in the Vienna Universal Exhibition, 1873

The Imperial Chinese Maritime Customs, established in 1854, were responsible for organising the participation of China at the Vienna Universal Exhibition in 1873. As Robert Bickers put it, “China was being represented through foreign nationals in state employ, certainly, but here nonetheless was an integration of China — of Chinese things and Chinese opportunity — into the global encyclopaedia, on display in Europe […].”

China’s participation in the Vienna Universal Exhibition was initiated in summer 1872 by Heinrich von Calice, the Austro-Hungarian diplomatic representative to East Asia. Because it had been one of the aims of the exhibition “to show the international exchange of products” and to exhibit “samples and specimens of the articles of trade and commerce of all the important harbours and sea-ports”, Calice asked Sir Robert Hart, the Inspector General of the Imperial Chinese Maritime Customs, “for assistance in arrangements to prevent China from remaining unrepresented at the Universal Exhibition”. Hart instructed his staff to prepare collections “to consist of samples from merchandise” to be found in the fourteen Chinese ports that were already open to foreign trade.

The preparations for Chinese participation were coordinated by members of the foreign staff of the Imperial Chinese Maritime Customs, who also came to Vienna as “Chinese commissioners”.

From the beginning, China’s participation in the exhibition was overshadowed by that of Japan. It

15 For the history of the Sinica collection of the Imperial Library (today’s Austrian National Library) in Vienna, see Lehner 2013a.
17 See Lehner 2013a. For Chinese books in other parts of the Habsburg Empire, see Lehner 2013b.
18 For the history of printing Chinese characters in Austria, see Lehner 2004, 151–189.
19 On these publications, see Führer 2001, 47 f. (catalogue of 1837), 49 f. (atlas), and 50–53 (grammar).
21 On the representation of China at the universal exhibitions of 1851 and 1855, see Girard 2014; on the representation of China at the Paris universal exhibition of 1867, see Martin 2019, 131–134.
22 Bickers 2011, 204.
Fig. 3  Map of the 1873 Vienna Universal Exhibition Ground. Detail showing the Rotunde (the central building on the exhibition ground) and the ‘Chinese court’ to the east of the pavilions of Austria and Hungary. Detail from the *Weltausstellungs-Album* (1873), end of volume. [Private archive, Michael Falser]

Fig. 4  “Vienna Universal Exhibition, 1873. Chinese Exhibition.” A glimpse into the exhibits collected by Gustav Overbeck, I. & R. Honorary Consul-General in Hong Kong. [Wien Museum]
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was only several weeks after the inauguration of the Vienna Universal Exhibition that the Chinese part of the exhibition was completed and finally opened to the public. The ‘Chinese court’ was the last court on the north side (Nördlicher Hof) of the industry palace (Fig. 3).

Apart from the collections assembled by the Chinese Imperial Maritime Customs, some collections were prepared by Gustav von Overbeck (Fig. 4), a merchant and Austro-Hungarian consul general in Hong Kong (who also used his stay at the World Exhibition in Vienna to present plans for the establishment of a trading base in North Borneo to Austrian government agencies\(^\text{25}\)), and by the staff of the Austro-Hungarian consulate in Shanghai, which contained samples of products from all over China provided by Roman Catholic missionaries. The visitors were made aware

[...] that the Chinese exhibition is extremely important from the standpoint of commercial and transportation shipping interests The exhibition brings everything that China can offer for export to Europe in an exemplary selection; it also includes a complete collection of all natural products of China, a large part of which is still unknown in Europe, even to the men of science, and finally has objects in the field of handicraft production, that in terms of beauty, form and efficiency of technology, are not inferior to the other exemplary achievements of the Orient. [...]\(^\text{26}\)

According to the official catalogue, the three parts of the “Chinese exhibition” comprised the following thematic groups: mining and metallurgy; agriculture and forestry; the chemical industry; food and luxury goods; the textile and clothing industry; the leather and rubber industry; the metal industry; stone, clay and glassware; the haberdashery sector; the paper industry; mechanical engineering and means of trans-

---

\(^{25}\) Pape 1959, 191 f.

port; scientific instruments; musical instruments; army; shipping; a bourgeois house with furnishings; a farmhouse with furnishings; religious art; and the applied arts.  

The *Weltaussstellungs-Album* [Album of the Universal Exhibition] contained an illustration and a description of the so-called Chinese teahouse (Fig. 5):

[…] a coffee garden, in which there was also a strangely shaped tea pavilion tapering downwards and covered by a curved roof — actually the model of a Chinese fisherman’s house, but here called a Chinese teahouse — always found a crowd of admirers who stood amid these oriental splendours at times specifically devoted to Western pleasures — beer.

To mark the end of the exhibition, the Chinese commissioners planned to host a festive dinner (for a sum of fl. 10,000, today approximately €117,000). After some deliberation, they changed their plans and sponsored a ‘Chinese concert’ to show their appreciation for Vienna and the exhibition. In the run-up to the event, the *Neue Freie Presse* mentioned the great impression made by Japan’s participation in the exhibition and drew some comparisons:

And if the gala concert turns out to be brilliant, as is not to be expected otherwise, the procedure of the venerable representatives of the Celestial Empire may be boldly compared with the famous feasts of Cleopatra when she dissolved precious pearls in wine, or the world-famous luxury of that Augsburg patrician, who lit a room fire with promissory notes for the imperial guest. After the exhibition is over, we will talk much more about the concert luxury of our Chinese guests than at the time of the exhibition itself, in which, as is well known, the active Japanese nation was known as the lap child of both Viennese and foreigners.

The Chinese concert took place in the Golden Hall of the Vienna Musikverein on 4 November 1873, starting at 10 p.m. The programme of the Vienna Philharmonic included works by Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Mozart, Schubert, Beethoven, Schumann, Lanner, and Johann Strauß father and son.

One of the more lasting consequences of the Vienna Universal Exhibition was the establishment of the *Orientalisches Museum* [Oriental Museum]. Its main purpose should be “to promote trade relations between Austria-Hungary and the countries of the Orient and East Asia”. The institution was renamed *k. k. Handelsmuseum* [Imperial and Royal Trade Museum] in 1885.

### 1.4. Austr(o-Hungar)ian travellers: curiosity, scientific exploration, and language studies

On his extensive travels through Asia, Australia, and the Pacific Ocean (1831–36), Karl Freiherr von Hügel (1795–1870) who, thanks to his inherited wealth could live an independent life, also went to China, visiting Guangzhou in the first days of 1835.

My next visit was to China, the pedantic, hard-working people who clung to the past, an Asian Germany whose ancient institutions England will overthrow with its advancing system, just as France’s ideas did with ours; not within two decades, but unstoppable all the same.

While in Manila, Hügel learned of the death of the British superintendent in China, Lord Napier, to whom all the letters of recommendation he had for Guangzhou were addressed. Hügel was now confronted with the problem that he did not know anyone in Guangzhou.

Yet his short stay in Guangzhou sparked his interest in the Chinese language. In 1903 his son Anatole von Hügel remembered:

---

27 General-Catalog 1873, 757–65.
28 Weltausstellungs-Album, 7.
29 Neue Freie Presse, 31 October 1873 (M), 5.
31 Mittheilungen der kaiserlichen und königlichen Geographischen Gesellschaft in Wien 18 (1875), 21. For the preparatory consultations prior to the establishment of the Museum, in: Wiener Zeitung, 5 July 1874, 66; and Neue Freie Presse, 24 October 1874 (M), 6. For the Chinese exhibits on display in the museum, in: Wiener Abendpost, 8 May 1875, 5.
32 On the history and development of this institution up to 1919, in: Das Handelsmuseum 1919.
33 On Hügel, see Feichtinger & Heiss 2020.
34 Oesterreichischer Beobachter, 8 November 1836, 1522.
35 Oesterreichischer Beobachter, 8 December 1840, 1756: “China galt mein nächster Besuch, dem pedantischen arbeitsamen, an allem Frühem festhaltenden Volke, dem asiatischen Teutschland, dessen uralte Einrichtungen England mit seinem fortschreitenden [sic] System umstürzen wird, wie Frankreichs Ideen es mit den unseren getan haben; nicht in zwei Jahrzehnten, allein dennoch unauthaltsam.” This article had been reprinted from the Berlin Haude & Spenersche Zeitung.
36 Hügel 1860, 155.
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I well remember in Brussels — in 1866 or 1867 — seeing him at his table writing in Chinese characters. He told me that since his visit to Canton in 1835, in leisure moments he had continued to practise what he had then learned of Chinese from a Mandarin, with whom he had ever since kept up a friendly correspondence.37

In his four-volume work, Kaschmir und das Reich der Siek [Kashmir and the Realm of the Sikhs], Karl Freiherr von Hügel reported on an episode of his visit to Guangzhou, which reveals his interest in Asian arts and crafts. In the section “Religion and superstition” [Religion und Aberglaube] he remembered his encounter with a Chinese stonemason and presented an example of the use of Pidgin English in Sino-Western encounters:

A strange idea arose in me in Canton about the origins of the lingam and yoni. At a stonemason from whom I wanted to buy the statue of one of the main Chinese idols, I found, to my surprise, a few dozen lingams standing on the yoni. I asked who they were for; he said: ‘For no one, he makes a few hundred randomly every year’. I asked further: ‘Do you call this lingam?’ ‘No,’ was the reply of the Chinese in his English, ‘Hab nam Handmill,’ it is called a hand mill; I did not want to believe this, but he brought me the part that did not stand on it, and I saw that the lower part of a hand mill common in India perfectly resembled the lingam and yoni.38

In the years 1846–1848, Ida Pfeiffer (1797–1858) made one of the most remarkable journeys of that time. After raising her two sons as a single mother, she pursued “a natural wish for travel” and began extensive travels. On her first journey around the world, she arrived in southern China in the summer of 1847, not quite five years after the Anglo-Chinese treaty of Nanjing (1842). Although this treaty included the opening up of five ports to foreign trade, she found it rather difficult to travel to Guangzhou (where she stayed for five weeks) and the surrounding area. She repeatedly mentioned the difficulties encountered by women travelling alone, especially in China (cf. Howe 1999, Hildebrandt 2005):

[...] I learned what risks I, as a woman, had run in traversing the streets of Canton with no escort but a Chinese guide. Such a thing had never occurred before and [...] I might esteem myself as exceedingly fortunate in not having been insulted by the people in the grossest manner, or even stoned.39

In the summer of 1847, there repeatedly circulated rumours in Guangzhou “of the near approach of a revolution, in which all the Europeans were to perish.”40 Only about two years after Pfeiffer’s visit, the British forced free access to the city of Guangzhou.

Another interesting but far less documented journey took place in the 1860s. The travel destination was the Jewish community in Kaifeng 開封: “The only [European] Jew who travelled to Kai-fung-fu was a merchant from Vienna, J. L. Liebermann, who went there in 1867 without bringing home anything noteworthy from his trip.”41

The brothers József (1841–1924) and Ágost Count Zichy (1852–1925) undertook a much better documented journey through Asia.42 Having originally planned a world tour, they had to revise their travel plans after a severe storm in the Yellow Sea. The journey to East Asia took them via Constantinople, Suez, Aden, Ceylon, and Singapore to the Dutch East Indies, where they spent several weeks in January and February 1876. After visiting Siam in February and March they continued their journey to Hong Kong, which they reached on 29 March 1876. The first part of their journey in China took them to Macau, Guangzhou, Shantou 汕頭, Zhoushan 舟山, and Shanghai, among other places. After a six-week journey through Japan (12 May–26 June) they continued their travels in China. In northern China they visited Yantai/Zhifu, Tianjin and Beijing. In his travel notes on Tianjin, József Count Zichy, a former Hungarian Minister of Commerce, referred to the most faithful description of the so-called ‘Tianjin Massacre’ (21 June 1870), given by Joseph Alexander Count Hübner.43 After a few days in Beijing, the

37 Hügel 1903, 72, n. 3.
38 Hügel 1840, 368.
39 Pfeiffer 1850, 94.
40 Pfeiffer 1850, 103. On the xenophobic mood of the Cantonese, see also the following remark (ibid. 108): “Six young men made this same excursion [as she did] six months later, stopping at one of the villages and mixing with the people. Unhappily, they all fell victims to the fanaticism of the Chinese; they were most barbarously murdered.”
41 “Über eine versprengte jüdische Kolonie”, in: (Neuigkeits) Welt Blatt, 12 December 1890, 7. Liebermann’s travel to Kaifeng is also briefly mentioned in: Reichspost, 5 August 1900, 9.
42 See Slobodnik 2013.
brothers continued their journey via Xuanhua 宣化 and Zhangjiakou 張家口. They crossed the Gobi desert and travelled through Mongolia. In mid-August 1876 they passed the Sino-Russian border at Khialkhat and then continued their journey home through Siberia and European Russia.

Soon after their return to Hungary, Ágost Count Zichy gave a lecture to the Hungarian Geographical Society on their journey from Beijing to Urga through the Mongolian desert.44 In 1880, he published a paper on his travel memories from China.45

The most remarkable Austro-Hungarian expedition including extensive travelling within China took place in the years 1877 to 1880. From 1874, after the death of his first wife, Béla Count Széchenyi (1837–1918) had developed plans for a scientific expedition to Asia. The main task of this expedition would be to conduct research on the geography and geology of the mountain ranges in the Chinese-Tibetan borderlands. After reaching Hong Kong on 1 April 1878, the expedition team visited Guangzhou (Canton), travelled to Shanghai, made an excursion to Japan, visited Yantai (Chefoo/Zhifu), Tianjin, and Beijing (October 1878), before returning to Shanghai, from where they set out for their scientific work on 8 December 1878. They went up the Yangtze River to Hankou. From Hankou they crossed the Qinling range 秦嶺山 (24 January 1879) and continued via Lanzhou 蘭州 and Suzhou 肅州 to Anxi 安西, before reaching Dunhuang 敦煌, the westernmost point of their travels across China (May 1879). After returning to Lanzhou, they once again crossed the Qinling range and continued via Chengdu and Dajianlu to Batang 巴塘. In Batang they finally had to give up their plan to enter Tibet owing to the repeated threats of the Tibetan authorities (December 1879). They continued their journey via Zhongdian 中甸, Dali 大理 and Tengyue 順越 (Momein) before leaving the Chinese territory for Burma.46 For the first time, Europeans had taken the route from Batang to Zhongdian.47 With the permission of Count Széchenyi, Gustav Kreitner (1847–1893), a geographer who took part in the expedition, published a travelogue in 1881; the scientific results of the journey were published in three volumes (plus an atlas) in the 1890s — the Hungarian edition in 1890–97 and the German edition in 1893–99 (Széchenyi 1893–99).

On his journey around the world (December 1892–October 1893), Archduke Franz Ferdinand only stayed briefly in southern China, where he visited Macau, Hong Kong and Guangzhou. During his stay in Guangzhou (Canton), he was a guest at the house of Customs Commissioner Edward B. Drew:

Not only does Mr Drew speak a little French, he also has a small treasure trove of German words at his disposal [verfügt auch über einen kleinen Schatz deutscher Worte] — an achievement that may be credited to his long stay in Vienna, where Mr Drew acted as Chinese Commissioner on the occasion of the exhibition in 1873 and felt so comfortable that he still speaks of that time with satisfaction.48

In 1892–93, Dr. Franz Kühnert (1852–1918), astronomer by profession and sinologist by vocation, was the first person sent to China by the Austrian government to improve his language skills. Kühnert went to Nanjing, where he studied the language with the “bonzes of a Buddhist temple” and was trained by one of the Chinese literati. On various excursions, Kühnert visited public buildings and temples to improve his knowledge of Chinese culture. From Nanjing, Kühnert travelled to Zhenjiang 鎮江 (also in the Yangzi valley), the Hubei province, and Beijing. In Beijing, he was taught by the Chinese teacher at the German legation. Visits to the surroundings of Beijing, for instance to the Great Wall and the Ming tombs, rounded off his programme.49 Having returned to Austria-Hungary, Kühnert occupied himself with preparing several publications on the Chinese language and continued to teach Chinese at the University of Vienna. From 1897 onwards, he also taught courses on the Chinese language at the Oriental Academy [Orientalische Akademie] in Vienna renamed Consular Academy [Konsularakademie] in 1898.50

In the second half of the 1890s, two Hungarian researchers travelled to China. While Jenő Cholnoky

---

44 Zichy 1877.
45 Zichy 1880.
47 See Kreitner 1881, 839.
49 “Ein österreichischer Sinologue”, in: Neue Freie Presse, 6 June 1894 (E), 4.
50 See Lehner 2004b. On Kühnert and his sinological work, see Führer 2001, 73–90.
2. Austria-Hungary as a treaty power

2.1. Early consular and diplomatic representation in China

The origin and development of Austrian/Austro-Hungarian consular and diplomatic representation in China have been described so far almost exclusively on the basis of official correspondence between the Austrian government and the early representatives appointed to consular and diplomatic posts in China.

Having appointed German merchants as consular representatives in southern China and Hong Kong, Austria developed plans to strengthen her commercial relations with East Asia. Moreover, Austria tried to secure a leading role in the German-speaking world. To serve both these purposes, the circumnavigation by the frigate Novara also included a visit to Hong Kong and a short visit to Guangzhou (summer 1858).57 By signing a treaty with China (1861), Prussia outdid Austria in terms of its consular and diplomatic representation in China. Owing to the Austro-Prussian War (1866), a planned Austrian expedition was then delayed for several years. The first treaty between China and Austria-Hungary could only be signed in September 1869.58 While Dong Xun 董恂 (1810–1892), one of the two Chinese plenipotentiaries, signed the treaty in Beijing (2 September 1869), Chonghou 崇厚, the second Chinese plenipotentiary, signed the treaty in Tianjin (8 September 1869).

In his official report of the expedition, Karl von Scherzer included a brief description of the geographical location and economic importance of Tianjin:
Figs. 6a,b “Tien-tsin”, detail of the British Admiralty Chart 1863 – Pei-Ho or Peking River, sheets 2&3. [Wikipedia Commons]
Historical Introduction. The many roads to Tianjin.

Tientsin [Tianjin], the most important of the northern ports in China, was opened up to foreign trade in 1860. The city is in the north of Tschili [Zhili] province on the outflow of the Grand Canal into the Peiho [Baihe 白河, i.e. "White River"], 28 miles from the mouth of the latter river and 60 miles from Peking. Tientsin, which has the provinces of Tschili [Zhili], Shansi [Shanxi] and Shensi [Shaanxi] as sales areas, surpasses all other Chinese ports regarding the import of cotton goods and also shows a considerable importation in the other articles of foreign origin.59

Thus, Austria-Hungary was one of those countries that had signed an unequal treaty with China (see Fig. 6a,b for the British involvement in the Treaty of 1858). In addition to this participation in asymmetrical relations between ‘the West’ and China, another asymmetry must be considered. Although the Monarchy at that time still saw itself as a major European power, unlike other European powers, it had no political interest in East Asia and hardly any economic ties with China.

After his retirement from diplomatic service, Joseph Alexander von Hübner (1811–1892; Austrian ambassador to Paris 1849–59 and, in this capacity, involved in the negotiations to end the Crimean War; then Austrian ambassador to Rome 1865–68) undertook (and later published) A Ramble Round the World (Hübner 1871/1874). For about two months, from 3 October to 6 December 1871, he visited various places in China. From 31 October to 7 November, he stayed in Tianjin:

The town, properly so called, forms a square. Its walls are crenelated and flanked by towers at the four angles. It is in the suburbs that the trade and commerce of the town are centred. The town and suburbs are situated on the southern bank of the Peiho and of the great canal, which here joins that river.60

In his German travel report Ein Spaziergang um die Welt of 1882 he added several illustrations about his stay in “Tien-Tsin” (Figs. 7a,b). Apart from the walled city, Hübner also visited foreign concessions:

As to the English and French concessions, they will be quickly described. In the first, you find, as in all the Chinese and Japanese factories, the bund — that is, a quay, lined with some fine and well-built houses. Here — and that alone proves how much everyone in this place must consider his personal safety — all the habitations are surrounded by a strong wall. Everyone has a watchman. Furnished with a rattle, he makes every night the rounds of the house, and does not cease, by the noisy sound of his instrument, to warn thieves of this presence, and to disturb the peaceable sleep of the inhabitants. […] The French concession is as yet without houses. The small number of residents lived until lately in the Chinese town. The mission in the native city having now been definitively abandoned, they are building a church on French ground.61

In his travelogue, Hübner explained the motivations that had led Austria to join the other powers in concluding a treaty with China:

In signing, in concert with all the other great powers, a treaty with China, the Austrian government has assured for herself a place in Asia for any future eventualities. She has established a Consulate in the most important port of the Celestial Empire [i.e. Shanghai]; and in order to enable her consul to proceed with an exchange of the ratifications of the treaty, she has conferred upon him a diplomatic character.62

When summarising his impressions of international relations in East Asia in 1871, Alexander von Hübner clearly advised against any active engagement of Austria-Hungary in that region:

Complications on questions foreign to the monarchy may arise on these distant shores. To refuse all concurrence with her allies, as long as she is represented there, would be impossible; to co-operate on a great scale for the defence of interests which are not her own, would appear, from the point of view of a healthy policy, absolutely inadmissible. To limit herself, as Spain does, for instance, to hoisting her flag in the suite of the Anglo-French fleet, would be unworthy of her position as one of the first powers in Europe.63

---

59 Scherzer 1872, 291. For details on the signing of the treaty, see ibid. XI (introduction). On the history of nineteenth-century Tientsin, see Bernstein 1991. On the correct name of the White River (Baihe), see Möllendorff 1881, 119 sq., Wong 2006, 807 and the entry in Zhongguo gujin diming da cidian, 250: “[…] from the confluence of the Baihe and the Grand Canal the river is called Haihe 海河 […].” See also Couling 1917, 221: “Hai ho 海河, the name by which the Pai-ho is known at Tientsin, below the terminus of the Grand Canal.”

60 Hübner 1874, I:300.
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Fig. 7a,b “Tien-tsin, the Pei-Ho and its confluence” with the Grand Canal (above), and a rare view into a “Room or salon of a Chinese house” (below) in Hübner’s *Ein Spaziergang um die Welt* [A Ramble Round the World] of 1882 [Hübner 1882, un-numbered plates]
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Hübner’s advice to abandon Austrian diplomatic representation in China after the ratification of the treaty went unheard. Until 1883, Shanghai remained the seat of an Imperial and Royal Resident Minister at the Eastern Asiatic courts. In 1883, the seat of the diplomatic representation of Austria-Hungary in East Asia was moved to Tokyo to stress the importance that Japan had acquired in international relations in East Asia. Shanghai remained the seat of a consulate general. Joseph Haas, who began his career as a student interpreter, served in China for many years. In July 1896, Haas drowned in a swimming accident; his body was never found. In his memory, a monument was erected in the cemetery of the French concession in Shanghai. Its unveiling took place on 15 November 1898. It consisted of a marble column crowned by an ashes urn. In spring 1900, two bronze wreaths donated by Haas’ widow and the Imperial & Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs, respectively, were added.

2.2. Imperial Chinese Maritime Customs

Thanks to the Austro-Chinese treaty, Austrian and Hungarian citizens were eligible to join the multinational Imperial Chinese Maritime Customs. In July 1873, at the time of the Vienna Universal Exhibition, applications by two candidates to join the Customs were invited by the Habsburg monarchy authorities. Two young men, the Austrian Ludwig von Fries (1852–1904) and the Hungarian Edmund Faragó (1853–1925) left Trieste for China in September 1873. After their arrival in Shanghai, they went to Beijing to begin their Chinese language training.

Fries (Chinese name Fei Lisi 費理司) obtained the rank of Second Assistant B in April 1881. Fries’ brother Sigmund (1855–1893; mentioned as ‘Sigismund’ in the Service Lists of the Inspectorate General; Fei Ximeng 費習孟) joined the service in November 1876.

Faragó passed the compulsory Chinese-language examination in March 1875. As was customary for personnel of the Imperial Chinese Maritime Customs, Faragó moved to various custom houses throughout the Chinese Empire. In the summer of 1878, while based in Tianjin at the time of the Great Famine, which had hit northern China, he and his Customs colleague Hosea Ballou Morse were chosen “to help distribute famine relief funds, particularly since the relief effort had recently been stigmatized by charges of corruption”. In March 1881, Faragó was promoted to the rank of commissioner. After having spent nine years in China, Faragó returned to Austria-Hungary in 1882 for a short visit. On this occasion, the (Neuigkeiten) Welt Blatt (Vienna) published the following information: “His name Farago reads in Chinese: Fa-Lai-Ko [Falaige] and bears the meaning: ‘by legal means one must attain a high rank’ [Auf gesetzlichem Wege muß man einen hohen Rang erreichen].” From time to time, Faragó returned to Hungary — on one of these occasions he was received in audience by Emperor Francis Joseph.

The Fries brothers published an “Overview of the culture of tea and the trade with tea in China” (1870) and — with the help of his Chinese teacher, Xu Shensi 徐慎思 — Sigmund published an “Outline of the history of China since its origins” with translated and edited sources (1884).
The Vienna-born Arthur von Rosthorn (1862–1945), who joined the Customs in July 1883 (Chinese name according to the Customs List: Luo Shiheng 羅士恆) and left it in 1893, published “On the Tea Cultivation in Western Ssüch’uan” (1895). Rosthorn based his study not only on reports and papers on this subject but also on a form of field research: In 1891, when I made the journey from Tachienlu [Dajianlu 打箭爐] via T’iench’uan [Tianquan 天全] to Yachou [Yazhou 雅州], I had opportunities for observing the more outward and ostensible features of the trade; and, continuing to pursue the subject afterwards, I was able, through exceptional facilities, to bring together sundry details not hitherto commonly known […].

---

78 On Rosthorn’s sinological work, see Führer 2001, 97–123.
80 Rosthorn 1895, 7.
Travel across various parts of China was necessary for officers of the Imperial Chinese Maritime Customs to reach their places of duty. According to the editions of the Service List for the years 1876 to 1893, the four Austrian/Hungarian officers worked in custom houses all over China. Owing to new appointments they had to move regularly from one place of employment to another: from Niuzhuang (Faragó) and Qiongzhou (S. von Fries) in the south, and from Yichang (L. von Fries; Rosthorn) to Tamsui, i.e. Danshui (Faragó) and Takow (S. von Fries) on the island of Taiwan, not to mention appointments to Shanghai (Rosthorn), Tianjin (Faragó), and the headquarters in Beijing (L. von Fries; Rosthorn).81

According to an article in the Österreichische Monatsschrift für den Orient (1899), one Hungarian (Faragó) and four Austrians were employed by the Imperial Chinese Maritime Customs (Fig. 8).82 One of the four Austrians was Erwin Ritter von Zach (1872–1942; Chinese name Sha Ewen; serving from November 189783), who later joined the Austro-Hungarian consular service and became well known for his translations of Chinese poetry.84 According to the Chinese Imperial Maritime Customs’ Service List, three Austrians had joined in June-July 1898: Maximilian Franz Hey (1876–1914; Hai Ma liang 海馬良, stationed in Tianjin in 1901), Fritz Materna (Ma Dena 马德那, stationed in Beihai 北海/Pakhoi in 1901), and K. J. Andès (An Deshi 安得士, stationed in Wuzhou 梧州 in 1901).85

2.3. Wine and weapons: Austrian experts and ‘merchants’ in China

Grapes are only used as fruit and for more than ten years an Austrian has been the first and only person trying to produce grape wine — without having achieved noteworthy success so far, as he told me.86

The Austrian expert mentioned in this remark by Fritz Materna was Maximilian Freiherr von Babo (1862–1933), son of August Wilhelm von Babo (1827–1894), founder of the viticultural college in Klosterneuburg near Vienna.87 Max von Babo (as he mostly is called in the sources) took up his post in Yantai 烟台/Zhifu 芝罘 on the northern shore of the Shandong Peninsula in the summer of 1896.88 In the summer of 1900, Babo “in every respect […] rendered the most grateful services” to the Austro-Hungarian navy.89

For more than two decades (until China declared war on Austria-Hungary in 1917), Babo worked for Zhang Yu niangjiu gongsi 张裕酿酒公司 — also known as Chang Yü & Co. or Pioneer Wine Company. This company had been founded some years earlier by the overseas Chinese businessman Zhang Zhenxun 张振勋 (c.1840–1916; also known as Zhang Bishi 张弼士 or Cheong Fatt Tze).90 Shortly after Babo had been hired by the firm, Austrian newspapers wrote of an emerging East Asian competition for European wines;91 about a decade later, a short note in Scientific American gave a summary of the whole enterprise:

---

82 OMO 1899, 138: “Gegenwärtig sind in der Verwaltung der kaiserlich chinesischen Seezölle (Conceptsbranche) fünf Nationale vertreten, und zwar ein Commissioner, ein Ungar, und vier Assistenten, Oesterreicher.”
85 Statistical Department of the Inspectorate General, Service List, 27th ed., 1901, 16.
86 Materna 1908, 105.
88 See Godley 1986.
89 Winterhalder 1902, 90.
90 Christies (London Kensington), Live auction 5074 (see footnote 87).
The hill-land near Chefoo was bought by a rich Chinaman and grapes from the principal wine-producing countries of Europe were planted under the supervision of a European expert, who still has charge of the vineyards and winery. It is reported that some of the wines have been attacked by phylloxera, but most of them seem immune to the pest. The winery is in the environs of Chefoo and the wine is stored in large casks, made in sections in Austria and put together in Chefoo.

About two decades earlier than Babo, the Vienna-born Hermann Mandl had embarked on a career in China. Under the title “A Viennese in Shanghai”, the Neues Wiener Tagblatt presented some information on Mandl’s career. Mandl’s father was known as ‘Berliner Mandl’, a “well-known personality in the circles of Viennese society.” Having received a business education and training in foreign languages, Mandl had left Vienna after the death of his father and went to Shanghai, where he worked for various companies.

One of these companies sent him on an inland journey to the headquarters of the famous general, later governor-general, of the provinces of Shaanxi and Gansu, Zuo Zongtang (1812–1885) in Lanzhou. Mandl had to accompany a consignment of European machines reserved for the newly established cloth factory [Lanzhou zhiniju] in that city. Mandl attracted Zuo’s attention and was hired by him as an English interpreter. The ‘job interview’ took place at Zuo’s temporary headquarters in Hami in August 1880. Afterwards, Mandl became Krupp’s general agent in China, rose “to honour and fortune” and was elevated to the rank of Mandarin by the Emperor of China. In 1890, Emperor Francis Joseph awarded Mandl the Order of the Iron Crown.

In March 1892, however, the Grazer Tagblatt published a rather biased and antisemitic article on Mandl’s career in China labelling him “an international parvenu” and “a strange international personality playing a certain role in European circles within China”. The article claimed that after being forced to leave Austria-Hungary “owing to questionable financial dealings”, Mandl went to Shanghai. At first, he had some difficulties to establish himself (amongst other things, he was said to have sold bibles), but later became well-informed about the smuggling of opium and other goods and managed to gain employment with a foreign wholesaler.

Thanks to his successful journey to the headquarters of Zuo Zongtang, Mandl had attracted the attention of the leading, largest foreign business firm in Shanghai. As the Grazer Tagblatt put it in 1892, “the former Israelite bible vendor now became head of the bribery department of Jardine Matheson & Co. with a monthly salary of 5000 mark.” The journal also published a reply by Mandl, who was in Graz at that time. Mandl stated that he was not a Jew, did not have to flee from Austria, and had never defrauded the Chinese Government through ammunitions deals.

93 “Ein Wiener in Shanghai”, in: Neues Wiener Tagblatt, 14 November 1890, 3 sq.
94 Kreitner 1882, 416. For a map of Mandl’s route, see ibid. 417.
96 Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung, 29 November 1887, 4.
97 Neues Wiener Tagblatt, 4 December 1885, 19. On the Order of the Double Dragon, see Gritzner 1893, 60–69 (with illustrations) and Brunnett & Hagelstrom 1912, 499 f. (No. 953).
98 Quoted in Lehner 1995, 263, n. 952.
99 “Ein internationaler Emporkömmling”, in: Grazer Tagblatt, 16 March 1892, 7. The article reflects discussions in Germany concerning Mandl’s corrupt business practices and obviously refers to some paragraphs in the antisemitic pamphlet of Paasch 1891.
100 “Ein internationaler Emporkömmling”, in: Grazer Tagblatt, 16 March 1892, 7.
101 Ibid.
102 Grazer Tagblatt, 19 March 1892, 2.
According to the Chronicle and Directory for China (1894 edition), Mandl also served as a Dutch consul in Tianjin, and the Shanghai branch of the firm H. Mandl & Co. [Xinyi 信義 or Xinyi yang-hang 信義洋行] served as an agent for the Donau Insurance Society of Vienna.\textsuperscript{103} When Li Hongzhang 李鴻章, one of the most important statesmen of nineteenth-century China, travelled to Europe and America in 1896, Mandl was part of his entourage:

During the Viceroy’s stay in Holland and Belgium, Mr Mandl will take over the position that Mr Detring is now occupying, but at the express request of the Viceroy, to whom he [i.e. Mr Mandl] is able to provide information in Chinese at any time, he has already joined the entourage.\textsuperscript{104}

In the late 1890s Mandl left China for Paris,\textsuperscript{105} and in June 1900 rumour had it that he would settle in Austria.\textsuperscript{106} Another Austrian merchant active in June 1900 rumour had it that he would settle in A. & Co. [Ka-ming-si; i.e. Kangmingrui Mandl. Kremsir, owner of the firm Gustav Kremsir China, Gustav Kremsir, also had contacts with Shanghai]\textsuperscript{107} Van den Brandt 1936, No. 178.

2.4. Roman Catholic missionaries

The work and impact of missionaries from the Habsburg monarchy who worked in China in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries have so far remained largely unexplored — with the exception of P. Josef Freinademetz (1852–1908) and P. Georg Froewis (1865–1934), who both worked for the Societas Verbi Divini in the Shandong province. Freinademetz went to China in 1879 and started working in Shandong in 1881. After Germany took over the protection of the missions in Shandong (1890) he wrote: “The German imperial eagle has spread his wings over Jen-I-Zhao-Zi [Yan-Yi-Cao-Ji 兖沂曹濟;\textsuperscript{109} i.e. the Catholic mission in Southern Shandong] […] he took it upon himself to protect the work of the German Catholic missionaries against the outbursts of Chinese fanaticism and pagan frenzy.”\textsuperscript{110} After Germany had occupied Qingdao 青島 and Jiaozhou 膠州 Bay, Freinademetz undertook a first visit of these places in February 1898. In the summer of 1900, he stayed at his mission station in Poli 坡里 in the interior of the Shandong province.\textsuperscript{111} As for Froewis, he travelled to China in 1894; during the summer of 1900, he went to Qingdao and in the aftermath of the events caused by the ‘Boxers’, he served as an interpreter to the German troops in Shandong for a certain time.\textsuperscript{112}

In the mid-1880s at least four Franciscan missionaries from Tyrol worked in China: P. Caspar Fuchs (in China from 1876), P. Ansgar Braun (in China until 1895), P. Zeno Möltner (1852–1904), and P. Lorenz Fuchs (1856–1899).\textsuperscript{113} Möltner had trained as a printer in Bolzano/Bozen. Emperor Francis Joseph had provided him with a printing press for his missionary work in Jinan and Möltner “[…] printed books and pamphlets in the Chinese language, after the invention of bishop P. Cosi […] who used to print Chinese texts in Latin script, after having introduced characters for those sounds not existing in our language.”\textsuperscript{114}

Lazarist (Vincentian) missionaries from the Habsburg monarchy had worked in China even earlier, from the early 1860s onwards. The first of these missionaries, Ignaz Erdélyi (1828–1885; Chinese name Ai Shusheng 艾樹聲), arrived in Shanghai in April 1861 and later worked in the Zhili province.\textsuperscript{115} Ignaz Ürge (1840–1898; Chinese name Wu Najue 吳納爵) went to China in 1880 and worked in the Zhe-
On a visit to the Habsburg monarchy in 1889–90, Ürge was accompanied by a fifteen-year-old Chinese boy, and both were dressed in Chinese clothes. Ürge and his young companion were received in audience by Archduke Karl Ludwig (1833–1895), the younger brother of Emperor Francis Joseph and, at that time, the heir to the throne.

After the death of Ürge in 1898, another Hungarian-born Lazarist, Josef Wilfinger (1874–1906; Chinese name Lang Kezhi, 郎克志), arrived in the Zhejiang province. In April 1900, Wilfinger was wounded in an attack. An investigation into the incident was started but, soon, was overtaken by the events of the summer of 1900 in northern China. In that summer, another Lazarist from Austria, Friedrich Sageder (Chinese name Sha Kaitai, 沙開泰), working in the Jiangxi province, had to flee an angry crowd on a war junk: “I was hardly in the junk when a hail of stones hit it. […] From the junk I could see the immense fire of our mission through a small opening.”

3. Imperialist opportunities: the ’scramble for China’ and the Boxer War

3.1. Austria-Hungary and the scramble for China

A few weeks after the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War of 1894–95, the Neue Freie Presse published the summary of a letter in which the unnamed author pointed out the dangers faced by all foreigners in China and mentioned news of anti-foreign assaults in Beijing. At that time, Austria-Hungary still only had one diplomatic representative for both China and Japan, who resided in Tokyo. While the position of foreigners in Japan did not seem to be in any danger at that time, it would be useful “if the Austro-Hungarian minister were to take up his post in Shanghai or Peking.” Moreover, Austria-Hungary should dispatch “some warships and gunboats to Shanghai and Tientsin [Tianjin] to protect her citizens living in China.”

Although this advice was not heeded, the Sino-Japanese War of 1894–95 was followed with interest in Austro-Hungarian military circles. This is attested by publications on both land and sea war.

Only after the end of the Sino-Japanese War did Austria-Hungary start to reorganise her diplomatic representation in East Asia. In 1896 it was decided to split the Austro-Hungarian diplomatic representation for China and Japan and establish an Austro-Hungarian legation in Beijing (Fig. 9). Mori[t]z Freiherr Czikann von Wahlborn (1847–1909) was appointed an envoy to China, which he reached in April 1897 travelling aboard H.M.S. Kaiser Franz Joseph I. Until the construction of the Austro-Hungarian legation was completed, Czikann resided on the premises of the Spanish legation. Moreover, the Austro-Hungarian consular representation in Hong Kong was reorganised. In 1897, the honorary merchant-consuls were replaced by career consuls dispatched by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The presence of Austro-Hungarian warships in Chinese waters had developed slowly and hesitantly. Apart from the above-mentioned voyages of the Carolina (1820–1822) and Novara (1857–1859), the Austro-Hungarian expedition that was organised to
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conclude treaties with Siam, China, and Japan (1868–1870) involved two ships. Leaving out the voyages of H.M.S. Fasana and H.M.S. Erzherzog Friedrich — the latter being a circumnavigation — in the early 1870s, a regular presence of the Austro-Hungarian navy in East Asian seas only started in the mid-1880s. In the period from 1884–85 to 1893–94, at least eleven ships of the Austro-Hungarian navy visited East Asia — one of them carried Archduke Franz Ferdinand on his above-mentioned
journey around the world (1892–93). These missions also had to report on economic perspectives and on the development of the East Asian line of the Austrian Lloyd (the latter had reached Hong Kong in 1880 and was extended to Shanghai in 1892). The second half of the 1890s saw a significant increase in the Austro-Hungarian naval presence in China (Fig. 10). In the years 1896 to 1899 at least five Austro-Hungarian warships visited Chinese harbours. This increase in numbers corresponded with increased interest in the international politics of East Asia. Owing to a lack of economic prerequisites,
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Austria-Hungary did not actively participate in the 'scramble for China', and corresponding plans were never realised. Yet in 1899, the Austro-Hungarian navy explored six bays along the Chinese coast for several weeks. The original intention being to occupy one of them, the Austrians explored and mapped two bays in the Zhejiang province (Sanmen 三門, and Leqing 樂清) and four bays in the Fujian province (Nanguan 南關 close to the border to the Zhejiang province, Sansha 三沙, Xinghua 興化, and Quanzhou 泉州).129

Rumours about this secret mission spread across the Austrian press from March 1899, but the plans were abandoned owing to new developments in the international relations of the Chinese Empire. Not only had the Chinese government been forced by Japan to declare that it would not alienate any part of the Fujian province to a third power, but Japan also firmly opposed similar Italian claims to the above-mentioned Sanmen Bay (March 1899).130

3.2. China 1900: Austria-Hungary and the Boxer War

In early 1900, Western observers in China repeatedly reported on the activities of the ‘Boxers’. These Boxers, originally members of a secret society named Yihe quan 義和拳 [lit., Fists of Righteous Harmony], quickly spread across the Shandong province. After being suppressed by the provincial authorities, the supporters of the Yihe quan moved to the Zhili province and, thus, to the vicinity of Beijing. After they were legalised by the Qing court, they were renamed Yihe quan 義和團 [Militia of Righteous Harmony]. It was only towards the end of May 1900 that diplomatic representatives in Beijing requested troops from foreign warships lying off the coast in the Gulf of Bohai to protect the legations.

Following other nations, German and Austrian troop contingents reached the Beijing legations on 3 June 1900. Shortly thereafter, railway services and the telegraph connection from Beijing to Tianjin were interrupted. Thus, a first attempt to relieve the Beijing legations failed and the relief force of 2000 men (among them 25 Austrians and Hungarians) had to retreat to Tianjin. Following the foreign capture of the Dagu forts (17 June 1900) and the assassination of the German envoy, von Ketteler (20 June 1900), the siege of the Beijing legations by Boxers began. In the first hours of this siege, the Austro-Hungarian legation was abandoned by its defenders because of its exposed location and the Austrians retreated to the French legation.

The escalation of the situation in Beijing was followed closely by political and military circles as well as newspapers in all European countries. In Austria-Hungary, too, preparations began to reinforce troops in East Asia. In contrast to all other powers, it was decided in Vienna not to send any land troops to China. The Austro-Hungarian navy had to equip three more ships (H.M.S. Kaiserin und Königin Maria Theresia, H.M.S. Kaiserin Elisabeth, and H.M.S. Aspern) which, together with H.M.S. Zenta, formed the Imperial and Royal Squadron in East Asia [k.u.k. Eskader für Ostasien].131

Following the foreign occupation of Tianjin on 14 July 1900, the foreign powers decided to establish the Tianjin Provisional Government [Tianjin du-tong yamen 天津都統衙門: short for Zhaxing guanli jin jun chengxiang neiweifang shiwu du-tong yamen 暫行管理津郡城廂內外地方事物都統衙門], which was led by three officers and included representatives of all the powers involved. During the entire existence of this authority, Paul Bauer, a merchant in Tianjin and Imperial and Royal Artillery Lieutenant of the Reserve, acted as the representative of Austria-Hungary.132 The establishment of the Tianjin Provisional Government did not prevent foreign atrocities in the city: “[...] foreign soldiers constantly humiliated and harassed the local population, frequently raping the women, especially in the Hedong section (east of the river), which was occupied by Russian and German troops.”133

Both before and after Tianjin had been taken by foreign troops in mid-July 1900 (Figs. 11a,b), further foreign reinforcements arrived in northern China. The relief operation to lift the siege of the Beijing legations began on 4 August 1900.

A few days later, the Neue Freie Presse published a map showing the Tianjin region (Fig. 12). The map

130 Lehner 2002a.
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132 Winterhalder 1902, 175 sq.; Lehner & Lehner 2002, 344 sq. For biographical information on Bauer, see Agstner 2006, 37. About Paul Bauer’s role to sell the Austro-Hungarian consulate in the former concession of Tientsin, including his signature on the contract of 1923, see the main chapter of this book (cf. Falsen, Fig. 71).
133 Cohen 1997, 182.
had been provided by the cartographers of Freytag & Berndt and was based on a map produced about two decades earlier by the German Otto Franz von Möllendorff (1848–1903) after extensive travels across northern China (Möllersdorf 1881). The new map showed the various ‘parts’ of the city of Tianjin, therefore updating the information displayed on the original Möllendorff map. While Möllendorff only referred to foreign concessions in general [Fremde Niederlassg.], i.e. foreign concession(s)]134, the map published in the Neue Freie Presse in August 1900 (Fig. 12) indicated the various parts of the city: apart from the city of “Tientsin” [“Chinesisch”, i.e. Chinese], the Japanese, French, English, and German concessions on the western bank of the Baihe are shown. But, whereas on Möllendorff’s map the Chinese city extends well beyond the eastern bank of the Baihe, the map produced by Freytag & Berndt

134 Neue Freie Presse, 9 August 1900, 2; Möllendorff 1881, plate VIII (environs of Tianjin [Umgebung von Tientsin] on an inserted map).
On 28 August, troops of all eight powers (including sixty Austrians and Hungarians) marched through Beijing’s ‘Forbidden City’ (i.e. the semi-urban ensemble of the Imperial Palace).\textsuperscript{136}

From September 1900, Austro-Hungarian troops took part in various operations in the Beijing area. These included an expedition to Zhangjiakou (Kalgan) in November, as well as minor operations in the vicinity of Beijing in December 1900 and January


\textsuperscript{136} Winterhalder 1902, 433–436; Lehner & Lehner 2002, 362.
1901. Like other troop contingents, the Austro-Hungarians were looking for supposed Boxers. Evidence of the guilt of those who were captured and executed during these ‘punitive expeditions’ [Strafexpeditionen] has not always been uncovered.137

After Belgium and Russia had seized some areas to establish concessions in Tianjin, on 7 February 1901 the Austro-Hungarian minister to Beijing (Czikann) asked the I. & R. Ministry for Foreign Affairs by telegraph for permission to occupy “a piece of land now that is quite suitable for this on the left bank of the Peihō [Baihe] […], adjacent to Italian occupied land, fairly close to the station, opposite the Chinese city […] for Austria-Hungary.”138

On 16 February 1901, a few days after the Austro-Hungarian occupation started, the Socialist
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**Fig. 13** Illustration No. 7: Aerial view of Tianjin from west to east (1900/01). The Chinese city can be seen in the foreground (the straight line to the left and right of the city gate is the eastern city wall); in the background flows the Haihe (mostly called ‘Baihe’ by Europeans) and the already densely built-up area of the (future) Austro-Hungarian concession is visible. Published in: *La Chine à terre et en ballon* (c.1901), planche 31.
Arbeiter-Zeitung published a critical comment on the topic of Austria in China:

So, Austria now also has a Chinese colony. It is so large that it can be easily circled on foot in twenty minutes, and the government is naturally ashamed to call it a colony. The English term “settlement” is therefore officially used for this area, because the German word Siedlung does not sound too elegant. The Austrian colony [...] represents a small area of 0.6 square kilometres, which is foreign to China and whose inmates [Insassen] live according to Austrian and Hungarian laws. The consulate building and a mission house with church and cemetery, are pretty much everything that can be accommodated in this space in terms of buildings.\footnote{Arbeiter-Zeitung, 16 February 1901, 4.}

At the end of the siege of Tianjin in mid-July 1900, the American photographer James Ricalton (1844–1929) took, based on a map (Fig. 14a), several pictures of the city. These photographs clearly show the extent of destruction caused by the fighting.

One of these pictures (Fig. 14b) was taken in the northern part of the future Austro-Hungarian concession and bears the following caption: “Family of the
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Lower Class ‘Chowing’ in Their Home, Partially Destroyed during the Siege, Tientsin [Tianjin]”. In his book, China Through a Stereoscope, Ricalton provided detailed descriptions for all his photographs. In the introduction to the description of No. 65, he mentioned the consequences of the fighting over several weeks in Tientsin/Tianjin and the new situation experienced by its inhabitants following the foreign occupation of the city and its suburbs:

Here as usual, we find the house partially destroyed; but as the buildings are chiefly of clay and unburned brick, many of them furnished little fuel for the flames and so escaped destruction. The inhabitants are now returning to reoccupy their old haunts when found habitable, and we find this family of the lower class ‘chowing’ after their wonted fashion. Whether afraid of the camera or not, they are now under the Allies and necessity has no choice; they meekly do our bidding.140

The photographs taken by French balloonists and Ricalton clearly show that the area occupied by Austria-Hungary in February 1901 was not vacant. This is also evident in the “orientation map [Übersichtsplan] of Tientsin” published in Winterhalder’s book on the Austro-Hungarian participation in the events of 1900 (Fig. 15).

4. From a tent to urban development: the very beginnings of the Austrian administration

In the concluding section of his account of Austria-Hungary’s participation in the Boxer War, Theodor Ritter von Winterhalder (1902) described the end of the Imperial & Royal Squadron’s involvement in East Asia and mentioned that, in the summer of 1901, the Austro-Hungarian detachment in Tianjin was about “to move to a Yamen [i.e. yamen 衙門] located in the occupied territory [of the Austro-Hungarian concession]. As an illustration of this relocation, Winterhalder included a photograph showing an Austro-Hungarian marine before a tent on the territory occupied by Austria-Hungary in February 1901 (Fig. 16).141

The territory of the Austro-Hungarian concession was administered by the Provisional Government of Tianjin until 4 August 1902. On that day, the Vice Consul Karl Bernauer took over the administration of the concession on behalf of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. As discussed in further detail in the main chapter of this book, Bernauer’s most important tasks after that point included negotiating a formal

---

140 Ricalton 1901, 241.
141 Winterhalder 1902, 570.
agreement with the Chinese government and preparing a description of the current state of the Austro-Hungarian concession area. The results of both efforts were noticed in the Austrian press.

The Austro-Hungarian consulate in Tianjin did not begin any negotiations with local authorities on a formal agreement to 'take over' the concession until the summer of 1902 — after Russia, Belgium and Italy had already concluded their own agreements with the Chinese side. After various necessary steps were arranged with the Tianjin daotai (i.e. the circuit intendant) Zhang Lianfen 張蓮芬 and the houbu dao 候補道 (expectant circuit intendant) Qian Rong 錢鈺, a formal agreement concerning the concession [Tianjin Aoguo zujie zhangcheng hetong 天津奧國租界章程合同; i.e. Tianjin Austrian Concession Charter Contract] was signed on 27 December 1902 by the Tianjin Customs Daotai [Tianjin haiguan dao 天津海關道] Tang Shaoyi 唐紹儀 and Vice Consul

Fig. 15 Sketch map of Tientsin/Tianjin. [Winterhalder 1902, 132]
Bernauer. The Austrian press published a summary of the contract:

[...] succeeded in obtaining the property in question from China without payment. We only had to undertake to compensate the Chinese government for the loss of property tax through an annual lump sum; insignificant costs are also likely to arise from the fact that several owners of grave sites are to be compensated for relocating them. On the other hand, the concession (Settlement) will have an income, since taxes are levied there, and administrative costs will be met from this income. [...].

On 29 December 1901 — only two days after the signing of the contract — Yuan Shikai, the governor-general of Zhili, reported to the Waiwubu 外務部 (Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs) that the Austrian concession in Tianjin was to be viewed as a violent occupation and that it would be difficult to fulfil Liu Xiangrong’s and other injured parties’ demands to obtain other land in compensation (compare Falser Fig. 13).

On 31 January 1903, Vice Consul Bernauer completed a detailed report on the Austro-Hungarian concession. Part of this report was published by the Fremden-Blatt (Vienna). Other Austrian newspapers quoted shorter or longer excerpts from the report. These excerpts contained information on the geographical location and size of the concession, the number of inhabitants, the number and state of buildings and streets, and taxation issues. In addition, Bernauer outlined the administration (including
police and fire brigade\(^{145}\)) and possible steps for its future development (such as road construction or real estate development).\(^{146}\)

Initial considerations on the part of the Austro-Hungarian consul in Tianjin were soon to be followed up by first plans for an economic use of the concession. In May 1903 it was reported that the Fiume Credit Bank [\textit{Fiumauer Kreditbank}], with the support of the Hungarian Credit Bank, was planning to open a branch in the Austro-Hungarian concession in Tianjin to stimulate Hungary’s trade with East Asia. For this purpose, the director of the Fiume Credit Bank, Arthur Steinacker, and a representative of the Hungarian Credit Bank, Emil Mauthner, travelled to China. A Budapest-based company (\textit{Ganz’sche Elektrizitätsgießerei und Maschinenfabrik}) sent Géza Szuk, its chief engineer (\textit{Oberingenieur}) and head of the-electrotechnical department, to East Asia.\(^{147}\) After his return to Budapest, Szuk described his travel experiences in a lecture and published at least two articles about his impressions of China and Japan.\(^{148}\)

5. Conclusion

The various strands of development presented in this introduction show that in nineteenth-century Austria(-Hungary) interest in China was highly discontinuous. One reason for this may be that there was no ‘critical mass’ in Austria(-Hungary) that could have promoted this interest purposefully. Early voyages of Austrian merchant ships to East Asia were just as confined to individual initiatives as early preoccupations with the Chinese language. Owing to political developments in Europe, Austria(-Hungary) was late in joining the ranks of the powers that concluded an unequal treaty with China (1869). The latter’s participation in the Vienna Universal Exhibition, although noticed in certain circles, did not manage to generate lasting interest in economic relations.

The number of Austro-Hungarian merchants in China was too small to develop serious lobbying for imperialist activities. As for missionaries from Austria-Hungary, they either placed themselves under German protection or acted within the framework of their orders.

The Sino-Japanese War of 1894–95, which was particularly important for the restructuring of international relations in East Asia, and the subsequent ‘scramble for concessions’, only marked a turning point in the history of Austro-Chinese relations on the surface. Reconnaissance missions along the Chinese coast (1899), participation in the international intervention to suppress the Yihetuan movement (1900), and the occupation of a concession in Tianjin (1901) followed the example of powers that dominated international politics in East Asia. However, maintaining its claim to being a great power was far more important for Austria-Hungary than a clear political or economic agenda in China. The events of the summer of 1900 probably brought Tianjin into the consciousness of the Austro-Hungarian public for the first time, but the road to the Austro-Hungarian concession in Tianjin had not yet been taken. The main motive behind Austria-Hungary’s claim to an area in Tianjin was the Monarchy’s self-image as a major European power. The hesitant steps towards formally taking over the area and developing the Austro-Hungarian concession are evidence of the double asymmetry noted in connection with the establishment of diplomatic relations: on the one hand, Austria-Hungary shared the privileges acquired by leading treaty powers; on the other hand, it still lacked solid economic interests that could make the Tianjin concession more than a purely legal and formal ‘Austrian’ one.

While this Historical Introduction dealt with the ‘intangible’ aspects of the relations between Austria(-Hungary) and China during the long nineteenth century, the following main part of this book by Michael Falser focuses on the most visible – and ‘tangible’ – aspect of Austro-Hungarian presence in China: the urbanistic and architectural development of the Austro-Hungarian concession in Tianjin (1901–1917) and its afterlife until today.

\(^{145}\) Bernauer’s positive assessment of the fire brigade contrasts with a later comment in connection with a major fire that broke out on 11 June 1907 in the Austro-Hungarian concession (cf. Neue Freie Presse, 13 July 1907, 9 sq.).

\(^{146}\) Report dated 31 January 1903, originally published in: Fremdenblatt. Extensively reprinted in, and quoted in: Czernowitz Tagblatt, 25 March 1903, 27 March 1903 and 28 March 1903. For a short summary of the report of 31 January 1903, see Lehner 1995, 427. For a quote from the report, see Agstner 2006, 34 (for a Chinese translation of this quote, see ibid., 35) and for a discussion of Bernauer’s report, see the main part of this book.

\(^{147}\) Wiener Zeitung, 29 May 1903, 12.

\(^{148}\) Pester Lloyd, 16 February 1904, 10. See also Szuk’s articles in: Vasárnapí újság, 1 May 1904, 292–295 (on the Austro-Hungarian concession in Tianjin) and ibid., 3 September 1905 and 10 September 1905 (on Japan). For a detailed quotation of Szuk’s descriptions and photographs of the Austro-Hungarian concession in Tianjin, see the main part of this book (cf. Falser Fig. 17a-c).
Habsburgs going global.
The Austro-Hungarian Concession in Tientsin/Tianjin in China: from a history of failure to a heritage of fake?

MICHAEL FALSER

The Concessions are miniatures, with modifications, of the countries they represent.
[Mrs Burton St. John, The China Times Guide to Tientsin and Neighbourhood (Tientsin 1908, 5)]

1. Preliminaries, challenges, goals

Today, we are witnessing a veritable boom in scientific interest for the history of international concessions in China, which lasted from the 1860s to the 1940s. Current research argues that the political, diplomatic, and ‘world trade’-related economic micro-set-up of these ‘inter-national’ networks of collaboration and knowledge exchange around 1900, along with the individual or joint logistics required for the infrastructural, urbanistic, and architectural development of the concession system itself, are useful to understand some of the founding factors of what we conceive today as ‘globalisation’. If this historical bridge between 1900 and 2000 in the name of a progressively interconnected world makes concessions an important field of current ‘global studies’, a second significant element will be considered in this contribution. In China’s belated nation-building process into a ‘global superpower’, old concession networks and areas that operated around 1900 and were, in fact, ‘inter-imperialistic’, are currently in the best Hobsbawmian sense not only being aesthetically ‘reinvented’ by local municipal agencies as supposedly old cosmopolitan ‘traditions’ linked to China’s entry into global modernity; under this ‘from history to heritage’ logic (as alluded to in the subtitle of this chapter), they are also physically being rediscovered, reconstructed, and even reinvented as multiform cultural heritage, from whole urban formations to individual monuments. In this sense, studying concessions is today extremely insightful for global history studies as well as for cultural heritage studies.

The historic concessions of Tientsin, today spelt Tianjin (see glossary) — now the third largest urban area in China, with a population of some fifteen million people — have come to scientific attention rather recently whereas the city’s pre-concession history was already well-known. An early Ming-period town within the walled military fortress of Tianjinwei on the Hai River was renamed around 1400; thanks to its geopolitical positioning at the northern end of the Grand Canal, the city took off during the seventeenth century Qing Dynasty as the economic entry point into Beijing, the new capital some 120 km to the northwest (e.g. Kwan 2001). However, it gained unparalleled importance between the late imperial and republican eras from 1860 onwards when, after the Convention of Beijing of 1860 (ending the Second Opium War between China and the Anglo-French powers), Tientsin was turned into an international treaty port. This phase came to an end after World War II; Tientsin was ‘liberated’ by the Red Army in 1949 (from this historic turning point, which ended foreign dominance of the city, the pronunciation Tianjin has been borrowed for the present book), the year of the proclamation of the People’s...
Fig. 1 “Map of Tientsin” (1912), printed at Chung-Tung Litho Works Tientsin. Chinese legend with English indications from north to south: Cheng-Li (lit. “within the city (walls)”), native or Chinese city, in brown, and Austro-Hungarian (in green), Italian (in light orange), Japanese (in pink), Russian (in yellow), French (in grey), British (in blue), and German (in dark orange) concessions. Not on the map, but indicated in the lower right margin: the Belgian concession. [Library of Congress, Geography and Map Division, Washington D.C., USA]
Republic of China. With its nine foreign-controlled concessions (zuje, literally meaning ‘renting zones’) and a separate Chinese ‘city’, Tientsin’s set-up of multiple territorialities after 1900 was indeed a ‘global microcosm’ ranging from the Far East to the Far West (Fig. 1). Politically and physically impactful concessions, which are rather well-researched and much better preserved, were those of France (1860–1946), Great Britain (1860–1943; with the affiliated American concession, 1869–1902), and Japan (1898–1945), side-by-side with slightly later ones: the German Empire (1899–1917), Russia (1900–1920), Italy (1901–1947) and Belgium (1902–1931). Surprisingly, the ninth concession has remained unknown until today: the one held by Austria-Hungary (1901–1917).

Responding to this scientific lacuna, the overall goal here is to provide a much desired missing piece of the puzzle in order to achieve a better understanding of the short urban and architectural history of the Austro-Hungarian concession. This agenda will be pursued by drawing on a coherent set of sources from Austrian libraries and archives, both written (published and unpublished) and visual (cartographic and photographic). In this context, a ‘spectacular’ primary source was rediscovered by the writing author and is presented here for the first time as central piece of evidence: a hand-drawn scaled development plan and a bound album from c.1911 entitled “Österreich-ungarische Niederlassung Tientsin” with 115 black-and-white photographs and a full written description of a tour through the Austro-Hungarian concession only a few years before its handover to the Chinese authorities in 1917. This new archival material will be used to pursue the primary ambition of this publication: to explain the major developmental steps of the Austro-Hungarian concession in Tientsin between 1901 and 1917 through its urban and architectural history (cf. Mengin 2014). In the concluding pages, according to our main goal, which is to situate the historical fabric of the Austro-Hungarian concession within ‘hyper-colonial Tientsin’ (after Rogaski 2000 and 2004, see below), our findings will be set in relation to the ‘heritagisation’ processes in the Chinese economic boom city of present-day Tianjin. This second strand can only constitute a preliminary set of observations, speculations and open questions for further research and does not pretend to come to a final judgement. Nevertheless, it will be illuminated by a selection of remarkable photographs that I took during a field trip in late 2018, roughly one hundred years after the Austrian impact on the city had come to an end.

2. The unknown episode of Austria-Hungary in China, archival access and the state of research

In my preface to this book, I profiled the four major reasons why the Austro-Hungarian concession itself a) ultimately was a failure (too late, bad location, little international experience and no support back home), b) fell into oblivion after 1917 as an historical element in the urban fabric of Tianjin (other concessions continued to flourish while Austria-Hungary had long left its de facto little developed concession during World War I), c) has not been fully researched by the international community until now, and d) is currently under threat, paradoxically through rediscovery and commodification. Arguably, all of these reasons were, and still are, embedded in a ‘global logic’. While both the historical context of the Austro-Hungarian concession and its afterlife (a, b) and the ambivalent heritagisation processes on the spot today (d) will be explored in detail in the following pages of this chapter, I would like to briefly summarise the state of the (astonishingly scarce) scientific research on the Austro-Hungarian concession in relation to on-site studies, current archival access to Austrian archives, and the ongoing problem of the gradual loss of German as a scientific language.

Austrian research about this topic was primarily produced in the fields of diplomatic history and political science — but not in urban or architectural history, which this piece of research is doing for the first time. Additionally, most of the available research was produced within the framework of unpublished PhD theses at the University of Vienna that sadly remained unnoticed by international researchers before E-theses began circulating the globe via ProQuest.2 In order to overcome this problem, which is associated with the unfortunate grad-

---

2 Nevertheless, it must be noted here that PhD theses in Austria are officially catalogued and count as ‘semi-official’ publications in their own right; they are indeed accessible (also to conscientious international researchers) as limited print versions in the relevant alma mater university libraries (such as Vienna University in the present case); they are also all collected by the Austrian National Library.
ual loss of German-language skills within the global research community, a short tour d’horizon of Austrian (German language) research literature into the Austro-Hungarian concession is provided here and related to international investigations.

In the case of the Austrian context, the earliest elaborated historiographical research-based remarks may be found in Johann Wagner’s unpublished PhD thesis, Österreichische Kolonialversuche in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts [Austria’s colonial experiments in the second half of the nineteenth century] (1955), at the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Vienna (see the chapter “Das Settlement Hotung in Tientsin”, Wagner 1955, 222–97). The equally unpublished PhD thesis, Die Österrei-

chisch-Ungarische Konzession in Tianjin, by Günter Hörtler followed in 1984 at the same institution; with two full volumes, it provides a unique source that was completely unknown until today1 (Hörtler 1984; compare with the contributions by Hungarian researchers, from Józsa 1962/1966, 128–45, to Palvölgyi 2008). In line with the aforementioned ‘archival-historiographical logic’ along which the ‘inter-national’ set-up of historical “Tientsin” has, until today, been perpetuated through different and most often disconnected national research agendas. As researchers focus until today on their ‘own’ national (i.e. Japanese, Chinese, British or French, etc.) legacies in present-day “Tianjin” (see the preface of this book), also the Austrian sinologist and historian Hörtler focused on original material stored in the Austrian State Archives (most importantly, the House of Habsburg-related section of Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv HHStA; other archival material will be mentioned in the present chapter4). However, he also complemented this with those Chinese-language primary sources which, as he explained himself, “the National-Chinese Government had brought to Tai-

wan and made accessible in the Zhonggyang yan-

juiyuan, jindaishi yanjiusuo (Institute for Modern History, Academia Sinica)” (Hörtler 1984, 141).

Other important (un)published German-language studies covered Tientsin only within the larger context of the political history of both empires around 1900: the Vienna-based historian Georg Lehner — he is the author of the introduction to this book — elaborated his long-lasting work on the Boxer Uprising (or Yi-

hetuan Movement) of 1899–1901 and the diplomatic relations between Austria and China (see Lehner 1992, 86–90; Lehner 1995, 323–42, 427–72; Lehner 1999; Lehner 2002a; Lehner & Lehner 2002, 609–22; and the listed bibliography in the introduction).5

Other studies that are part of these historical inves-

tigations lack an explicit architectural focus (see Schusta 1967; Lee 1971, 55–86; Unterrieder 1978; Kaminski & Unterrieder 1980, 449–54; Klein 1984; Heise 1999; Kolm 2001, 86–97; Krasser 2015, 51–81; Skrivan 2015; Canis 2016; Agstner 2006, 2018, 70–71; Müller, Perner & Pankraz 2020). Finally, Tientsin has been mentioned in relation to Aus-

tria-Hungary’s rather episodic exploratory missions around the globe (Randa 1966; Winter 2005; Sauer 2002), its comparatively limited extra-European colo-

nial appetite (Wagner 1955; Loidl 2012/2017; Call-

away 2019; Bachinger et al. 2020, with Leidinger 2020), or in recent Habsburg (post-)colonial and global studies (Sauer 2002, 20126; Feichtinger 2020).

3 In this context, it is important to know that Hörtler’s indications of primary sources (they will be quoted in the following text from his work) may have changed after 1990 when documents from the Beijing Legation Archive were reclassified; as a result, their call/inventory numbers may have changed.

4 I would like to thank my colleague Georg Lehner for helping with mapping out the various archival units that also structured my research: the holdings of the various departments (Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv and Kriegsarchiv) of the Austrian State Archives are of central importance for the history of the “Austro-Hungarian” period of the area in Tianjin’s concession (see Generaldirek-

tion 1896). The Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv (House, Court and State Archives) contain the Political Archives of the Imperial and Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs [Politisches Archiv des k.k. Ministeriums des Äußeren], including the collected reports of the Austro-Hungarian Legation in Beijing (1896–1917), which were regularly sent to Vienna. These materials are especially valuable as regards the history of the Austro-Hungarian occupation within Tianjin. Apart from China-related material in the Political Ar-

chives and archives on administrative matters of the Austro-Hungarian embassies, legations and consular representations (Admin-

istrative Registratur), the Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv holds the Archives of the Austro-Hungarian Legation in Beijing, which also contain some files from the Tianjin Consulate Archives. The War Archives [Kriegsarchiv] not only contains the correspond-

dence of the East Asian Squadron (1900–1901) and the reports of various missions to East Asia between 1900 and 1914, but also written evidence and some photographic material of the détachement of the Austro-Hungarian navy at Tianjin. Finally, the Adminis-

trative Archive [Verwaltungarchiv] is useful to retrieve historical bills, contracts, etc.

5 A small exhibition, Ein Stück Österreich in China [A piece of Austria in China], was shown in May 2001 at Vienna University’s Main Library in the context of an Austrian-Chinese research symposium.

6 Astonishingly, a themed volume about “Colonial Austria: Austria and the Overseas” in the Austrian Studies journal (vol. 20/2012) did not cover the Austro-Hungarian concession in Tientsin at all.
While Austrian research on the urban and architectural history of former Tientsin is still lacking, neither have the latest research initiatives in Great Britain and France about (their) concessions in Tientsin furthered any new investigations into Austro-Hungarian concession history: this includes the University of Bristol-based network, *Tianjin under nine flags. 1860–1949* (2008–2012; cf. Bickers & Tiedemann 2007; Bickers 2011; Bickers & Jackson 2016; compare Goodman & Goodman 2012). The same missing link has been perpetuated since 2007 in the Sino-French academic joint venture, *De Tientsin à Tianjin. Internationalisation et patrimonialisation des concessions (1860–2030)* and subsequent French research: a themed volume in the *Outre-Mers* journal followed in 2014 (Singaravélou & Tertrais 2014, with Mengin 2014, cf. Singaravélou 2011) and related publications, such as the 2017 monograph, *Tianjin cosmopolis. Une autre histoire de la mondialisation* did cover the Austro-Hungarian or German concessions, most often, however, only marginally (Singaravélou 2017, 267; cf. Gotteland 2016, 2014). The same lacuna can be detected in the sizeable ongoing Paris-Tianjin research network — named after a fused neologism: *Patrimondialisation* — about the current ‘heritagisation’ and touristic commodification strategies of the concession era’s (re)built legacy (for an overview, see Lu & Mengin 2020, Chauffert-Yvart et al. 2020).

The Australian National University’s *China Heritage Project* covered “The architectural heritage of Tianjin” in a themed issue of its *China Heritage Quarterly* online journal in March 2010, with guest editor Maurizio Marinelli (Marinelli 2010a/b); following the aforementioned ‘national-historiographical archival logic’, he may well be the most prominent expert on the Italian concession today (e.g. Marinelli 2009 and 2018; for historical publications Fileti 1921 or Cesari 1937). None of the six papers of *China Heritage Quarterly*, including the recent trend “between development and heritage” (Nobuo & Xu 2010), covered the Austro-Hungarian concession.

American research, unsurprisingly, rather focuses on the US-American impact, and is most prominently represented today, more than a decade after Lewis Bernstein’s seminal PhD study, by Ruth Rogaski, with her publications on the aspect of ‘hygienic modernity’ in treaty ports like Tianjin (Rogaski 2000, 2004, see below; compare with some of the earliest studies by Lieberthal 1980, Hershatter 1986, Bernstein 1988). A focus on lifestyle and housing cultures was most recently added by Elizabeth LaCouture (2021, cf. LaCouture 2010). While Japanese or Belgian researchers have equally investigated ‘their’ former concessions in historical Tientsin (e.g. Toru 2002 or Dussart-Desart 2017), we cannot cite any examples of publications about the Russian concession.

Last but not least, the global dimension of scholarship has been enriched with long-standing Chinese research, both in its original language and English. However, Europe’s imperialist history in the Far East was heavily downgraded during Maoist China and this trend continued in the years after the 1989 political crackdowns (the infamous Tiananmen Incident is often quoted as the prime ideological threshold). We can only speculate that Chinese scholars, in particular, began to experience the tightening up of the Chinese archives and the topic of the imperialist history of the Tientsin concession era during that period. However, we could find a few important results dating from that time (cf. Gao 1990; Fei 1991; Fang 1995; Liu 1996; Shang & Liu 1996). Arguably, the first detailed Chinese study of the Austro-Hungarian episode in China was produced by Chinyun Lee, with a first summary (Lee 2001; cf. Lee 2007, 2021), while Liu Haiyan has regularly contributed to the wider concession-era history, research about which has accelerated considerably since 2000 (Liu & Stapleton 2006; Wu 2007; Shang 2008; Li 2010, 50–88; Liu 2011; Zhang & Liu 2013; Liu et al. 2016; Kan 2017; Zhao 2018; Ding et al. 2018; Hong 2018, 2019). The recent trend in cultural heritage studies of historical *Tientsin* proved useful for the present research because it reflects a strong Chinese aware-

---

7 The former website: http://www.bristol.ac.uk/tianjin-project/tianjinnineflags/ (retrieved 7 June 2020).
8 Results of the *Tokyo Research Group on the History of Tianjin* are summarised in Liu & Stapleton 2006 (see below).
9 Original Chinese and Japanese research about Tientsin-Tianjin is summarised here in great detail.
10 In this article, further Chinese studies (from unpublished qualification scripts to historical map collections, articles and monographs) are listed.
Fig. 2a Map of Tientsin in 1870 as reproduced in the second volume of Hosea Ballou Morse’s series *The international relations of the Chinese Empire* of 1918. [Morse 1918, vol.2, map between the pages of 240 and 241]
Fig. 2b Map of Tientsin around 1900/1902 as reproduced in *The period of subjection (1894–1911)*, the third volume of Hosea Ballou Morse’s series *The international relations of the Chinese Empire of 1918*. [Morse 1918, vol.3, map between the pages of 240 and 241]
Fig. 2c  Map of “Tiën-Tsin” as indicated in the 1900/01 edition of *Meyers Konservationslexikon* (5th edition, vol. 21, Supplement 1901) [Private collection Michael Falser]
ness of Tianjin’s current commodification from a more general perspective. However, the Austro-Hungarian concession per se was rarely mentioned in this context (for instance, a first mention in Shang & Liu 1996), not to mention any relevant photographic survey on the spot.

In such a context, more on-site research is still needed. As a small selection of my own pictures (taken when I visited the site in December 2018) show, this commodification process ranges from in-style additions to reconstructions, overpowered by megalomaniac construction projects in its direct vicinity. The rest was commodified — now in concert with other former concessions, such as the neighbouring Italian one — into what I would like to call a truly ‘global theme park atmosphere’. Thanks to my own comparative study of photographs of the original fabric from c.1911 with what I could witness myself some hundred years later, I will conclude that Chinese heritage in the making (after Maags & Svensson 2018) has transferred ‘Habsburgs going global’ from an originally post-1900 Austro-Hungarian project to a post-2000 local Chinese agency.

However, it needs to be emphasised that the remarks about Tianjin’s heritagisation process made towards the end of this chapter are of a preliminary, speculative nature at this point owing to limited access to contemporary (above all, Chinese) sources. Given the complexity of the current situation, they are meant to inspire further in-situ research rather than come to any final conclusion.

3. Austria-Hungary in Tientsin (1901–1917): a failed project in Habsburgs going global?

The first official treaty between the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and China dates back to 1869. At that point in time, the original Chinese city of Tientsin had already turned into an international treaty port — with small French and British concessions along the Hai River to the south-east of the original ‘Chinese City’ (Fig. 2a, compare with Morse’s map of Tientsin after 1900 in Fig. 2b). For some three decades, the Austrian ‘intangible’ contact zone with China continued to develop (see the introduction by Georg Lehner), but Tientsin had not yet appeared on her imperialist radar; however German-language dictionaries like the Meyers Konversationslexikon (here in its edition of 1901) could already identify different national sections in the “Foreign Quarters” [Fremdenviertel] (Fig. 2c).

However, it was the ambitious Count Goluchowski (1849–1921), Austria-Hungary’s Minister of Foreign Affairs between 1895 and 1906, who gave fresh political impetus towards the Far East (Fig. 3a). After China’s humiliating defeat in the Sino-Japanese War of 1894–95, Japan and Germany installed their concessions in Tientsin, the German Empire built a naval base in Tsingtau (from 1898), the Russian and French expanded in China, Great Britain settled in Hong Kong, and Italy launched an (unsuccessful) exploratory mission in February–March 1899. Austria-Hungary, with its new Beijing-based delegate and plenipotentiary minister, Moritz Baron Czikann von Wahlborn (1847–1909) (Fig. 3b), equally felt under pressure to further investigate potential trading posts along the Chinese coast (compare with Lehner in his introduction).

In this context, the following anonymous front-page article of 11 March 1899 in Austria’s most important newspaper, Neue Freie Presse [New Free Press], which openly advocated Habsburgs going global towards East Asia may itself have been a secret Goluchowski/Czikann initiative and a perfect surprise for the Viennese authorities:

A remarkable rumour is circulating in diplomatic circles. [...] Austria-Hungary might join other European powers to claim a share of the Chinese coastline under similar conditions [...] we have no doubt that the thought that Austria-Hungary could join the other powers and, while all the others seize the opportunity, also claim a share of the Chinese spoils, is consistent with Austrian feeling [...] Austria in China! Only at first glance does this synthesis sound — as we may call it — exotic. [...] Surplus European energy is longing imperatively for exploitation, and it is irresistibly attracted by the unlimited perspective opening up on the shores of the East Asia seas into the unexplored expanses of the Chinese empire [...] Our Old Europe has become too cramped, and the new journey of the Argonauts towards the Golden Fleece of economic wealth is pointing towards fairy-tale-ish faraway lands. Why should Austria not take part in such an endeavour? Why should it stand apart while all the others are helping themselves? [...] Bosnia and Herzegovina have provided sufficient proof that we do not lag behind in the art of colonising. We do not need to stick to our native soil in resigned self-sufficiency when, at a moment of a veritable mass migration across the oceans, all European nations are setting out to create an immense market.
for their productions and in this way mightily promote their economic prosperity. [...] **Austria**, too, intends to occupy a colonial territory along the Chinese coast. [...] stemming from a desire to equally benefit from the Fountain of Youth of economic regeneration, which gives the Old World its modern imprint. No present state shall stiffen into sluggish self-sufficiency and noxious isolation. The world has become tremendously large and a share of it lays there for all who desire it. We need a window that opens up a view towards this new world. Longing for the far-away, competition for the market of modern life, expanding one’s horizon ... these are the new solutions. [My emphases]

[Neue Freie Presse, Morgenblatt No. 12411, 11 March 1899, cover page]

However, besides this wishful thinking, incidents were escalating (see the introduction by Georg Lehner). A local attack against Catholic Father Wilfinger in April 1900 resulted in a critical political situation. The installation of a small protective naval base at the mouth of the Hai River close to Tientsin followed, with some thirty Austrian marines assigned to it. Then a few hundred soldiers of the Dual Monarchy participated in punitive action against the so-called Boxer Uprising. In July 1900, the Expeditionary Forces of the Eight-Nation Alliance recaptured Tientsin, but in an internal report (dated 31 October 1900) Arthur von Rosthorn, councillor of the Austro-Hungarian legation in Beijing since 1895, warned about the potential risks incurred by an Austro-Hungarian concession project in the city (Lehner 1995, 427).

The (unequal) peace treaty was negotiated in 1900 and “the final protocol was signed on September 7th, 1901, eleven months after the first formulation of the allied demands”, as Hosea Morse, in his series *The International Relations of the Chinese Empire* (volume three: *The Period of Subjection 1894–1911*), documented in great detail in “Chapter

---

[1] In this context, the *Modern Family Journal — Österreichs Illustrierte Zeitung*, in its issue 34 (Oct. 1900) reported on “Our troops in China” (p. 623) and depicted battle scenes from Beijing as well as the Austrian army and its soldiers in a hospital in Tientsin.
3.1. From territorial occupation to ‘uneven’ contract and a first contact zone (1901–04)

On 7 February 1901 Czikann nervously reported back to the Vienna-based Ministry of Foreign Affairs that some of the other powers planned to further expand their concessions.

Now that the Italianlegation has occupied some land in Tientsin and only very few spots suitable for settlement are left over, and in the event that the Imperial and Royal Government [die k.u.k. Regierung] should intend to establish an Austro-Hungarian Settlement in Tientsin, I ask for immediate permission to occupy on behalf of Austria-Hungary a rather suitable plot of land on the left bank of the Peiho, which includes some 500 metres of riverside, borders the Italian occupied land, and lies near the railway station *vis-à-vis* the Chinese City and the new Japanese settlement. It is feared that any delay would lead to an occupation by Japan. Russia and other powers have paid the Chinese government around 75 taels per Mou for their settlements, and it can be expected that we would have to satisfy similar conditions as well.14

Only two days later, on 9 February 1901 a message from Vienna finally granted “the authorisation to occupy land under the condition that this would happen in a peaceful way, without any provocation or acute complications [and that] the transfer fee for the new area would be counter-balanced with the liquidation of our compensation claims”15 flowing from the military campaign against the Boxers. Armed with this ‘official go-ahead’, the occupation ‘took place’ on 11 February (compare with Fig. 16 in the introduction by Georg Lehner), as Czikann reported to Goluchowski:

In compliance with the telegraphed directive of 9th of the month, Vice-Consul Silvestri, Lieutenant Commander [Linienschiffsleutnant Oskar] Gassenmayer and Chief Officer of the General Staff [Hauptmann des Generalstabs] Wojcik were sent to Tientsin to occupy the territory concerned, whose boundaries had been drawn up in the attached report by the k.u.k. [Ettappenkommandant] Commander. The aforesaid gentlemen reached Tientsin in the late afternoon of the 11th of the month and approached, shortly after arrival and at the onset of darkness, the land concerned in order to mark out its boundaries as fast and discreetly as possible with the aid of flags and signposts bearing the written text: “Occupé par la délégation d’Autriche-Hongrie à Pékin”. On the very same day as the successful occupation, a hereby attached notification, which I had prepared and which was signed by [Linienschiffs-Capitän] Captain Ritter Bless von Sambuchi, was delivered to all the foreign consuls in Tientsin, in order to anticipate all eventual further protests of another power.16

12 He continued in the sub-chapter “Signature of the final protocol”: “The protocol was signed by the plenipotentiaries of China, Yik-wang, Prince of the first rank of China, and earl Li Hung-chang, and by the plenipotentiaries of the foreign powers, as follows: Germany: A. Mumm von Schwerzenstein; Austria-Hungary: M. Czikann von Wahlborn; Belgium: M. Joostens; Spain: B.J. de Cologan (doyen); United States of America: W.W. Rockhill; France: Paul Beau; Great Britain: Sir Ernest Satow; Italy: Marquis Salvago Raggi; Japan: Jutaro Komura; Netherlands: F.M. Knobel; Russia: M. de Giers” (Morse 1918, vol. 13, 325).

13 Morse put it, “the game of ‘grab’ thus begun was continued by the other powers” (Morse 1918, vol. III, 325):13 Germany (in 1899) and Italy (in 1901) joined Great Britain, France, the USA (already present since 1860–61 after the Treaty of Tientsin of 1858), Japan, and Russia (since 1898/1900) in the family of Concession Powers. Belgium followed suit in 1902. All these countries progressively installed their concessions in far less pre-populated areas and joined in the international Tientsin Provisional Government (T.P.G., *Dutong yamen* in Chinese). However, with no operational base on the spot Austria-Hungary could not adequately participate in the game until 1901.


16 HHStA MdA AR F8 (241), Czikann to Goluchowski, Beijing 14 January 1901. Shortly after, in his “Notiren über die Sicherstellung eines Settlements in Tientsin” [Notes about the seizure of a settlement in Tientsin] of 18 February 1901, Czikann reported back to the Austrian and Hungarian prime ministers Ernest von Koerber and Kálmán Széll, respectively. In his report of 10 March 1901, Czikann mentioned the long diplomatic “silence” of Japan and the US-American “solemn protest”.
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The first maps and their cartographic discourses

What Czikann mentioned in this report may count as the first map ever produced by an Austrian author to indicate the “Austro-Hungarian Settlement”. The hand-drawn sketch was called “The foreign settlements in Tientsin” and signed by “Chief Officer [Hauptmann] Wojcik”. While it differentiated between the “boundaries of the areas with constructed houses” and the “artificial boundaries of the settlements” (Fig. 4a), the first approximate dimensions of Austria-Hungary’s new possession (drawn with a red pencil) were indicated: “c.800 m” to the south towards the Italian concession, “1200 m” along the Hai River to the west, a zigzag line of “390 m, 180 m and 320 m” towards the north and north-east and, finally, “350 m” towards the east along the artificial line of the Chinese Railway tracks. This equalled an overall surface of just 0.64 square kilometre (or 1012 Chinese mu) with, as roughly calculated later, an approximate population of some 35–40,000 Chinese inhabitants.

This information was then reused, only one year later, by the ship-of-the line lieutenant Theodor Ritter von Winterhalder, ‘k.u.k.’ (which stood for ‘imperial and royal’ in Austria-Hungary) for his book Kämpfe in China. Eine Darstellung der Wirren und
der Betheiligung von Österreich-Ungarns Seemacht an deren Niederwerfung in den Jahren 1900–1901 [Clashes in China. A description of disturbances and of the participation of Austria-Hungary’s sea power in their defeat in the years of 1900–1901] (Winterhalder 1902, 132, 538–70). What Winterhalder himself had previously mapped out as “Chinesenstadt” [Chinese City] around 1900 (see Fig. 15 in the introduction by Georg Lehner) was now, a few months later, updated by simply transcribing the aforementioned original map into an official print version while also depicting some of the actors of the occupation itself (Figs. 4b,c).

However, if we look closer at the occupied area, we can see that the slot was to be far from an easy one for Austro-Hungarians to develop. A section of the depiction of Tientsin by the Chinese Feng Qihuang (1899),17 with its ‘typical late-Qing’ imagi-

---

17 The complete map is accessible through the online map section of the US Library of Congress, under https://www.loc.gov/item/gm71005155/ (retrieved 4 July 2020).
nary aerial map perspective (cf. Yee 1994), clearly shows (Figs. 5a/5c) that the future core of the Austro-Hungarian concession along the riverside directly east of the indicated “Dong fuqiao” Bridge [meaning “Eastern Pontoon Bridge”, compare our glossary] was occupied by long rows of small buildings (those towards the south may have belonged to the Chinese salt administration). Just east of the bridge, Chinese buildings were depicted, such as the “Sanqu” Academy (slightly to the south) and the “Sanguan” (probably Daoist) temple (right opposite to the bridge) — where the future main street would be. Towards the north, the “Shanxi huiguan” (House of the Shanxi trading guild) was standing.

When Noah Fields Drake was hired as a governmental land surveyor, the map that was produced for the first (1900) edition of his small booklet, *Map and short description of Tientsin*, was a totally different affair (Drake 1900; cf. Singaravélou 2014, 169–77). A comparison of the two visual representations demonstrates that the Chinese and Western colonial ‘cartographic discourses’ (after J.B. Harley) produced very different territorial, institutional, and social claims over one and the same urban space: Tientsin around 1900. For one side (the Chinese), it was a living social entity, whereas for the other side it constituted a calculable, measured space for future urban planning. In the Drake map of 1900 (Figs. 5b/5d), the same section indicated only a dense street pattern over *Ho Tung* (often referred to as ‘Chinese Town’). It was reached over the “Tung-puch’iao” from the west by crossing the Hai River,

---

18 I thank the co-author of this book, Georg Lehner, for his help with deciphering some of the Chinese indications on the map.
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Figs. 5a,b Two different cartographic discourses over one and the same city (Tientsin): above, “Complete map of the community self-defence system of the walled city of Tianjin and its environs” (originally in Chinese), attributed to Feng Qihuang and dated “Guangxu 25 nian” (1899); below, “Map of Tientsin, prepared for the Tientsin Provisional Government, from surveys made by N. F. Drake, 1900”. [Library of Congress, Geography and Map Division, Washington D.C., USA]
which had just been connected to the old artificial Beijing-Hangzhou Grand Canal to the north. On the other side of a pontoon bridge (see Fig. 5b), the buildings of a “College” and a “Salt Inspectors Office” along the riverside, a few other communal sites to the north, and a patchwork of water surfaces stretching east were indicated.

Whereas the cartographic language of the West was measured and scaled, based on the strictly planar representation of the ‘map’, the Chinese notion involved a form of religious and social topography (Yee 1994): the most important features and structures were represented through a mix of isometric and/or side-elevation perspectives. In order to understand these great differences, we need to go further back, in our case into the mid-nineteenth century. One Chinese source, Jinmen baojia tushuo [Explanation of the Tientsin/Tianjin baojia plan], dated 1846, is useful here: it shows the densely built-up area on the east bank of the Hai River just before any direct Western impact (see the introduction by Georg Lehner, in particular Illustrations 6a,b: maps of the British Admiralty of 1863), and de facto half a century before the same spot would be occupied by the Austro-Hungarian regime.

The first ‘map’ (Fig. 6a) — with a ‘correct’ north orientation from a Western point of view — shows the eastern part of the walled city (with the “Dongmen”, i.e. East Gate) and the confluence of the Grand Canal and the Bai River (equally called Pei River, see our attached Glossary). As regards the suburbs east of the river, the map shows various structures; just west of the “Dong fuqiao” [Eastern Pontoon Bridge] lies the “Tianjin fensi” [Office of the Circuit Intendant of Tientsin]. Just east of the bridge to the south, we can see the “Yanguan ting”

19 On the separate legends of “Government Civil Places” did Drake indicate number 58 as “Yen Kuan/Salt Inspectors Office” and under “Educational Institutions” number 59 as “San-chu Shuyuan/Hsiu-tsai College”.

Figs. 5c,d  Left: Section of the future Austro-Hungarian concession, as indicated on Feng Qihuang’s map of 1899; right: The same section, indicated as “Ho Tung” in Drake’s Tientsin map of 1900. [Library of Congress, Geography and Map Division, Washington D.C., USA; Noah Fields Drake: Map and short description of Tientsin 1900, map (selection)]
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[Building of the Salt Administration], facing the bridge the “Sanguan miao” (most probably a Daoist temple), and to the north the “Shanxi huiguan” [House of the Shanxi trading guild]. Further east on the plan, the “Guandi miao” [Temple of the War God Guandi] is depicted. The second ‘map’ (Fig. 6b) depicts roughly the same section, but from another viewpoint (the original map is turned to the right). The same major sites are depicted again (now with a more precise indication of the streets, such as the much-named Chinese main street, called Xinglong jie, or Hsin-Lung-Dschie in later Austro-Hungarian concession maps), but from a ‘Western’ standpoint. The representations of one and the same area are worlds apart.

Drake’s maps were also instantly appropriated for the Austrian project itself. When his “Map of the foreign settlements — Tientsin” was updated and re-published in 1902, Drake indicated the “proposed Austro-Hungarian and Italian Concessions” on the affected territories (however, his previous local Chinese indications had now been deleted!) (Fig. 7) and the same delimitations were incorporated (transcribed) into the first Austrian (German-language) cartographic efforts (Figs. 8a,b).

However, cartography always went hand in hand with political action. As early as April 1901, the k.u.k. Escadre Kommandant Contre-Admiral in East Asia, and an important Austrian player during the Boxer Uprising, Rudolf Count Montecuccoli, addressed a report to the Navy Department at the Imperial War Ministry in Vienna together with “his croquis” (sketch map) of the “Austro-Hungarian Settlement in Tientsin”20 (Fig. 9).

Figs. 6a,b Two maps in the Chinese source Jinmen baojia tushuo [Explanation of the Tientsin/Tianjin baojia plan], dated 1846, indicating the densely built-up area on the east bank of the Baihe/Haihe [River]. The future site of the Austro-Hungarian concession is on the right side, compare the location of the salt heaps on both maps. [Harvard University, Widener Library]

Fig. 7 “Map of Tientsin” (detail), as reproduced in Drake’s updated publication of 1902 [Drake 1902, map (detail), reproduction from Austrian State Archive, Vienna]
Figs. 8a,b Two early Austrian (German-language) maps (published in 1901 and 1902) about the “Austro-Hungarian concession”, drawn on the basis of Drake’s larger maps of Tientsin (1900 and 1902, see above) [Austrian State Archives]
Fig. 9 Sketch map in an internal report of 20 April 1901 by Count Montecuccoli, indicating the section of the “Austro-Hungarian Concession” [Öster-ung. Settlement in Tientsin]. [Austrian State Archives, Vienna]
While the overall street grid and the Chinese locations indicated certainly referred to the aforesaid maps by Noah Fields Drake, new important information was added: to the south-west, he indicated the spot of the “salt heaps”, while in the centre, the location of the “German military camp” [Deutsches Feldlager] was shaded in grey; this was instantly handed over to the Austrian navy. Of greater relevance for the coming years and difficult discussions with the local authorities, the map showed the large surfaces occupied by “individual graves and temples” (in blue) and “graves” (in red) of the local Chinese population.

The concession contract was negotiated from late 1901 onwards, but the Chinese side was in a weak position given that the whole city was occupied and de facto administered by foreign troops at that point in time. Since 4 August 1903, the Austro-Hungarian delegation was headed by the newly appointed Consul for Tientsin, Dr. Carl (or Karl) Bernauer, who had already started to equip ‘his’ consular section with all the administrative and representative devices of local governance even before a permanent consulate building had even been planned. The stamps and seals were designed to match those of the Austro-Hungarian delegation in Beijing (Figs. 10a-c).22

On the other side stood Tientsin’s Customs Daotai, Tang Shaoyi (other sources use the name “T’ong Shao I”), who was appointed as a negotiating

---

21 However, Montecuccoli wrongly indicated (to the west of the settlement) the “Pei River”, which de facto changed its name into “Hai River” after its confluence with the Imperial Canal (see glossary at the end of this book).

22 These devices for the representation of a European, imperial and Catholic power such as Austro-Hungary, included, as Bernauer indicated in several reports in 1902: a set of Austro-Hungarian merchant flags, official seals, administrative tools [Amtsbehelfe], a crucifix, and a portrait of the Austrian Emperor Francis Joseph, as well as a full set of the Imperial Law Gazette [Reichsgesetzblatt]; HHStA AR 8/242 (23 January and 4 July 1902).
partner by the powerful General Governor of the Zhili province, Yuan Shikai. Problems included an official (but unsuccessful) petition by local inhabitants to the Chinese City Administration as regards an exchange of territory, the (weak) guarantee of their continued ownership rights on occupied land in relation to newly introduced taxation and rather harsh expropriation rules (see below), compensation for the relocation of “6700 graves” (as mentioned by Bernauer in an interim report\(^\text{23}\)), and the handling of six enormous salt heaps along the riverbanks in the Austro-Hungarian and Italian possessions. A unique source, a photograph depicting these giant salt heaps.

\(^{23}\) Bernauer to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Tientsin 22 June 1902), “Concerning the completion of a draft contract for the acquisition of the Austro-Hungarian concession”, see HHStA MdÄ AR 8/241 (19).
along the Hai River, could be tracked down in the Austrian War Archives in Vienna (Fig. 11).

In a letter dated 8 August 1902 Bernauer (he was just appointed Vice Consul on 4 August of the same year) reported back to Count Goluchowski that, along with the Austro-Hungarian merchant flag at the bridge connecting the concession to the “Chinese city”, an official announcement [Kundmachung] had been put up in Chinese-language banners all over the area. One banner, attached to the Bernauer report, has survived until today in the Austrian State Archives and is shown here for the first time (Fig. 12a). It proclaimed “that the Austro-Hungarian Consul in Tientsin had taken over the administration of the Austro-Hungarian Concession in Tientsin from the Tutung Yamen, seat of the provisional government, on the first day of the 7th Chinese month (4th of August)”. As Bernauer further explained in his report, this would be the right moment “to expropriate the current owners, take over the land with its houses, hand it over to potential purchasers [Kauflustigen] [and] found a Municipalität for our concession.” 24 As an ironic detail, it shall be noted that, next to the stamp of the “Tientsin Provisional Government — Chief of Police” (Fig. 12c), the official Austrian stamp on the banner, indicating “K.u.K. Oesterr.Ung. Consulat Tientien”, misspelt the city’s name, which was commonly spelt “Tientsin” at that time (Fig. 12b).

The Treaty of 1902

As a curious matter of fact, the original Treaty concerning the transfer of the settlement of Austria-Hungary in Tientsin, drafted on 20 June 1902 and issued on 27 December 1902 has apparently been lost in the Austrian State Archives, but Günter Hörtler was able to locate a copy belonging to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the Academia Sinica Archive (Taiwan) during research for his 1984 PhD thesis. 25 The borderline was described in §1 of the contract as running between the rivers to the west and north, the Italian concession to the south and the (yet to be exactly delimited) railway tracks to the east (compare with Figs. 8a,b, 9).

The affected area was, as explained in §2, granted to Austria-Hungary for an “unlimited time without remuneration” and was to be marked out by permanent “border stones”. The ownership of land was granted to local inhabitants in §3 as long as “they could prove their possession by means of legal documents”. In spite of this, Austria-Hungary would “have the right to acquire land if it deemed it necessary in the interest of the state, for the development and flourishing of the settlement, or for sanitary reasons.” As for §§ 4 to 13, they dealt with the remaining salt heaps, an impending proclamation of the Austro-Hungarian consulate as regards the status of undeclared properties, the rights for Chinese to acquire land according to established rules, the translocation of private and public graves (and its remuneration), taxation, telegraph and telephone lines and, finally, the official proclamation of the contract itself by the Governor General, and the German and Chinese copies to be signed and stamped. However, the Chinese side slowed down the final ratification process as a result of internal strategic calculations.

Bernauer had meanwhile summed up his observations about the Austro-Hungarian concession project in a document first entitled “Vice-Consul Bernauer to Count Goluchowski” and dated “Tientsin, 31 January 1903” — an official ten-page report to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Vienna (Bernauer 1903a). This was then turned into a newspaper story called Unser Settlement in Tientsin [Our settlement in Tientsin]. First printed in the Viennese newspaper Fremdenblatt, the detailed description was, in a curious instance of global back-translation from one periphery (Habsburgs’ new concession in the ‘Far East’) to the other (Austro-Hungary’s Galician crownland of the Bokowina), then published in the Czernowitz Tagblatt on 25, 27 and 28 March (Bernauer 1903b): 26 diverging slightly from the first calculations (see above), the affected area would now

24 As “borderlines of the Austro-Hungarian Concession [he defined] “the Paiho to the north, the Peiho in the west, the Shi-dse-dji Street to the north-east, the rail tracks to the east, and the Italian concession to the south-east”, in: HHStA MdÄ AR 8/241 (9), Vice-Consul Dr. Bernauer an Ministerium des Äußeren (Tientsin, 8 August 1902).

25 For the “Vertrag betreffend die Abtretung einer Niederlassung an Österreich-Ungarn in Tientsin” [Treaty concerning the transfer of the settlement to Austria-Hungary in Tientsin], issued 27 December 1902 (“referring to the date of the 28th day of the 11th months of the 28th year, see in Hörtler 1984, 1:42–45.
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Figs. 13a,b Official Chinese proclamation of the Austro-Hungarian concession by Yuan Shikai on 23 March 1903 (full version, and detail bearing the Austro-Hungarian police stamp “Osterr.Ungar. Niederlassung Polizei”) [Austrian State Archives, Vienna]

The total “722,528 m² (equalling 1.178 Mow)” (one Mow or Mou equalling 666 m²), while the eastern section (with its disputed border with the railway tracks) still needed to be mapped out precisely. His description of the existing building stock and limited development potential was hardly encouraging: “Almost the entire area is [already] built up with houses, which are arranged on often very narrow and irregular streets and alleys (both two main thoroughfares with a maximum width of 3 m, all side-street even smaller). Unbuilt surfaces lie under water during most of the year and can therefore only be built on if the soil were to be filled up. The size of these plots can be roughly estimated at 25,000 m² (or 40 Mow),
while the existing graves may [on these plots] be about 10,000.” A rough census in December 1902 had calculated “about 25–30,000 inhabitants with some 1832 houses”, with “very shabby mud houses in the southern sections, better-built Chinese houses in the northern sections, and no European-built houses”. Besides the marine soldiers [Marine-Detachement] there were only three Europeans present, while Bernauer painted a lively picture of wealthy merchants (“doing their daily business in the neighbouring ‘Native City’”) and otherwise busy small-scale businessmen and many shops, ranging from grocery stores (“opium shops” and “liquor distilleries” included) to small manufacturers (from tailors to basket weavers).

As regards the concession’s emerging institutional structure, Bernauer mentioned the employment of Chinese civil servants, translators, secretaries, tax collectors and “70 policemen, called Shimbos” (see below, Figs. 17a,b) — in a sense, we may see them as cultural brokers between the local population and the foreign power — “meant to make the new administration popular”, as Bernauer claimed. In the meantime, a municipal council [Gemeinderat] was constituted in October 1902 (it lasted until 1916)27 with a mixed Austrian-Chinese board, while overall policing [Straßenpolizei] for law, order (small street lamps in front of the houses), and hygiene (street cleaning, disposal of waste and faeces, prohibited keeping of animals on public streets, closure of cemeteries, no more burials of the dead) was overseen by the Austrian navy under Commander-Lieutenant von Hassinger.

Bernauer concluded his report with a checklist of the “most urgent ameliorations”, that would indeed prove a heavy burden for the Austro-Hungarian concession for the years to come: such as “the building of a 1300 m-long quay along the riverbank, the repair and/or complete replacement of the existing, wooden floating bridge, and the removal of the burial grounds and their building development” (Bernauer 1903a, 9–10). It seems that Bernauer’s reports to Austria-Hungary, together with all internal correspondence via Beijing, had some effect. As the Wiener Zeitung reported on 29 May 1903 from the Hungarian Telegraph-Correspondence-Bureau, the Fiume-based Credit Bank planned, together with the Hungarian General Credit Bank from Budapest, to “open a branch office in the Settlement in order to mediate Hungarian trade with East Asia”.28 Besides other firms, the Ganz Iron Foundry and Machine Factory (already based in the neighbouring Port Arthur) planned to expand there and sent its chief engineer, Géza Szuk, on a mission (see his report below; cf. Szuk 1903).

Yuan Shikai’s official Chinese proclamation of the agreement was published on 23 March 1903. The original and published document, a large-size poster, could be located during the present research in the Austrian State Archives; it is translated and published here for the first time (Figs. 13a,b).

In his own report to Arthur von Rosthorn at the Austro-Hungarian delegation in Beijing, dated 26 March 1903, Bernauer himself provided a German version (here in an English translation) of the proclamation:

During the Boxer Uprising of 1900, after Austro-Hungarian troops had occupied a tract of land on the left-hand bank of the Peiho and immediately mapped out its borders, the k.u.k. Austro-Hungarian delegate Baron Czikann entered into negotiations with the general director [Generalintendant] of the northern ports, Li, as regards the establishment of a settlement. The unfinished negotiations (owing to the death of the latter) were brought to a conclusion through our despatched delegates, the Taot’ais T’ang, Chang and Ch’ien, together with Vice-Consul Dr. Bernauer, himself being appointed by Minister Czikann, and this resulted in the arrangement of the concession regulations. To this end, we received the following notification by the aforementioned Taot’ai: “Because the territory concerned was occupied by the force of arms and its borders were already delimited, it was impossible to undertake a scaling down or exchange of land. Therefore, we could only make the difficult situation of the inhabitants easier and find satisfying solutions for the transfer of the salt heaps. The following points were agreed upon [Bernauer: the §§ 3–6, 8 of the contract were quoted]. Additionally a map was drawn with this agreement.”

On the basis of the notification of the aforementioned Taot’ai, we deem the arranged agreement satisfactory and already reported back to the Waiwupu [Ministry of Foreign Affairs]. We publish this proclamation so that all inhabitants of the settlement will be informed. In future, all inhabitants of the Austro-Hungarian concession must follow

27 In a rare note the Gemeinderäte of 1916 were named in an internal report: H. Accurti, F. Bauer, S. Eichner, S. Scheyer, Li-Ko-Chang, Li-Wen-Hsi, Sun-Chen-Liang und Gji-Yü Nan. In: HHStA GesA Peking 102 (Settlement).
28 Wiener Zeitung, No. 122 (29 May 1903), 12.
Fig. 14a A topographical survey map (plan and section) of the Austro-Hungarian concession (c.1903) [Austrian State Archives, Vienna]
Fig. 14b A survey map of the Austro-Hungarian concession (1903) where Chinese public squares and temples are indicated
[Austrian State Archives, Vienna]
its regulations. Their obedience is commanded, it is warned against any infringement.

Yuan Shikai’s memorandum for the concession contracts for Italy, Austria-Hungary, and Japan, addressed to the Chinese throne in Beijing, only received imperial approval on 26 July 1903 (Hörtler 1984, I:41).

At this point, Austria-Hungary’s endeavour in China had gained a final legal status, but the Chinese parties to the agreement had all reasons to be suspicious, given that the Austrian land developers were well under way: two maps produced in the same year could be located for this study. In the first map (most probably drawn by the “local engineer K. Korsten”29 by transcribing the general street-grid data from the Drake maps of 1900/1902, see Figs. 5d, 7) a horizontal cross-section of the whole territory [Verlauf des Nivellments] was added, running from the river to the west to the neighbouring railway station to the east, and already indicated “36 border stones” to physically codify the property rights of the concession against the outside world (Fig. 14a). Towards the concession’s interior, the creation of a cadastre about actual real-estate conditions was initiated, existing mechanisms to expropriate local inhabitants in the other (French, British, Russian, Italian, German and Japanese) concessions were compared and discussed, and a “list of public buildings in the Austro-Hungarian concession”30 (with twelve entries, ranging from diverse temples to the “Salt Commissionary site”) was incorporated into a second map (Fig. 14b).

Some months later in 1904, Bernauer reported on “lengthy negotiations with the Chinese local authorities concerned” about the “established sums for the expropriation of Chinese land and houses” (with a differentiation between more expensive “brick houses”, medium-priced “cement houses”, and cheap “mud houses”, the “compensation of Chinese families after relocation”), and the first application of this procedure to ‘make space’ for the planned consulate complex around 1904/5 (see below).31

To conclude this sub-chapter about the developing ‘Sino-Chinese contact zone’ in the Austro-Hungarian concession, we would like to mention a curious document, as an archival source, that was added without any further comment to the correspondence material of the consulate: a “lottery” that took place in January 1903 “under the supervision of an officer delegated by the Consulate” (Fig. 14c).32

---

29 HHStA GesA Peking 104 (Settlement), Bernauer, Tientsin 21 December 1903, reporting to the Beijing Delegation about Korsten’s first proposals to develop the settlement and the study of other concessions’ expropriation strategies.

30 HHStA F63/1 (28), Beilage 2a ad No. XXXI 1903.

31 HHStA F63/1 (36), Bernauer to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Vienna, signed Tientsin 29 May 1904.

32 HHStA GesA Peking 103 (Settlement), Tientsin 12 January 1903.
Press reactions and travel reports

Given that until 1903 all these quasi-colonial and partly violent processes involving ‘uneven’ contracts, expropriation strategies, and established administration and policing structures happened ‘under cover’ to the largest extent, it is unsurprising that visible and tangible information about the Austro-Hungarian concession was rather scarce. The interested public back in the motherland had to content itself with limited photographic press coverage, while individual travel reports were just beginning to appear; some of this information shall be discussed in the following.

During the first years after 1901, press reception, both international and domestic, was at the very least ambivalent. The London Times reported on 18 February 1901 that “The microscopic settlement, measuring about half a square mile, which had been secured by Austria-Hungary at Tientsin would be hardly worth talking about if it did not constitute the début of the Dual Monarchy in colonial policy […] a Lilliputian Bosnia in the Far East” (quoted in Schustá 1967, 154; Lehner 1992, 88). Back in the Austro-Hungarian motherland, the official reaction in the Viennese press was not much more appreciative (Wagner 1955, 253–261; Lehner 1992, 87–9; Lehner 1999). Since the general context of this far-eastern “Habsburgs going global” (the present book’s title) venture needed to be explained, on 15 February 1901 the Wiener Abendpost [Viennese Evening Post] referred to the general difference between Austria’s acquisition of a “settlement” and a “colony” for the benefit of its readers in the capital of the monarchy.\footnote{Referring to a “dispatch from Beijing”, “Austria-Hungary had secured the land of a \textit{Niederlassung} for the establishment of a consulate and for the settlement of its citizens and their business.” Contrary to a “colony”, a “settlement [was described] as a small extraterritorial area where the settlers, most often around their consular representation, could live according to the law and order of the motherland.” Wiener Abendpost, Beilage zur Wiener Zeitung, No. 38 (Friday 15 February 1901), cover page.}

The 28 February 1901 issue of Danzers Armee-Zeitung (the army’s journal) published a small sketch map of Tientsin’s concessions, where the Austro-Hungarian one was highlighted with an ironic small question mark over two possible sites (Fig. 15a).

On the same day, the satirical magazine Kikeriki! Humoristisches Volksblatt (the first word being an onomatopoeic German word for the cry of a rooster) depicted a rather helpless Austrian soldier on guard,
Fig. 15b Press cutting from the Austrian satirical magazine Kikeriki, 28 February 1901, cover.

[Kikeriki! Humoristisches Volksblatt, 17 (28 February 1901), cover]
hanging in a basket out of the window of the projected consulate owing to limited space in the occupied concession (Fig. 15b). 34

Interestingly, provincial newspapers back in the peripheral Austrian motherland — such as the Echo aus Pilsen und Westböhmern on 30 March 1901 — reported “About the situation in Tientsin” [Zur Lage in Tientsin] 35 as a sequel to the international siege of the city in 1900 (see the Figs. 11a,b in the introduction), but not a single word was said on the resulting Austrian territorial ambitions in that city.

A constant critical undertone also emanated from Viennese intellectuals against Austria’s costly adventures in China. Amongst many others, a prominent comment was published in February 1904 by the journalist and writer Karl Kraus in his renowned newspaper Die Fackel [The Torch], in which he reflected on “the necessity of the whole” concession project (he never visited Tientsin himself) and rather opted for Austria’s involvement in the railway construction business all over China (Kraus 1904).

Beyond all official rhetoric and political programmes, individual eye-witness reports by Austrian and Hungarian visitors to the Austro-Hungarian concession in the first years of its existence are particularly helpful to better grasp actual local conditions and understand the kind of visual material, in the form of black-and-white photographs, that reached

---

34 “Das österreichisch-ungarische ‘Settlement’ in Tientsin”, in: Danzers Armee-Zeitung, No. 9 (Vienna 28 February 1901), 2–3; Platzmangel in Österreichisch-China”, in: Kikeriki — Humoristisches Volksblatt, No. 17 (Vienna 28 February 1901), 1.
Habsburgs going global. The Austro-Hungarian Concession in Tientsin/Tianjin in China

the European mother country. Visitors’ experiences in the Chinese-Austrian contact zone differed greatly — seemingly in direct relation to their social and professional status — as did their ‘ethnographic’ curiosity for Chinese daily life on the spot or interactions with Austro-Hungarian protagonists (from acting consuls to stationed marines).

The global journeys of four travellers to Tientsin between 1904 and 1909 are depicted below. It is interesting to note that most likely all of them started their world trips from Austria’s Adriatic port of Triest (Trieste, today in Italy), from where the Austrian Lloyd (Austria’s shipping company⁵⁶) connected the Austro-Hungarian Empire with all continents from the 1880s onwards (Figs. 16a,b).

⁵⁶ The Austrian Lloyd (Österreichischer Lloyd) was established in 1837 and had its first base in the Adriatic seaport of Triest/Trieste (today in Italy); since 1907, it has had its headquarters in Vienna. From the early 1880s, connections to India (Bombay), Singapore and Hong Kong were established; in 1912, a new “express line [Eillinie] Triest-Shanghai” was added (Österreichischer Lloyd Triest 1913, 13; cf. Winkler & Pawlik 1986, 10–39).

---

Figs. 17a–c Photographs from Géza Szuk’s 1904 article about the Austro-Hungarian concession (from top left to bottom right, and below from left to right): “Chinese street cobbler; The Chinese Police of the Tianjin Austro-Hungarian Settlement; Our Marine Detachment’s commander; Potato-roasting Chinese on the streets” [17a]; “Our Tianjin Marine Detachment’s storehouse; Chinese chief sentenced to kang” [17b]; “Our Tianjin Marine Detachment” [17c].

The first report is particularly interesting and quite unique because it documents a longer stay, most probably towards the end of 1903 or early 1904, at a time when the ‘Chinese’ character of the newly occupied territory still seemed to be largely intact. Its author was Géza Szuk, the Hungarian engineer from Budapest (see above) who visited East Asia to study the economic, financial, and technical conditions in Japan and China. His four-page report “Our little China. The Austro-Hungarian settlement in Tientsin” [in original Hungarian: “A Mi Kis Kínnánk. A tientsini osztrák-magyar telepítvény”] painted the busy everyday life of the local Chinese population; it was published in the Budapest-based newspaper Vasárnapi Újság [Sunday Newspaper] along with seven photographs of exceptionally colourful scenes. During our research on the Austro-Hungarian concession, no other report displaying this level of detail or quality was found — a fact that leads us to quote a substantial part of the article and reproduce its photographs (Figs. 17a-c):

[... After the war’s end, many [in Austria-Hungary] disapproved of Austria-Hungary’s land acquisition in Tientsin, China: they believed it to be a new burden, an unnecessary thing, since they thought that we wanted to colonise it. Now that I have had the chance to stay there longer to study the conditions of our little China, I do not believe that I am doing a useless effort if I should tell a few things about it.

When I left Europe, I thought I would find rather primitive conditions in Tientsin, but I was profoundly proved wrong. Tientsin is one of the most populous cities of China, with about one million residents, therefore more than Beijing, the capital of the Celestial Empire. Tientsin consists of two parts, one is the actual Chinese city, the other is the European settlement. [...]

Our settlement consists almost entirely of Chinese houses: a real Chinese city. Its area is about six-tenth of a square kilometre, just as large as our city centre in Budapest. The part of the Chinese cemetery closer to the railway still contains 10.000 graves. Although it is now forbidden to bury the dead there, it is still unpleasant when it rains; the area becomes flooded and the coffins loosen up. The dislocation of the graves is hard, owing to the Chinese belief that they are not allowed to be disturbed. Still, with money one can solve everything in China, so we can redeem the tombs for some trifling sum.

The territories occupied by the other great powers are partly empty lots, or already built up with European-style houses, with good roads and boulevards. [...]

On our settlement, so far not many things have happened. We are constructing a consular house, that is all. A large barrack has been planned, that could be equipped for defensive purposes. The area is connected to the Chinese city by a run-down pontoon bridge that is opened every two hours for passing sailboats. These are the moments when the pulsing life that is typical of Chinese cities can be felt the most. Pack animals, sedan chairs, two-wheeled carts, masses of people gather on the bank, waiting to cross. Approximately 30.000 Chinese live in our district. The streets are narrow, two-three metres wide. The kern of the residents are underprivileged, apart from some rich Chinese merchants, chandlers and tradesmen. There is everything that Chinese mouths and eyes might wish for: theatres, baths, opium dens, pawnshops, and even Chinese schools, where the children sit in pairs at their little desks, with books, writing tools and teacups in front of them; the stooped, bespectacled teacher welcomes the foreign visitor with great deference.

The streets are clean, since it is forbidden to litter and pasture pigs, and this is great progress for the most difficult task is to train the Chinese to cleanliness. All these achievements are a tribute to the executive power, which is represented by Hugo Accurti, ship-of-the-line lieutenant commanding a detachment of forty marine soldiers. A ship-of-the-line ensign and a naval doctor have been assigned to him. The supreme commander is based in Beijing. Officers live in a small Chinese house, next door there is the administrative building with the courthouse, tax office and police station. Order is maintained by seventy Chinese policemen, the so-called shimbo, who are serving with incredibly serious faces and are stationed in four rooms. Every morning they sentence trespassers caught on the previous day following an expeditious procedure. The punishment is twenty-five bamboo strokes, a fine, or stocks, the so-called kang, which is tightened around the neck.

Public affairs are conducted by the municipal council, constituted by wealthy Chinese, where the military commander and our Tientsin Consul always have the majority. The Chinese are very satisfied because they are treated according to European ways, but the Chinese authorities are envious of this treatment, for they view the [consular] jurisdiction as harming their own power. If a Chinese commits a crime outside of the settlement, of course that falls under Chinese jurisdiction.

In front of the municipal building, in a former Buddhist temple, lodges our marine detachment.
The soldiers live in Chinese houses. In the courtyard stands the temple within a seven to eight-metre high, gold-covered wooden Buddha sculpture. It is a curious sight when sailors clean their horses in front of this saint, or carry hay into the room. A chapel-like room serves as a storehouse. There is a military hospital, too. I have found some Hungarian boys amongst the sailors.

Although the streets are washed with water, and cleaned, still, sometimes the stench is unspeakable, but this comes with China. The civil service/administration costs money, but taxes cover the expenses, there is even a good sum left over every year, so the settlement does not cost us a thing; it is more likely that it turns a profit for us.

It would not do any harm if, following the other great powers’ examples, we would also make use of our settlement to promote commercial ends. Amongst all the European settlements, ours lays on the best location; we possess almost 1.5 km of riverbank along the Pei-Ho [River], and this is very important in Tientsin, since transport is conducted on the Imperial Canal and on the Pei-Ho [River]. On the east side, it is bordered by the railway, so that it is accessible by land as well as water.

While all the great powers are leasing their settlements from the Chinese, our settlement is the property of Austria-Hungary, we have occupied it; there is an agreement only about private property. So if there is a need for private buildings or lots, we have to expropriate them and the expropriation sums are set according to the condition of the houses. The public buildings, and temples, were simply taken by us, these are ours.

The streets are filled with people all day long. On street corners, there are large red posters informing those who wish to be entertained about plays performed in the theatre. Theatre is a real passion of Chinese people and even in the tiniest village we could find at least one open stage (if not more), where travelling actors entertain the audience. [...] 

There are many shops here. The main wish of every Chinese is to become a businessman, and in skilfulness the Chinese surpass the Europeans. They possess an excellent talent for business. The shouting and the noise produced by all kinds of vendors unsettles one's brain; everybody attempts to shout louder than the neighbour, they beat metal bars, drums, copper plates. Barbers run along the narrow alleys, for here they shave men not in shops but on the streets. They carry a bar on their shoulder, on one side a small stool hangs, where the customer will sit, on the other side a little closet with all the necessary equipment. In the middle of the busiest bustle, he has his patient sit down, washes his face with some water and shaves him — soap is unknown here. After shaving, he unties his hair, combs it and braids it, all this for about seven pence. The most interesting thing is that, in the meantime, pack men with loaded donkeys will have passed along while he carries on with the greatest calmness.

Fortune tellers and scribes pursue their professions at small desks. Tramps and street beggars are not to be seen on the streets, while other cities are filled with them, and oh, woe to you! If you give something, then the whole street runs after you!

On a square in front of a temple there is a rather great mass of people standing or sitting, and listening to an old Chinese's tale, who tells all sorts of stories with a peaceful face. Chinese people are passionate gamblers; men sit by the road and play cards. In the autumn, potato and chestnut vendors dwell on the streets. They roast potatoes in clay stoves, and chestnuts on small pebbles.

On the bank of the Pei-Ho rises a one-storied building, this is the public bath; by the entrance, a painting attracts attention: a carp bathing in the waves. If the pigtailed fellow pays his five pence, he can enter. In a large room there are small closets all around, and benches in the middle; the public undresses and goes into a room closed by a door, where there are benches and water is boiling in a huge cauldron, filling the room with steam in which the Chinese man sweats. Then, when he comes out, water is poured on him, and in his Adam’s costume he sits or lies down on the bench, and barbers and nail-cutters start their operations while they are drinking tea and smoking pipes.

The houses are packed very closely together, built of loam, there are no windows facing the streets. On the one hand, this is to prevent neighbours from peeping in, on the other hand for the women to be locked up from the outside world. When fire breaks out, which happens frequently in the hot summer, instead of bringing water and starting to extinguish the fire, first they will try to scare away the fire’s bad spirit with noisy tools, and only when our policemen appear with fire engines will the firefighting start, often too late.

When a Chinese is sick, he will heal himself with all kinds of homemade herbs; they are afraid of European doctors, especially the women, but they have already come to be fond of our detachment’s doctor, and when there is a problem, will often turn to him. Especially if it is about a surgical operation, they will willingly accept help, since they can see that the European treatment is worth more than the Chinese. Our doctor could tell interesting stories about the insensitivity of the Chinese. In cases where a European would have to be
anesthetized, a Chinese will bear the pain without flinching a single muscle, at the first cut he hisses once, and that is it.

The public health measures are also testimony to our commander’s foresight and vigour. There are no sewers and pipelines, people drink the dirty water of the Pei-Ho, and it is God’s miracle that these people have not died; if Europeans should drink from this water, they would certainly have typhus or dysentery. Despite all the safety regulations, cholera still occurs, as well as typhus and even the pest, but it is difficult to diagnose these diseases because they hide these patients and when they die, they are put into coffins and buried immediately.

Life in our little China is like in a hive, it starts with sunrise and ends with sunset. In the evening, the streets are illuminated, every house owner bound to light a little candle in front of his house; but there are public lamps, too. The other great powers light up their settlements with gas or electricity, even the Chinese city is equipped with electric trams and street lighting. Chinese shops are open until late at night, although there is no street life anymore, but there is always a late customer who buys something. Around midnight only the noise of the policemen’s steps can be heard.

When I saw our navy’s flag flying on the bridge and above the barrack, it was strange in this Chinese environment, but one gets used to it quickly and wishes: if only our homeland’s trade and industry could take part and seize the opportunity to use this piece of land. (Szu 1904)

On 25 April 1904, Count Alexander von Hübner, k.u.k. diplomat and retired field marshal, visited the Austro-Hungarian concession during his “trip around the world”, coming from Beijing with Vice-Consul Ernst Ludwig and then leaving via Shanghai for Japan (compare with the Tientsin travel report of 1871 by his father, see contribution by Georg Lehner with its Figs. 7a,b). His *Diaries about a world trip in 1904* [Tagebücher über eine Weltreise im Jahre 1904] were only published in 1911 (unfortunately without any photographs) and his experience in Tientsin was far from optimistic, but he added some worthy comments about conditions in the Chinese City and the other concessions:

Mr Ludwig and I reached Tien-tsin at 3 p.m. and were received at the railway station by ship-of-the-line lieutenant Mr Colledani. He is the commander of our local detachment, consisting of fifty sailors whose duty it is to guard the Austro-Hungarian settlement. In the wake of other great powers, after the Boxer Uprising and the siege of the legations in Beijing, we acquired a small territory termed a “Settlement” in English. Like the other great powers, we also administer justice and run the courts in concert with the Chinese Government. As regards law and order in our concession, the Chinese police answers to Lieutenant Colledani. He is the judge in cases of minor misdemeanours, such as theft, affrays and obstructiveness, etc., and can also impose penalties, fines, arrests, and lashes, while crimes are brought before the Chinese Tribunal. Local and administrative affairs are dealt with by our Consulate.

We visited the foreign concessions as well as the Chinese City. As regards the former, as in all foreign trading posts [Faktoreien] in China, those are lined up along a Bund, a quay bordered by well-built houses. All houses are enclosed by a strong wall — a proof that one has to take safety seriously in this country. Each house has a guardian who goes around the building during the night and disturbs the smooth sleep of the residents with the shrill tones of his trumpet. In these concessions we found a few very beautiful houses which are inhabited by the consuls of England, France, Russia, Germany and Japan; a large park; and the large hotel where I stayed. Together these concessions constitute a European city situated at a distance of two English miles from the Chinese City.

The Austro-Hungarian and Italian concessions are located in the Chinese City. In comparison to the other concessions, they are still in the making; our concession in particular leaves a lot to be desired. Although public administration, health care and policing have improved considerably, the streets and alleys here are in a piteous state [erbärmlicher Zustand]. Lieutenant Colledani is busily trying to steer all this, but where shall he draw the necessary funds? Our government seems to have no desire [keine Lust] to grant money for this purpose and the Chinese government takes good care not to pay for the expenses of the intruders [Eindringlinge]. In the middle of the concession lies a large abandoned burial ground which is now in a process of reclamation. Some hundred coffins have already been excavated, several thousands are still in the earth. Excavated coffins are taken to another site or returned to relatives as a result of claims.

These works and a great many others will demand a lot of time, and many years will pass before our concession compares to others. (Hübner 1911, 105–7)

When Friedrich Klein, a former k.u.k. district commissioner, published the *Travel memoirs with a special attention to the Austrian interests* of his world
Figs. 18a,b Above: The Chinese main road through the Austro-Hungarian concession, called Hsin-Lung-Dschie; below: The police station [Polizeiwachstube] in the Austro-Hungarian concession, as photographed by Friedrich Klein during his visit on 30 September 1905. [Klein, Friedrich: Nordamerika und Ostasien. Reiserinnerungen. Leipzig 1910, 43, 45]
trip to North America and East Asia, he included his late September 1905 visit to “our Austro-Hungarian concession” (Klein 1910, 39–47). While he also commented on other building projects (see below), the following passages indicate that the new Austro-Hungarian regime identified useful buildings inside the original Chinese street patterns (Fig. 18a, cf. Figs. 44–46 in the photographic album of 1911, Appendix) in a first step, adapted already existing buildings to their new purposes, and employed local Chinese (Fig. 18b) out of the densely populated area itself:

We entered Hsin-Lung-Dechie, a crooked, sinuous lane […] which is the only and shortest way between the indigenous quarter, Cheng-li, the railway station, and the Italian and Russian settlements.

Understandably, its traffic is bustling even by the standards of Chinese street life. […] During my visit, it was not possible to say exactly how many people live in our concession because preparations for a census were just in full swing. A rough estimate came to some 30,000 to 40,000, so that our settlement is the most populous of all. When it comes to native Austrians, however, you will find ten at the most.

In a narrow side street, an old Jamen — this is a palace for a high-ranking Mandarin — and a Buddha temple were converted into a barracks for our guard detachment [Wachdetachement] of forty marines, and our soldiers seem to feel rather cosy in the Buddha’s holy halls. In the courtyard of the barracks lies an old Buddha statue made of wood, of astonishing dimensions, and an age-old and very valuable bronze bell — the last remains of an old
As regards the importance and beauty of its buildings, our settlement assuredly cannot be compared to the English, German or French concessions but, as Austrians we cannot help feeling touched — and at the same time somewhat wistful — as we step onto a tiny patch of earth, in God’s wide world, beyond the black-and-yellow boundary marks [of Austria-Hungary in metropolitan Europe, MF], which may not be in Austria’s possession, but all the same is a place where, just like the others, we have secured the right to settle, to our own administration and to our own police force.

A [Chinese, MF] keeper of the law with his hair in braids, an old Austrian sapper’s sabre, and our double-headed eagle on the buckle of his shoulder strap [Überschwungriemen], isn’t this a sight for...
Fig. 20b  Photograph (c. 1902) of the old Chinese pontoon bridge connecting the Chinese city with the future Austro-Hungarian concession (note the Austrian marine, in white, standing on the bridge). [Austrian War Archive, Vienna]
the gods to behold? We could not deny ourselves
the pleasure of lining up such a specimen — I be-
lieve our fellow was also an “Austrian” sanitary
officer — for the picture that we took of our strap-
ing marine unit [Marinedetachement] […]

The positioning of our settlement along the
Peiho just opposite the Chinese City does not ap-
pear to be unfavourable for its development; unfor-
tunately, the absolutely necessary spirit of enter-
prise [Unternehmungslust] is missing in our world
of commerce; that, alone, could enable this little
‘Austria in China’ to stand on its still rather gaunt
little legs. […] May God help! (Holy 1911, 228–9)

As these four samples prove, the social and profes-
sional status of the visitors not only affected their ex-
periences on the spot as regards local informants and
visited sites in the contact zone, but also the word
choice in eventual publications in the then-popular
format of ‘travel memoirs and diaries’ at a time
when Austria finally became connected to the world
through her own steamship connections — from
Trieste all the way to East Asia.

3.2. Establishing visual markers: a consulate,
the river quays and an iron bridge (1905–
06)

Besides an institutional set-up and management plan
to develop her new concession, Austria-Hungary
was in a hurry to establish visual markers of its dip-
lomatic presence — and this was, of course, a con-
sulate building.37 After he was installed as consul,
Carl Bernauer was confronted with a rather curious
situation: there existed neither a private residence
nor an imposing office for his diplomatic duties in
the newly established Austro-Hungarian concession.
As he reported back to Vienna in a series of notes in
early 1902, Bernauer had to rent a “three-room
apartment on the periphery of the French concess-
ion” (in 1904, he apparently moved to the German
concession),38 and even pondered the options of the
“rental or new construction of an official building”.
Additionally, he commented about “the long dis-
tance between the Austro-Hungarian concession it-
self and the centre of social life” (i.e. the French
and British concessions),39 but this “great disadvantage
großer Übelstand] would hopefully be at least
partly remedied in the foreseeable future by the
planned electric tramway” (see below).

However, before either project (an electric tram-
way and a consulate) could become reality, the site
where they would be built had to be rearranged first
(Fig. 20a): on the one hand, the old wooden floating
bridge that connected the ‘Chinese native city’ to the
west over the Hai River with the new Austro-Hun-
garian concession (compare with the maps in Figs.
4–9) and, on the other, the riverbank on the ‘Aus-
trian’ side itself, which was de facto unconsolidated
and, across a mere dirt road, completely built up
with small Chinese houses.

As far as the existing bridge was concerned, its
old floating pontoons were judged too unstable for
increasing traffic, especially at low water, when the
flexible connection between the riverbank and the
floating elements became too steep; a replacement
with an iron bridge including tramway tracks had al-
ready been under discussion since 1902 (see below).
Newly discovered plans in the Austrian State Ar-
chives not only prove that Austrian marines already
controlled the old structure (Fig. 20b), but also that
engineering efforts were initiated in June 1903 to re-
force the floating structure with “new planking
over the boats” and two new foundations on both
sides (Figs. 21a,b).40

37 So far, references to this building project are few, cf. Lehner 1995, 327–30; Agstner 2018, 70–71.
38 With an attached contract, Bernauer reported in January 1904 that “he had rented a semi-detached house from the Land Invest-
ment Company, located on Wilhelmstraße in the German concession” (HHStA A.R. F8/241 (16), Tientsin 14 January 1904).
39 HHStA GesA Peking 103 (Settlement – Dschenenbrücke), Bernauer to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 6, 11 and 16 April 1902. Bernauer attached an offer by “Selberg & Schlüter, company of structural and civil engineering, Berlin and Tsingtau” (the German colonial marine base, some 600 km
south-east of Tianjin).
40 HHStA GesA Peking 103 (Settlement – Dschenenbrücke), Bernauer to the Austrian legation in Beijing, 12 June 1903. A cost es-
timate was turned in by the firm “M. Dietrich, Shanghai & Tientsin (Wilhelmstraße)” on 11 June 1903.
Figs. 21a,b  Old pontoon bridge across the Hai River: repair drawings of 1903 [Austrian State Archives, Vienna]
The consulate

Meanwhile, the Vienna-based Ministry of Foreign Affairs had agreed in April 1903 to build an appropriate diplomatic representation. In this context, the political circumstances surrounding the Boxer Uprising in 1900, the siege of the international legation quarter in Beijing, and the partial destruction of the Austrian representation in that quarter need to be remembered (cf. Fig. 9 in the introduction by Georg Lehner). To rebuild and partially enlarge the damaged main building, Ferdinand Kowarski, a Silesia-born architect who had studied in Vienna and was a veritable globetrotter in his profession,41 was selected for this purpose. Rare historical photographs from the Austrian State Archives (War Archives section) in Vienna were tracked down during the present research; they indicate the ‘before-and-after’ conditions of Kowarski’s project in Beijing (Figs. 22a,b).

![Image of the heavily damaged building of the Austro-Hungarian Legation in Beijing, and its rebuilding by architect Ferdinand Kowarski](image)

Figs. 22a,b: The heavily damaged building of the Austro-Hungarian Legation in Beijing, and its rebuilding by architect Ferdinand Kowarski (before and after 1902), photographs from Austrian War Archives [Austrian State Archives, Department of Kriegsarchiv]

---

41 A short obituary in the Zeitschrift des Österr. Ingenieurs- und Architekten-Vereins [Journal of the Austrian Society of Engineers and Architects] highlighted the global career of “Ferdinand Kowarski v. Stepowron” (Schulz-Strasznicki 1907), while the internal correspondence of Austria-Hungary’s delegation in Beijing added further information (HHStA GesA Peking 80, Akte “Ferdinand Kowarski”, entry of 26 June 1906): born in Teschen in Austrian Silesia in 1844, he had studied at the Polytechnical Institute in Vienna and participated in various railway construction projects — from Austria to the Caucasus and Bulgaria. After his involvement with the above-mentioned projects, he apparently planned to work on the Russian embassy in Beijing, but died on an Austrian Lloyd passenger steamship, the ‘Imperatore’, on 13 June 1906 near Cape Matapan (the southern tip of the Greek Peloponnesian peninsula) while working on a sanatorium building in Egypt.
Figs. 23a,b Floor plans and elevation plan (with sides flipped) by architect Ferdinand Kowarski for the main consulate building of the Austro-Hungarian concession (1903), stored in the Austrian State Archives [Austrian State Archives]
Shortly after, he was assigned the job to build the new consulate building complex in Tientsin, and a contract was apparently signed in April 1903. Two months later, Bernauer reported that Kowarski had produced a set of ground plans for the main consulate building, with offices on the ground floor and the official residence of the consul on the upper floor (Fig. 23a). The only elevation plan that could be found — unfortunately not of the main façade with a veranda on the river side, but of the longer façade containing the secondary entrance, which faced Baron Czikann Street — testifies to Kowarski’s rather conventional classical design (Fig. 23b). For the annex building, he designed offices for the administration of the concession and police (ground floor) and a flat for the clerk [Kanzlerbeamter] (upper floor) (Figs. 24a, b). Additionally, stables and even a tennis court were sometimes mentioned, but these features could not be confirmed by photographs for this study. Also, it seems that Kowarski’s plans as depicted here were not actually executed in all their details.

According to Bernauer, Kowarski had presented a cost estimate of c. 87,000 Mexican dollars (about c. 175,000 Austrian crowns), but he had to admit that “the duration of the project highly depended on the process of clearing the site of existing houses, whose owners needed to be expropriated first”. In a letter dating from October 1903, Bernauer reconfirmed the “consent of the Beijing Delegation for the overall 2700 m² construction site, the expropriation and clearing of the spot, and for Kowarski’s revised plans and cost calculations”. However, procedures went not as smoothly as projected; in December 1903, Bernauer had to report that a “Petition by the recently expropriated house owners” was not issued and delivered to him, but published in the China Times on 4 December 1903. A curious exchange of letters — between the relevant authorities in Tientsin —

Figs. 24a, b Floor plans by architect Ferdinand Kowarski for the annex building of the consulate of the Austro-Hungarian concession (1903), stored in the Austrian State Archives [Austrian State Archives]
Beijing and Vienna, the architect (he was reportedly hardly there during the entire construction period), local consultants, the manager in charge of construction (the neighbouring Brunner Construction firm, see Fig. 9 in the Photographic Album in the Appendix), and suppliers — explains the delay in project completion.46

Remarkably, this instance of ‘Habsburgs going global’ from Central Europe to the Far East entailed the sending, all the way from Austria, of exterior decorations (like the metal fence, Fig. 25) and all interior furnishings (from stucco to handrails, carpets, wallpapers, heating stoves and furniture) for the consulate complex! As with the Beijing project, the k. k. private Südbahn-Gesellschaft (a private Austrian rail company) and the Österreichische Lloyd agreed to transport building material from Vienna over the Alps to the port of Trieste, and from there all the way to China.

The completed project consisted of two buildings, with the main building rather neo-classical and the annex building a little more historicist in style. It was “bright white and an unmistakably Austrian building design”, as Klein put it in his above-quoted memoirs, illustrated with photographs that he had taken during his own late September 1905 visit to the Austro-Hungarian concession (Fig. 26a): the entrance of the main consulate building (left-hand side) was oriented towards the river and welcomed visitors coming from the west over the old pontoon bridge (see the Chinese boats in the foreground); it included a two-storey, columned open veranda (note the isolated brick gateway without any connecting fences).

It was in this rather bare setting that the opening of the new consulate was officially celebrated on 22 September 1905. This important event took place in the presence of Yuan Shikai, the heads of the local Chinese administration, and many other important figures, as Vice-Consul Ernst Ludwig proudly reported back to Vienna:

I saw it as my patriotic duty to solemnise this occasion and to send invitations to the Viceroy of Tchili Yuan Shih-kai [sic] and the heads of the Chinese authorities. As the S.M. ‘Empress Elisabeth’ had just reached Ching wang-tao near Tientsin, Commandant [Commandant Linienschiff-Capitän] Mirl, some officers and the whole orchestra also came.

---

46 For example, interim Consul Ludwig complained in October 1905 that “building elements (such as stair railings, wallpapers and ceiling decorations) arrived too late and delayed completion, [as much as the fact that] the architect oversaw the project from Beijing, Japan, Egypt and Vienna, and was therefore not informed about work progress”. Ludwig even recommended a penalty [Pönale] against Kowarski (HHStA A.R. F8/241 (35), Ludwig to the Beijing Delegation, 26 October 1905).
over. Likewise, legation councillor Dr. von Rosthorn, the delegation commander [Gesandtschafts-
Schutzwach-Commandant Corvetten Capitän] von Pflügl and the here present members of the Austro-
Hungarian Colony [sic] attended.

The consulate, the quay in front and the pontoon 
bridge were decorated by our concession with 
flags, lampions etc., and within this magic stage set 
the new and entirely white building appeared very 
monumental and stately. Only too bad that the pe-
rimeter fence towards the waterside was not yet 
finished and that this side had a bare appearance. 
[…] 

The celebration started with a short reception 
that was followed at 5 p.m. with a banquet in pres-
ence of the Viceroy. I need to mention here to His 
Excellency that the Viceroy to this date had never 
attended any afternoon or evening celebrations by 
Europeans and that his presence — as he person-
ally reconfirmed in a conversation to us — could 
be solely ascribed to the extremely cordial rela-
tionship between our governments. This friendly 
relationship was also mentioned in several toasts 
raised at the table.

As regards the circumstance that Yuan Shih-kai 
is the most powerful and influential man in China 
today, and that his reputation and importance even 
surpass those of Empress Dowager and the Em-
peror, a further rapprochement with him would 
seem useful to overcome our commercial and fi-
nancial hindrances in China.47 

In the same vein, the Austrian Legation councillor, 
Arthur von Rosthorn himself, reported back to the 
Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Vienna. With himself 
being in attendance at the opening of the consulate, 
he also referred to “the different speeches under 
which the toast of the Governor General Yuan-Shi-
K’ai [sic] about the rapprochement between China 
and the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy deserved a spe-
cial mention.”48 Fostering this diplomatic connec-
tion, Bernauer could proudly report back to Vienna 
from his “business trip to the Beijing Delegation 
[…] that on 21 September 1907 His Majesty had 
awarded the Viceroy Yuan Shi Kwai [sic] the Grand 
Cross of the Order of Francis Josef [Großkreuz des 
Franz-Josef-Ordens]” and just two days later — 
with an even more obvious agenda connected to 
concrete projects inside the Austro-Hungarian con-
cession in Tientsin — “the local Customs Tautai Li-
ang Tun Yüen [sic] received the “Commander’s
This diplomatic Sino-Austrian contact zone was kept well alive over the years. A couple of years later, in a report to Vienna (1909), the new Consul Ernst Ludwig who, after all, was a diplomatic representative of one of the oldest European monarchies, also praised the cherished Chinese-Austrian relations and remembered Yuan Shikai — one of the most effective Qing governors until the death of Empress Dowager in 1908.

\[49\] HHStA A.R. F8/242, Bernauer to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 28 February 1908.
and with a reported *faible* for mimicking old imperial grandeur — as “the most promising man for the reorganisation of the Chinese empire” (quoted in Lehner 1995, 330). From today’s perspective, events such as the opening ceremony of the Austro-Hungarian consulate in 1905 may be conceptualised as temporary stages where various Chinese and international consular actors would perform their mutual ‘late Empire attitudes’ and ‘world trade’ business in the “hyper-colonial” setting of Tientsin (after Rogaski 2000, 34).

Beyond all representative actions, the structural and decorative completion of the consulate complex was not achieved until far into 1906. Maybe these circumstances explain why illustrated press coverage in Austria was extremely rare. Professional journals like *Der Bautechniker* [The Civil Engineer] in 1906 were more concerned about the supposed costs of the project, while the *Zeitschrift des Österreichischen Ingenieurs- und Architekten-Vereins* [Journal of the Austrian Society of Engineers and Architects] only depicted the annex building (Fig. 26c) in a short obituary about the architect (Schulz-Straznicki 1907). Vienna’s *Modern Family Journal — Österreichs Illustrierte Zeitung*, which was designed to appeal to a wide audience in Austria, reported on “The Austro-Hungarian Settlement in Tientsin” in its issue of 10 February 1907, and placed a photograph of the consulate (Fig. 26b) next to a couple of illustrations, in the before-and-after mode, of the neighbouring bridge (see Figs. 35a,b).

The side-by-side picturing of the new Austrian consulate and the old Chinese bridge affected the fragile self-image of the Habsburgs’ civilising mission in the Far East, as a curious small project proposal would seem to indicate: in 1907, the year when the famous Austrian architect Ferdinand Fellner was commissioned to design a decorative niche in the stairway of the Austro-Hungarian embassy in Beijing *[Gesellschaftsplatze]* for a statue of the Emperor Francis Joseph (Fig. 27a), the same “sponsor, the firm of Alfred Taussig, Tientsin” (with its seat next to the consulate complex) proposed a similar project: “a free-standing statue of His Majesty at its own cost on the land of the Austro-Hungarian Settlement”. While a letter from “Gottlieb Taussig perfumeries factory, Vienna” (Fig. 27b) still supported this proposal in 1908, when construction of the new bridge had already been completed, the attached photographic description of the monument’s suggested positioning next to the old Chinese bridge (Fig. 27c) triggered a negative response from the consulate administration.54

### Riverside and quay constructions

As regards improving the infrastructure, Tientsin’s international concession community worked “with great verve” (Bernauer 1905, 32) and tackled the urban riverbanks for the following decades. What he was referring to was the *Hai-Ho Conservancy Commission*, which had been founded in 1894 and restructured in 1901 by the *Tientsin Provisional Government* as a collaborative board of engineers and city planners. It improved the course of the river (between Tientsin and its river delta in Taku/Dagu towards the Bohai Sea) as regards flood protection and

---

50 As an *Encyclopedia of Modern Dictators* has it, Yuan later (after 1905) ruled like a dictator, “got himself elected […] Emperor, [liked] to be dressed like his Austrian or Japanese counterpart, but claimed powers more befitting a Peter the Great than a constitutional monarch” (Kinkley 2006, 327; compare with MacKinnon 1980 and Shan 2018).

51 Rogaski’s observation about “the emergence of a hyper-colony” in Tientsin was influential for all subsequent studies about a pan-colonial setting of which the Austro-Hungarian concession had been part, but had not yet been taken into consideration. Therefore her definition is quoted here in full length: “During the first two decades of the twentieth century, Tianjin was the location of as many as nine foreign settlements. I characterize Tianjin’s unique situation as a ‘hyper-colony’ […] First, Tianjin’s status as a hyper-colony placed Chinese elites and nonelites alike under the gaze — and sometimes the control — of multiple imperial powers. As a result, there were multiple actors within Tianjin who utilized the discourse of hygiene as a symbol of foreign superiority and a marker of Chinese inadequacy. At the same time, the close juxtaposition of so many foreign settlements within one urban space dramatically influenced the self-representations of the imperial powers at the local level and offered the Chinese a view of several variant models of urban modernity. Finally, in contrast to colonial cities, the presence of a ‘native-administered’ area within the city provided some groups in Tianjin society with a physical and symbolic space from which they tested and reshaped the dictates of the new regime” (Rogaski 2000, 34).

52 A short notice listed the actual costs for the k.u.k. Ministry of Foreign Affairs as regards Chinese building projects; for the embassy buildings in Beijing: 300,000 Kronen, and for Tientsin: construction of the consulate ensemble 200,000 K., and renovation of the military barracks 40,000 K. In: Der Bautechniker, XXVIIth year, No. 24 (15 June 1906), 521.

53 Together with Fellner’s partner Hermann Helmer, the firm Fellner & Helmer designed over 200 buildings (mainly opera houses and apartment buildings) in all corners of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.

54 HHStA GesA Peking 80 (Projekt Kaiser-Denkmal), exchange of letters between 1907 and 1908.
commercial navigation. In its annual report of 1905 (the summary was published only in 1919 when, ironically, the Austro-Hungarian concession no longer existed), the Hai-Ho Conservancy Commission mentioned the completion of the overall works in Tientsin’s harbour area. This also included “widening and straightening of the river over a large portion of the Austrian Concession (the width attained there was 250 feet)”. The report continued: “The work involved in widening this cutting in order to mitigate the difficulty to navigation caused by the salt junks moored in the cutting was commenced” (Hai-Ho
Fig. 27c  Photograph in viewing direction towards the newly completed consulate building in the Austro-Hungarian concession in Tientsin, with a hand-written explanation about the exact positioning ("x") of the projected Kaiserdenkmal (attached to the 1908 letter from the Taussig firm to the consulate, compare the back cover of this present book) [Austrian State Archives]
Fig. 28 “The Peiho at the Austro-Hungarian Settlement in Tientsin”, depicted in Friedrich Klein’s “Travel Memories” [Reiseerinnerungen] of 1910 (compare with Fig. 7) [Klein 1910, Illus. 9]

Fig. 29 Floor and section plans for the constructions along the Hai River in the Austro-Hungarian concession [Austrian State Archives]
Habsburgs going global. The Austro-Hungarian Concession in Tientsin/Tianjin in China

Conservancy 1919, 23; compare with the Illustrations 86–115 in the photographic album of c.1911 in the Appendix, cf. Grünfeld 1913, 145; Rasmussen 1925, 221, 268).

Again, Friedrich Klein’s September 1905 visit to the Austro-Hungarian concession is an important source to set the aforementioned rhetoric of the Hai-Ho Conservancy Commission on technological development in relation to the specific ‘Austrian’ reality on the ground. One of Klein’s published photographs, entitled “The Peiho in the Austro-Hungarian settlement in Tientsin” (actually he depicted the Hai River), gives us an impression of how little the Hai River was actually developed at that point in time (Fig. 28).

However, internal correspondence proves that this costly issue was at least budgeted for that year: Bernauer reported to Vienna on 22 May 1905 that several project proposals for the quay construction had been discussed (one French proposal for the “Quais de la Concession Autrichienne à Tientsin” could be located in the Austrian State Archives) (Fig. 29) or, more precisely, for “the 400 m-long southern section between the [projected new and] more stable bridge and the neighbouring Italian concession”.

Just one month later, Ludwig added two plans and elevation sketches about how the imaginaire of a (Shanghai-inspired, though without a doubt much smaller, Austrian version of a) “Bund Street” would ideally be combined with a thirty-feet wide paved and drivable street, with a sewer system underground, and pavements and an electrified tramway along its sides (Figs. 30a,b).

On 30 June 1905, interim Consul Ernst Ludwig drafted an addition to the existing “settlement treaty” (see above) in which he explained the complex interplay between the intended quay and street constructions along the river, the upcoming iron bridge and tramway project, and the inner-city development of

---

Figs. 30a,b Sketch plans and elevations for the construction of the new main street [Hauptstrasse] through the Austro-Hungarian concession and for the new Bund Street, with details of the projected tramway line (June 1905) [Austrian State Archives]

55 HHStA F 63/1 (43), Carl Bernauer to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tientsin 22 May 1905.
56 HHStA F 63/1 (44), Ernst Ludwig to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tientsin 22 June 1905.
Fig. 31 Area plan and topographical section (Verlauf des Nivellments) of Austro-Hungarian concession (dated June 1905): the “godowns” area in the north-west is indicated, along with the difficult graveyard sites in the south-east of the concession [Austrian State Archives]
the Austro-Hungarian concession through a dedicated investment company (see below). The attached sketch plans (Figs. 31, 32) indicated the areas from which the local Chinese population was to be expropriated (including the large graveyards), and whose dwellings were gradually to be displaced in the following years by “Austro-Hungarian subjects” and their European-styled houses or “godowns” along a Shanghai-inspired “Bund”.

In the end, this was wishful thinking and a scenario that never really happened. Moreover, the site of the slightly more southern new bridge and the new main street with structures built by the “construction company” [Bau-Gesellschaft] were already indicated:

Along the river of the Haiho, from the northern limit of our concession to its southern limit, which borders the Italian Concession, Austro-Hungarian subjects have the right to buy land and houses from the Chinese in order to build houses or godowns, but only in plots that are fifty-metre wide, counting from the border of the new Bund under construction. […] A committee composed of two Europeans, a civil engineer and a European functionary of the concession, and two Chinese, under the presidency of the Austro-Hungarian Consul or the Chairman of the municipality, if such a body will be in existence later on, will be appointed, whenever the case arises, and will set the price of the land and the houses to be expropriated. These modifications will enter into force instantly once the bridge issue has been satisfactorily settled with the Chinese authorities and after approval by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but will not be applicable to the Austro-Hungarian Hotung Land Investment Company, which is to be established this year, with regard to the construction of a road from the iron bridge to the railway terminus, which is to have a width of 50 feet and a 100-foot wide piece of land on both sides of this road, where it is intended to build semi-foreign and foreign houses.157

---

157 HHSIA F63/1 (47), Draft of the overall development, Ludwig, Tientsin 30 June 1905.
The new bridge and the tramway line

In the context of the infrastructural measures, one Austro-Hungarian highlight was certainly the replacement of the above-mentioned old floating pontoon bridge in wooden construction with an iron swing bridge. Leading towards the newly built consolidate, the bridge would finally provide a perfectly ‘engineered’ visual entry into the Austro-Hungarian concession. From a logistical point of view, given the increasing amount of traffic, the bridge became all the more necessary, especially as the Belgian Compagnie Internationale de Tramways et d’Éclairage de Tientsin (with its headquarters in the Austro-Hungarian concession, see Fig. 55b) was planning a tramway line across the international concessions (Liu 2006; Dussart-Desart 2017; Zhao 2018).

One important task in this regard was to connect the railway station in the south-east, through the Austro-Hungarian concession and over the Hai River, with the Chinese City to the north-west. While internal correspondence indicates that project proposals for a tramway system already circulated as early as 1902 and a contract with the Chinese government was apparently signed in 1904, concrete involvement of the Austro-Hungarian concession only gained momentum from 1905. At that point, as Ludwig explained in an interim report to Rosthorn in October 1905, L. Jadot, engineer and manager of the Compagnie de Tramways, had reached general agreements with the Italian and Russian concessions, “approached the Belgium Minister and Yuan Shih-kai, and urged the other contracting partners to ratify the contract”, whose draft version was also sent to the Austrian consulate. Together with an earlier draft of the tramway connections across the Austro-Hungarian concession, although not across the river (Fig. 33a), a “specification of the bridge” was attached: it was planned to have a total length of 248 English feet, between the abutments, over the Hai River, stand about 60 feet below the [old, MF] bridge and piers and abutments in cement, concrete, and brickwork. Jadot’s section plan of December 1905 has survived in the Austrian State Archives; it indicates the general dimensions of the “Iron Bridge at Tung Fu Chiao” connecting “the new road of the Austro-Hungarian Concession” and the “Chinese Bund” (Fig. 33b) along one of the four proposed tramway lines, more precisely “Line A: From the Tung Fu Chiao to the Tientsin Settlement Railway Station on the Main Road crossing the Austro-Hungarian, Italian and Russian Concessions”.

The bridge was intended to be under sole Chinese ownership (maintenance included), while freight was to be provided by the Imperial Railway of North China free of Imperial Maritime Custom fees. All necessary facilities for the bridge were to be provided by the Austro-Hungarian and Chinese sides of the bridge, and the Tientsin City Public Works Department had to lend their machines, such as dredger, pile driving engine, boats, and steamroller, free of charge. As regards the bridge and overall tramway deal (the second part included mandatory electric light installations along the tracks and an electric traction overhead system), the typescript, which contained thirty-six paragraphs and was five-page long, bore the following title: “Agreement between the Austro-Hungarian and Italian Governments and the Municipal Authorities of the Austro-Hungarian, Italian and Russian Concessions in Tientsin, represented by Mr E. Ludwig, Austro-Hungarian Acting Consul, Mr G. Chiostri, Italian Consul, Mr N. Laptew, Russian Consul, Chairman of the Russian Municipal Council, on one side; and the Compagnie de Tramways et d’Éclairage de Tientsin, represented by Mr L. Jadot, Engineer and Manager of the said Company, on the other side”; it was marked with the official stamps on 16 November 1905 (Figs. 34a, b) and was valid for a first term of five years. The bridge project was jointly financed by the Chinese government (37%), the Belgian firm (36%), and Austria-Hungary (27%).

The iron swing bridge, together with the tramway system, was inaugurated on 21 November 1906. While secondary sources mention that Yuan Shikai himself had taken an active part in the supervision of the project (Shan 2018, 108), Bernauer confessed in his report to the Beijing Legation on the day of the project's inauguration, that "the payable amount of 89,000 francs was transferred from our settlement for the construction of the bridge to the Compagnie", Austrian State Archives (Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv – Handel, Department 12, China 1907, Fasc. 1058).
opening ceremony that “Viceroy Yuan Ski Kwai [sic] was absent owing to indisposition, but in his stead the head of the Chinese administration, the local Customs Officer Taotai Liang, was present, as well as all consular representatives, delegations from all the concessions, commanders of the stationed troops, and company directors.”

As a two-page report in the journal *Das Han-dels-Museums*, edited by the k.u.k. Austrian Trade Museum, put it on 10 January 1907, this “iron swing bridge [Drehbrücke] was the new pride of the trans-

---

61 HHStA GesA Peking 103 “Settlement Brücke und Tramway 1902/06” (Bernauer to the Beijing Legation, Tientsin 21 November 1906.)
Fig. 34a,b Agreements and stamps by the contracting parties for the iron swing bridge, namely: the Belgian Tramway Company, the Austro-Hungarian, Italian and Russian parties (above), and the Chinese side (below); signed in Tientsin on 16 November 1905 [Austrian State Archives]
port system of Tientsin […] and opened with a big ceremony in the presence of high Chinese and foreign dignitaries”. 62 What this infrastructural project meant for the self-understanding of Austria-Hungary’s civilising mission in the Far East is easily exemplified through a couple of historical, and so far overlooked illustrations published by Austrian media, from periodicals to postcards.

In its issue of 10 February 1907 on “The Austrian settlement in Tientsin” (cf. Fig. 26b), the aforementioned Österreichs Illustrierte Zeitung juxtaposed, next to a short comment, a photograph of “The former pontoon bridge, with an Austrian-Hungarian marine soldier standing on guard” and the soon-to-be expropriated Chinese huts in the background (Fig. 35a, cf. Fig. 20b), with a picture of “The recently opened Austrian-Hungarian bridge, connecting the Chinese City with our settlement” (Fig. 35b). This visual ‘before-and-after Western-impact narrative’ gradually condensed into a certain iconicity of Austrian progress and orderliness when hand-coloured postcards, such as those showing the “Austrian bridge — Tientsin” (cf. Krasser 2015, 52), or other street scenes with the tramway tracks, circulated around the globe (Figs. 36a–c).

Finally, this “Austrian bridge” (nota bene: 73% of its cost was financed by non-Austrian shareholders) became a constant feature in almost all city guides or ‘best-of’ illustrated overviews with their ‘must-see’ canon of Western achievements in Tientsin. Examples include the Astor House Hotel Guide to Tientsin and Neighbourhood (Burton St. John 1908, 39) or Cook’s Handbook for Tourists to Peking, Tientsin… (Cook’s Handbook 1910, 70). In the 1912 issue on Northern China by Madrolle’s Guide Books series (Madrolle 1912, 59–66), an overall map of Tientsin depicted the tramway line from the railway station in the Russian concession, through the Italian and Austro-Hungarian concessions, over the ‘Austrian bridge’ and into the Chinese City (Fig. 37a). An often-quoted source is Rasmussen’s Tientsin — An Illustrated History (Rasmussen 1925, 33, 39, 45), published when Austria had already left the concession for more than ten years. However, the bridge also continued to be an iconic feature of international postcards in the postcolonial period, when its supposed ‘Austrian’ origin was transcribed into the “Chin Tang Bridge” (Fig. 37b).

3.3. Between wishful thinking, urban planning, and local realities: developing colonial space (1906–11)

While the first representative structural and visual markers of the Austro-Hungarian presence in Tientsin, namely, the consulate and the iron swing bridge, were being built, the administrators of the newly established concession were confronted with a challenge: to effectively conceive, institutionalise, and physically develop ‘their’ colonial space. For all occupying forces, the foundation of a permanent, institutionalised management structure was required as a first step towards “bringing order into chaos” in “Tianjin cosmopolis” (Singaravélou 2017, 113); also in the Austro-Hungarian concession, this meant tackling urban development.

▶ The Hotung Construction Company

The Hotung Baugesellschaft (H.B.G.) [Hotung Construction Company] was created in late 1905. As internal correspondence clearly indicates, Austrian administrators carefully studied and compared the structure and statutes of existing construction companies in the British, French and German concessions. Thus, the statutes of the H.B.G. built on what we may conceptualise as a form of silent inter-concessional transfer of knowledge and expertise; their twelve short paragraphs were discussed, drafted and published in a short brochure in the same year (Statuten 1905), but after some internal debates were republished in a slightly revised version in 1908 (Figs. 38a,b). 63

As the Amtsblatt zur Wiener Zeitung und Zentral-Anzeiger für Handel und Gewerbe [Official Journal supplement to the Vienna Journal and Central Gazette for Trade and Commerce] announced on 24 February 1906 by quoting from the statutes, the H.B.G. was authorised by the k.u.k. Legation in Beijing and founded on 19 December 1905 with its headquarters in Tientsin (§ 1). Its mission was the land acquisition and property development; purchase, sale or other exploitation of buildings in the Austro-Hungarian concession, in Tientsin city and

---


63 Both versions are stored in HHStA Adm.Reg. F63/1 (Statuten).
Fig. 35a The old pontoon bridge to the Austro-Hungarian concession before its replacement by a modern iron bridge, photographed for the *Österreichs Illustrierte Zeitung* [Austria’s Illustrated Press] of 10 February 1907. [Österreichs Illustrierte Zeitung, Vol. 19 (10 February 1907), 451]

Fig. 35b The new “Austro-Hungarian Bridge”, depicted in the *Österreichs Illustrierte Zeitung* [Austria’s Illustrated Press] of 10 February 1907. [Österreichs Illustrierte Zeitung, Vol. 19 (10 February 1907), 451]
36a–c Painted postcards depicting the “Austrian Bridge in Tientsin” (c.1910) and the other end of the concession [Krasser 2015, 52; Wikimedia Commons]
Fig. 37a A map published in 1912 in Madrolle’s Guide Book series on Northern China, already indicating the tramway line: from Tientsin’s railway station (in the Russian concession), across the Italian concession, over the new bridge of the Austro-Hungarian concession, and terminating in the Chinese City [Madrolle 1912, no page, between 56 and 57]

Fig. 37b A painted postcard from the postcolonial period showing the former Austrian Bridge in Tientsin and indicating the “Chin Tang Bridge and the Metropolitan Police Board, Chinese City, Tientsin” (undated) [Wikimedia Commons]
its surroundings and all related business; further the construction and operation of warehouses (§ 2). The company [was] in operation for an unlimited period (§ 3), equipped with 200,000 taels of share capital (§ 4) and run by an elected gremium with a concrete working agenda (§ 5–12). Its public announcement jointly signed by its directors, Hugo Accurti and Wen Shou-Feng. The H.B.G. directors were originally assisted by Max Hey (from the Imperial Maritime Customs, see introduction by Georg Lehner) and Eduard Andres (k.u.k. consulate secretary) while construction works were led by Johann Brunner (his local construction firm had already assisted in building the consulate, see above) and Rudolf Wipplinger. Other public sources over the years mention a slightly different set-up of six members, three Austro-Hungarians and three Chinese. Arnold Wright’s 1908 Twentieth Century Impressions of Hong Kong, Shanghai, and Other Treaty Ports (Wright 1908, 749, 751) and The Directory & Chronicle for China for the year 1909 (Hong Kong 1909, 692) listed: “Gino Accurti (general manager), S.F. Wen (co-manager), and the directors Hugo Accurti, Emil S. Fischer, Ch’en Chu Chi and Yuen Tsu Chen”. A constant source of trouble and complaints (caused by a lack of control mechanisms over some dubious machinations behind the scene, see below), Hugo Accurti (a former naval officer who, together with his brother Gino, had come to China with the Austrian army during the Boxer Uprising) played a dual role, being also the concession’s official secretary.

A series of sketch plans from the first year (1906) of the H.B.G. has survived in the Austrian State Archives: between the written lines of accompanying, often lengthy explanations of internal reports between Tientsin, Beijing, Vienna and Budapest, these may be contextualised as a cartographic discourse of visions developing the colonial space of the Austro-Hungarian concession or, more explicitly, as a violent planning tool designed to insert the concession into a pre-existing Chinese urban fabric. Building on the aforementioned inventory maps (compare

---


65 One of the earliest sources concerning the financial status of the Austro-Hungarian concession was summarised by Bernauer in a report in April 1905, quoting “The revenues and expenditures of the settlement, August 1902 to December 1904, compiled by the secretary of the Austro-Hungarian concession in Tientsin” (this was Hugo Accurti). The latter stated a “liquid cash balance [Kassarest] of 28,000 teal (65,000 Austrian crowns)” and a “list of buildings, sorted by business classes [Geschäftsklassen] 1 to 3, [comprising of] hotels, restaurants, a pawn shop, a distillery, wine sales, a theatre, a tea room, baths, and opium saloons (increasing from 16 to 24)”, HHStA F63.1 (43), Bernauer to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 11 April 1905.
Figs. 8a,b with Fig. 31), one plan with an added legend covering the entire concession area (Fig. 39) indicated the “former cemetery”, “temples and public buildings” — including the local municipal Yamen site (used by the Austrian navy and police, see below) next to the local Chinese Sin Lun Dje Street (or Hsin-Lung-Dschie as it was called in the Klein report, see quote above) — and “public lots and private houses” (cf. Fig. 14b). Additionally, the “Neue Strasse” [New Street], with the building lots of the “Hotung Baugesellschaft” was highlighted in red.

Zooming into the planning area, Arthur von Rosthorn (in his 24 March 1906 report from Beijing to Agenor Goluchowski, Minister of Foreign Affairs in Vienna) attached two of Hugo Accurti’s working maps. The first map indicated the “ten blocks to-be expropriated”,66 reserved for the Hotung Baugesellschaft along “Neue Straße” between “Bund Straße” and the consulate and so-called Marine-Grundstück [navy grounds, which were never developed and neighboured the new market] on the one side, and the dotted line towards the Italian concession to the north on the other side (Fig. 40a; cf. the Italian map in Fig. 64). The second map already went one step further: it displayed a vision of twenty-two street blocks to be developed towards the southern border with the Italian concession (Fig. 40b).

Finally, an overall plan of 1906 provides evidence that the projects along the new Baron Czikann Street, the plots reserved for the future (including the “Dschunken Hafen Project” [junk port project] near the constantly swamped area towards the railway tracks), and the Chinese urban fabric from the recent past collided over one and the same territory, which was now labelled the “Austro-Hungarian Concession” (Figs. 41a,b).

The Hotung Construction Company’s annual reports [Hotung Baugesellschaft – Geschäfts-Berichte], published from 1906 to 1916 (Figs. 42a–c), constitute an important primary source of information on work in progress. By comparing reports of

---

66 HHSIA F 63.1 (55), Rosthorn to Goluchowski, 24 March 1906.
**Fig. 40a** Development plan by Hugo Accurti (1906) indicating the various blocks of the H.B.G. building project to the left and right of the new main street [Austrian State Archives, Vienna]

**Fig. 40b** Development plan by Hugo Accurti (1906) indicating all 22 blocks of the projected new urban grid for the Austro-Hungarian concession [Austrian State Archives, Vienna]
Figs. 41a,b Development plan (by Hugo Accurti, 1906?) showing the projected new urban grid of the Austro-Hungarian concession (lower right side), next to the older, traditional Chinese quarters (left side) [Austrian State Archives, Vienna]
Habsburgs going global. The Austro-Hungarian Concession in Tientsin/Tianjin in China

Figs. 42a–c Covers and balance sheet of the Hotung Construction Company “annual reports” [Hotung Baugesellschaft – Geschäfts-Berichte] [Austrian State Archives, Vienna]
the period 1906 to 1915, we can see that the greatest amount of building activity was in the first three years, followed by stagnation and a considerable vacancy rate of the built housing stock: between the lines this means that the Austro-Hungarian concession never attracted many international residents; neither did it increase business activity, and the provided structures, from houses to theatres, were hardly accepted by the local Chinese population.67

Additionally, the administration within the H.B.G., which involved the two Accurti brothers sitting for years on both sides of the controlling mechanism, was increasingly considered problematic (see below the legal case around Hugo Accurti and the connected petition).68

Press reactions and PR initiatives

Despite the representation of these internal visions on circulated maps, political representatives, local players, and informed journalists as well as anonymous authors provided a rather ambivalent range of opinions about the Austro-Hungarian concession’s achievements, the challenges it faced, and its future options. On 20 September 1906, *Pester Lloyd* (the largest business-oriented German-language daily newspaper in Hungary’s capital, Budapest) published a comment on “Das österreichisch-ungarische Settlement in Tientsin”. Far from being enthusiastic, the anonymous writer stated that “the new effective colonial possession” did not offer an opportunity, but rather would “pose a problem for the government, as it simply did not want to be colonised by Austrian or Hungarian settlers” [my emphasis]. This had to do with “a vicious circle of indifferent domestic exporters and very insufficient transport conditions” on the global scale. As regards governmental efforts to develop “our only colonial possession overseas”, the list of achievements (which most often were borrowed from foreign third parties) was, however, highlighted: “the construction of a quay; the regulation of the Hai River; the building of a swing bridge; the installation of a water supply system, electricity, and an electric tramway; a new reservoir for the sewer system; the transfer of several thousand Chinese graves;69 and a cadastre”. But, the author rightly speculated, “would all these improvement measures [Meliorationsarbeiten] just be made for the local

67 Recalling the first “business year of 1906” the H.B.G. declared: “49527 Mow of arable land in its possession of which only 15040 Mow were built on [verbaucht] (one Mow equalling 666 m²); the “business year of 1907” indicated a slightly larger ownership of 49581 Mow, newly developed land amounting to 24047 Mow, built-on land totalling 39087 Mow, leaving 10494 Mow for future development [Verbaussen]. In 1907, the company built: “173 Chien Chinese houses, 49 shops, 4 European houses, 2 hotels and one bath, including a western addition to the market hall”, resulting in an overall H.B.G. ownership of “431 Chien Chinese houses, 85 shops, 1 theatre, 2 tracts of market hall, 4 European houses, 2 hotels and 1 bath”. The attached “balance” and “profit-and-loss account” was signed by the “supervisory board [Aufsichtsrat] Emil S. Fischer, Hugo Accurti, Chen Tsu Chi and Yuen Su Cheng” and the “directorate [Direktion] Gino Accurti and Wen Sho Fang” (Hotung Baugesellschaft 1908). The report for the “business year of 1909, signed by the supervisory board H. Accurti, Emil S. Fischer, Chen Tsu Chi and Yuen Su Cheng” and the “directorate Hugo Accurti, Gino Accurti and Wen Sho Fang”, indicated a land ownership of 55582 Mow and the following newly built structures: “1 Chinese hotel, 1 pawn shop, 1 Chinese restaurant and 12 Chien Chinese houses”, totalling a building stock [Besitzstand der Bauten] of “547 Chinese houses (60 empty), 93 shops (23 empty), 2 theatres, 1 market hall, 10 two-storey houses (empty), 4 European houses (1 empty), 3 hotels, 1 bath, 1 European restaurant (1 empty), 1 bowling alley with 2 billiard rooms, 1 pawn shop and 1 Chinese restaurant” (Hotung Baugesellschaft 1910). The “Business Report about the ninth business year of 1914”, the year when World War I broke out, indicated that the “supervisory board G. Bourboulon, Emil S. Fischer and Yuen Su Cheng” and the “directorate Hugo Accurti and Wen Sho Fang”, stated that the H.B.G. owned “55013 Mow, with 46963 Mow of already built-on land [verbauter Boden]; it listed a building stock of “502 Tien Chinese houses (71 empty), 92 shops (12 empty) and 11 two-storey homes (2 empty)” and reported “36 Tien Chinese houses being demolished, the grounds of which being infilled to the new street level and developed with 22 new Tien houses and one hotel” (Hotung Baugesellschaft 1915). The “Business Report about the eleventh business year of 1916”, signed by the supervisory board G. Bourboulon, Emil S. Fischer per pro. Yuen Su Cheng” and the “directorate Hugo Accurti and Wang His Wu”, indicated “no new construction activities and no changes in land ownership”, listed “502 Tien Chinese houses (31 empty), and 92 shops (12 empty)”, and reported “a net profit [Reingewinn] of 16,126 Tls” (Hotung Baugesellschaft 1917).

68 A comment from June 1908, labelled as “private and confidential” by its author Emil Erwin Ritter von Zach (Consul for the Tientsin concession in 1908), described Hugo Accurti’s double role as “strange conditions between the secretariat of our settlement in Tientsin and the directorate of the H.B.G.” and even spoke of “increasing complaints about the ‘Accurti Clique’” (HHStA F63.2, E. Zach to “Hochverehrter Herr Minister”, Hongkong, 17 June 1908).

69 As regards this challenge, Ludwig gradually revised § 8 of the concession treaty of 1902 (see above) because the originally promised “remuneration for the removal of public graves of 4 taels per coffin” became a too costly affair. One disputed case was the burial place of the influential “Tsu Family with 312 identified coffins alone, totalling 1248 Tls of remuneration”, a sum which Ludwig judged “intolerable for the k.u.k. government” (HHStA GesA Peking 104 (Settlement), Ludwig, Tientsin 8 June 1905 (Entschädigung Friedhof/Gräberfeld).
Chinese population?” and he hinted at Austria’s supposedly less imperialistic, even disinterested “role as a friend and benevolent advisor” of “China as a world empire of peace.” Shortly after, this comment was republished by the important Österreichische Monatszeitschrift für den Orient [Austrian Monthly Journal for the Orient, hereafter Monatszeitschrift] which had, since the 1870s, regularly informed its Austrian readership about the ‘Orient’, ranging all the way from Serbia to East Asia — China’s Tientsin and Japan included.71

In the 3 January 1907 issue of Pester Lloyd (re-published a week later in Das Handels-Museum) Emil S. Fischer, owner of the only Austrian trading house in Tientsin, reported “About our Chinese settlement”. Listing again the above-mentioned projects, his inventory of Austro-Hungarian achievements sounded rather like a colonial gentrification project in favour of new Chinese inhabitants (and not, as one might expect, of incoming Austro-Hungarians or other Europeans): “When Austria-Hungary took over seven tenths of a square kilometre after the Boxer Uprising in 1900, it was just a site of poorly looking Chinese huts where day labourers resided who worked in the Chinese City. [...] Today there is no such populace in huts [Hüttenbevölkerung] anymore in the Austro-Hungarian settlement. It moved away completely; one has created space for beautiful, mostly new premises in which rich and wealthy Chinese lodge.” What this actually meant, as explained in the Monatszeitschrift in its July 1907 issue, was that “the Austro-Hungarian concession was without a doubt the only one to provide a budget surplus in its administration system, owing to this numerous, tax-paying Chinese population”. Further, Fischer referred to an economic phenomenon (the global relevance of which could not be more topical given present-day trade wars with China): the lack of a coherent “brand and trademark protection [Markenschutz], which should follow strict conventions on the basis of fair reciprocity” for European, and here he meant Austrian, export products for the Chinese market (Fischer 1907a). In the same year, Fischer turned in a “Top Secret” Promemoria report to the k.u.k. Foreign Ministry as regards a potential (and never granted) loan to develop the concession. With an attached map of Tientsin dating from 1900, Fischer highlighted, along with the other Concession Powers further south, the “Cheng-Li – Chinesenstadt, 1 Million Seelen” (“Chinese City – 1 million inhabitants”) to the west, and the “Austro-Hungarian Concession – Hotung” to the east (Fischer 1907b) (Fig. 43).

In the meantime, political lobbying work for the Austro-Hungarian concession was also taking place back in Vienna, where the former interim Consul for Tientsin (1905–06), Ernst Ludwig, held a speech in front of the Österreichisch-Ungarische Export-Verein [Austro-Hungarian Export Association] on 10 April 1907. To begin with, Ludwig retold the story of the 1901 occupation of the territory, its geographically advantageous position at the confluence of the Hai and Pei Rivers, and recent achievements such as the iron bridge, which was supposedly “used by some 100,000 pedestrians per day”. What followed in his speech provides a good example of how colonising powers in Tientsin underlined their shared civilising mission through the notion of “hygienic modernity” (after Rogaski 2000, 200472) or, even, of a “hygienic revolution” (Singaravélou 2017, 207–37) for the city and its Chinese population. Besides partial regulation of the river, quay installations, widening of the concession’s main streets, and a partial levelling of the terrain, Ludwig explored what he called his “hygienic point of view”: it comprised “a removal of c.7000 graves from the terrain of the settlement, the existence of which would certainly irritate European inhabitants within the settlement; the sewerage system with pumps towards new reservoir against flooding;”73 and a contract with a [British] water network company for the supply of good drinking and cooking water” (Ludwig 1907, 221). All this

71 In issue 10 of 15 October 1885 Lorenz von Stein had already reported “About the settlements in East Asia and their legal relations” (215–18, 241–44); issue 3 (March 1901) featured “Austria-Hungary’s occupation of a territory for its upcoming settlement” (33), while the issues 5 (May 1901), 10 (October 1901), 4 (April 1905) and 12 (December 1905) had focussed on economic developments in Tientsin.
72 “Personal hygiene and public health administration had become markers of civilization and modernity in the context of high imperialism” (Rogaski 2004, 167).
73 The great relevance of this proposal became evident in the great flood disaster of 1911, the destructive after-effects of which in the Austro-Hungarian and Italian concessions were later documented in the official report and its large photographic album (see the appendix to this publication).
Fig. 43 The map sent by Emil S. Fischer in December 1907 to the k.u.k. Foreign Ministry as regards a possible loan to develop the Austro-Hungarian concession [Austrian State Archives, Vienna]
also aimed to convince the investors present to become involved in a plan to build a (never realised) “port for Chinese junks [Dschunkenhafen] to the north of the concession” (cf. Fig. 41a).

Ludwig’s typically colonial self-praise was, however, followed by an astonishing confession and accusation:

In this sense our settlement is not the heap of dirt [Schmutzhafen] anymore as we found it before we occupied the land, but on the best way to become a modern polity with all necessary elements which should characterise an overseas’ colony. However, its main feature is still missing, namely, Austrian and Hungarian colonists. […] It is not a settlement in the proper meaning of the word, because there is no real interest for it back home. In any case, this is very sad and an evidence of incapacity [Armutszeugnis], which our domestic exporters and commercial circles issue for themselves (Ludwig 1907, 222).

International concessions like Shanghai or Tientsin, with their global mix of architectural languages, were often related to temporarily installed rues des nations at World’s Fairs — an ephemeral format of global trade, national prestige competition, and spectacular installations at the local level that had been used since the first such event in London (1851) and peaked with the Paris Exposition Universelle in 1900 (Singaravelou 2017, 11; Marinelli 2010a). In Tientsin, these ephemeral ‘streets of all nations’ putting the “world-on-exhibition” (cf. Mitchell 1989) were transferred into a solid, permanent set-up, not only in architectural and urbanistic terms, but also institutionally and logistically, amounting to a veritable process of global ‘back-translation’: while Austria itself had also hosted one of these temporary global trade shows, the Vienna Welt-Ausstellung of 1873 (see in Georg Lehner’s introduction, Figs. 3–5), now, some thirty years later, Ludwig wished to bring Austrian and Hungarian export products to international and Chinese customers, and place them on an unquestionably permanent display in Tientsin. Like the Taussig Company had already proposed in 1903, he pledged for the “installation of a permanent museum or sample collection [Mustercomptoir]” inside the Austro-Hungarian concession, to be managed by a dedicated “import-export company”, with a printed “catalogue for the orientation” of buyers of Austria-Hungary’s product range and the option (which at the time was high-tech) of “instant ordering via an installed telegraphic code” from firms in the motherland (Ludwig 1907, 236–7).

Shortly after Ludwig, the vice-president of the Association of Austrian Exporters [Verband Österreichischer Exporteure], Hugo Schwer, expressed a similar vision, though with even more enthusiasm, wishing to link the supposed success story of the Austro-Hungarian concession in Tianjin with “a better promotion of our national products [by] staging an Austrian industries exhibition in the most important trade centre of China, namely, Shanghai”:

The administration of our Settlement in Tientsin is acknowledged by both the Chinese authorities and the Chinese population as perfectly functioning, and this small piece of Austria-Hungary in the Far East is developing towards a bright future, thanks to the focused and tireless work of the consuls Dr. Carl Bernauer and Ernst Ludwig, as well as of the head of administration, former lieutenant Hugo Accurti (Schwer 1907, 15).

---

74 In a letter dated 31 October 1903, Gottlieb Taussig, k.u.k. Hof-Parfumeur from Vienna, proposed a “Warenmusterlager for the export relation in East Asia, on 400 m², in connection with his Taussig Company site in the concession, built by ‘architect Kowarski, presently in China’ (HHStA A.R. F8/242 (Konsulatsitze, Tientsin)).

75 It is interesting to note that the idea to install sample collections of Austrian export goods in Tientsin had its equivalent in Vienna, where “Exposituren” (collections of import articles on display) were part of the Handelsmuseum (Trade Museum), which itself came into being after the Vienna Universal Exhibition of 1873 (see the introduction by Georg Lehner). It was systematically extended with a collection of Oriental arts and craft (“Österreichische Kunstgewerbesammlungen”), formed the basis of a planned Oriental Museum (with a “Chinese collection [being recognized] as the most complete and comprehensive one in Europe”) and in 1907 was merged with the Wiener Exportverein (Viennese Export Association) (Handelsmuseum 1919, 7, 22). It was the association where Ludwig held his speech in 1907 (see above). The above-mentioned “Exposituren” were, from 1905, set up for suitable “sales agents for Austrian export” from Constantinople to Cairo and, after 1911, also in Hong Kong, Shanghai, and Yokohama — but seemingly not in Tientsin (Griesmair 1968, 2002–4; cf. Gruber 2013). Between 1916 and 1918, the k.k. österreichische Orient- und Überseegesellschaft (Imperial and Royal Austrian Oriental and Overseas Society) was created under the patronage of Emperor Karl, but the imagined colonial possessions never materialised.

76 The excerpt is stored in the Austrian General Administration Archive, Handel, Department 12, China 1907 (Fasc. 1058).
The Municipal Council and the Concession Regulations

The next important step towards giving the colonial space of the Austro-Hungarian concession an institutionalised structure was the foundation of a representative municipal council [Gemeinderat] in 1908, a decision that was reported on in newspapers such as China Times (26 September 1908) or Shanghai Mercury (1 October 1908). Conceived as a mediating element between the political administration and the Hotung Construction Company, the council originally counted eight members who were appointed by the consul: four Austro-Hungarians and four Chinese. The first session convened in autumn 1908, and the four Austrian members were, as the Austrian Monthly Journal for the Orient reported, Franz Bauer, Johann Brunner, Dr. Rudolf Civranek, and Emil S. Fischer. Wilhelm Ritter von Storck, then secretary of the Austro-Hungarian legation in Beijing, reported to Alois Lexa von Aehrenthal, since 1906 k.u.k. Minister of Foreign Affairs in Vienna, in a letter dated 8 September 1908, added two foreigners to the list, and also explained the four Chinese representatives.

In the global process of ‘back-translating’ and hybridising governing styles and administrative standards from all over the world into Tientsin, the Austro-Hungarian concession followed similar schemes for comparable institutional bodies from its European motherland, as well as merging other colonial concepts from the wider East Asian sphere into it. In this specific case, internal documents of written letters together with attached original primary sources of the time prove that the most recent version of an Austrian municipal code [Gemeindeordnung], the one developed by Carinthia’s new provincial capital (Klagenfurt), was used as an organisational blueprint, while the Austro-Hungarian actors carefully studied already existing regulations, plans and urban development schemes of/for other concessions, such as Chefoo or Shanghai in China or Russian Dalny/Dalian.

The Concession Regulation [Niederlassungsreglement] was drafted by Bernauer in 1903, but issued only in October 1908, printed and circulated in the three languages of German, Hungarian and Chinese (Fig. 44). It soon became clear that the whole mechanism was difficult to be managed by the far too few Austro-Hungarian residents in the concession. If anything, Austro-Hungarian nationals tended to live in the far more popular French and British concession zones. The “Regulations” were then also distributed in 1909 in the Austrian Monatszeitschrift and were divided into four sections: land-use [Landregulationen], administration [Verwaltung], policing [Handhabung der Ortspolizei], and fees/taxes [Abgaben]. Annex A covered the “Order concerning the policing of streets, security, market and morality and health standards [Ordnung bezüglich der Straßen-, Sicherheits-, Markt-, Sittlichkeits- und Sanitätspolizei]”. After directives concerning cleanliness on the streets and fire security, and against gambling halls and corruption, the final remarks concerned the “codes of conduct [and] preventive measures against human infectious and epizootic diseases”. Annex B, “Building regulations [Bauordnung]”, was divided into two sections. The first one, entitled “New buildings and repair work [Neubauten und Reparaturen]”, covered building permits; property rights;
building taxes; compulsory street and building alignment; inner courtyard levels and drainage; the obligation to build only with brick, stone, or cement along large streets; the erection of fire walls; and special regulations for warehouses, factories, and theatres. The second section, entitled “Existing houses”, declared that “dilapidated or poorly built mud houses were to be renovated or demolished, [and] those facing large streets be replaced with cement or brick houses within an officially determined period”. Further, “newly acquired building plots had to be developed within three years, or a contractual penalty would be issued”.

Although these regulations were meant to steer the gradual modernisation of pre-concession Chinese building stock according to Western standards, internal and published reports prove that the economic development of the Austro-Hungarian concession faltered from 1909 onwards. A rather gloomy picture was painted in the 1912 Annual Report of the Neue Wiener Handelsakademie [New Viennese Commercial Academy] in Ottokar Nemeček’s eight-page summary: “Das österreichisch-ungarische Settlement in Tientsin”. Even if the local “population stratum with its mid- and small-range business activities, and some larger industrial companies like a ‘Kaoling distillery’ [he probably meant a sorghum/gaoliang distillery, MF], weaving mills, dye houses, fabric and chemical stores” were present, “no efforts” had been made by Austro-Hungarian firms to develop ‘their’ concession — except by “the only Austrian industrialist, the soap manufacturer Gottlieb Taussig” (Nemeček 1912, 98, 102–3). Certainly, later statements in the Monatszeitschrift about riots and executions in Tientsin (in 1912, the year when the Chinese Republic was founded) suggest that business had failed to gain any positive momentum by 1914, when World War I brought about a new situation (see below).85

85 The April 1909 issue of the Monatszeitschrift für den Orient reported a “dismal business situation [trotzlose Geschäftslage]” both as regards Austrian imports and within local Chinese trading (“Tientsin im Jahre 1908”, in: OMO, No. 4 (April 1909), 38). In the journal’s June 1910 issue, a short announcement was even grimmer: Chinese tax income decreased through a “stagnation of trading”, the frequentation of the concession’s “main street with its entertainment venues [Vergnügungsetablissements] by less wealthy Chinese and “the competition with more popular attractions in the neighbouring Japanese concession”. Additionally, the commitment of the Austro-Hungarian members within the Gemeinderat decreased (“Miszellen — Österreichisch-ungarisches Settlement in Tientsin”, in: OMO, No. 6 (June 1910), 66–7). The December 1910 issue spoke of “inhibited Chinese dealers”, while a 1912 entry on Tientsin reported “halting trade and traffic” and “executions of mutineers and looters”. When Nemeček reworked his aforementioned paper of 1912 for his contribution “Austro-Hungary’s colonial interests” in the May 1915 issue of the Vien-

Fig. 44 The Regulations of the Austro-Hungarian concession, printed in 1908 in German, Hungarian and Chinese [Austrian State Archives, Vienna]
Implementation: taxation, expropriation and smaller individual projects

Reacting to the concession contract of 1902, with its unclear legal definitions of land acquisition, expropriation and remuneration (see above; cf. Hörtler 1984, I: 78–84) and in the context of the statutes of the H.B.G. and the concession regulations of 1908, the overall construction area of the Austro-Hungarian concession was segmented into four main building and taxation zones (and three ‘sub-classes’) (Fig. 45). Like the system applied in the neighbouring Italian concession, the borderlines of this topographical pattern did not reflect any local irregularities of local urban and building structures, but ran parallel to the north-western curved riverbank and were differentiated into “high land, middle land, lowland and land submerged by water”.86 Under this logic, parcels closer to the river were assessed as more valuable owing to their easier access to infrastructure for waterborne transport.

Apart from this rather rigorous dealing with the territory, its topography, and the local inhabitants through the single lens of rather technocratic development schemes, other voices were concerned about the lack of local legitimation of Austria-Hungary. As Eugen Ritter von Kuczynski, minister in the k.u.k. Beijing legation between 1905 and 1911, stated in a report in December 1909 to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Vienna, more should be done for the Chinese population since it was the “main taxpayer in the concession”, and the visible “indifference of the local circles of our Chinese pied à terre” could only be counteracted with “a proof of goodwill and interest” on the Austrian side. What he was aiming for here was the “foundation of a public Chinese elementary school”, a draft isometric plan of which was available in the disenchanted tone had not changed considerably. As World War I had already started, he was well aware of the “approaching upheavals of the territorial possessions of the world powers”, but what he meant with “the cultural-geographic life interests of our fatherland” still included the “Austro-Hungarian settlement of Tientsin, as an everlasting Niederlassung in China” (Nemeček 1915, 73, 76). At this point in 1915, China had not yet declared war to the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, but this changed in 1917 — with dramatic effects (see below).

86 HHStA A.R. F 63/1, attachment to the report, Storck, 22 February 1908.
already attached to the report (Fig. 46). The school was indeed built and depicted in the below-quoted photographic album of 1911 (see Appendix, Figs. 55–56), where it was described as a “charity school [Armenschule] with a planned extension to receive some 200 pupils in four classes, including regular evening German courses offered by the k.u.k. interpreter Li” (Anonymous 1911, n.p.).

With the new acting consul, Miroslav Kobr (1908–12), some intriguing codes of conduct were issued, such as the 1908 “Regulations restraining the owners of dogs in the Austro-Hungarian concession” (Fig. 47).

In the meantime, the consulate complex was constantly modified between 1908 and 1912 (unfortunately, no interior photographs could be located for this study) because existing rooms needed to be converted for private reasons, more office space was created for administrative staff, the open loggias were considered “useless”, closed, and converted into interior space, and some renovations necessitated structural modifications, which were conceived and carried out by engineer J. Brunner (Figs. 48a–d). Owing to these constant modifications of the consulate buildings, the architectural appearance of the remaining structure today is very hard to date (cf. Figs. 80a–c).

Archival material shows a new impetus for the consolidation of the quays along the river in June 1911. One sketch by the civil engineer Bruno Moser has survived; it showed the increasing (and then dredged out) alluvial deposit between small loading ramps along the river and around the iron swing bridge (Fig. 49); Moser also drafted a proposal for more refined quay constructions towards the Italian concession (Fig. 50). Most probably, this project was stopped owing to flooding in late summer of that year (see below).

Finally, one project within the Austro-Hungarian concession needs to be mentioned here, even if it was an unsolved issue from the start and, effectively, until the last days of the Austrian presence in Tianjin: structures for the Austrian navy. While the proposal by the k.u.k. War Ministry to construct new military barracks and comments about the “mostly unusable and ugly conditions” and the “highly alarming sanitary problems of the used structures of the Hauptetappe in Tientsin” can be traced back in correspondence material dating from 1904 (although neither plans nor photographs could be located),

---

87 HHStA F 63/2 (124), Ritter von Kuczynski to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Beijing, 22 December 1909. The cost estimate for the construction itself was some 4100 Mexican dollars, to which he added some 1000 Mexican dollars for furnishings and an Austrian (but French-language) “illustrated catalogue of teaching material” (Pichler 1906) and even commented on the offered courses, such as geography and German.

88 HHStA A.R. F8/242, Kobr to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tientsin 13 September 1909.

89 HHStA A.R. F8/241 (52), Kobr to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tientsin 12 October 1910.

90 HHStA A.R. F8/241 (54, 55, 57), Kobr to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 18 May 1911, 15 March 1912 and 6 November 1912.

91 HHStA GesA Peking 102 (Settlement – Quaibauten), Stumvoll to von Storck, Tientsin 8 June and 5 July 1911; and HHStA F63.3 (224), Report about our quay constructions, Tientsin 12 June 1911.

92 Carl Bernauer reported in October 1904 about the “old temple” and “its use by the navy after the construction of the barracks or the administration of the settlement” (HHStA A.R. F8/241 (22), Bernauer from Tientsin 3 October 1904).
The Public are hereby notified that the Austro-Hungarian Acting Consul, Mr. M. Kojbr, has issued the following Regulations restraining the owners of dogs in the Austro-Hungarian Concession:

1. The owners of dogs in the Austro-Hungarian Concession shall register at the Police Office their names and addresses, together with the number and description of the dogs kept by them.

2. All dogs shall be effectively muzzled, and collars made of metal bearing the owner's name, shall be fastened to them.

3. Unmuzzled dogs, kept within the owner's premises, shall be chained in such a manner as to prevent their being dangerous to visitors.

4. Dogs suffering from hydrophobia or suspected to be infected with this disease shall be chained in the house, and the owner shall immediately report the case to the Police.

5. Dogs unmuzzled, or not effectively muzzled, or without the collar above mentioned, shall be regarded as stray dogs and destroyed by the Police whenever found.

6. The above regulations will come into force immediately after their publication, and offenders against them will be strictly prosecuted before their respective Authorities.

By order,

H. ACCURTI,

Tientsin, 27th April, 1909.

See, Austro-Hungarian Concession.

*Fig. 47 “Regulations restraining the owners of dogs in the Austro-Hungarian concession” (1908) [Austrian State Archives, Vienna]*
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Figs. 48a,b  Ground floor and first floor of the consulate building, drawn in 1909 during presumed modifications [Austrian State Archives, Vienna]
Figs. 48c, d Ground floor of the consulate building, drawn in 1911 during presumed modifications (above); ground floor of the consulate annex building, drawn in 1912 for planned modifications (below) [Austrian State Archives, Vienna]
Fig. 49 Analytical sketch by civil engineer Bruno Moser (1911) explaining the alluvial soil deposits around the iron swing bridge [Austrian State Archives, Vienna]

Fig. 50 New quay constructions conceived and drafted by civil engineer Bruno Moser (1911) [Austrian State Archives, Vienna]
Michael Falser

Evidence of the presence of the Austro-Hungarian navy detachment [Marinedetachment] in the Chinese municipal yamen complex only dates back to 1911; it was supposedly used until 1910 by the local administration and then handed over (compare with Fig. 41b, where “Fa-Fou-Si Barracks” and the “Officers’ yamen” are indicated on the opposite side; see Fig. 54b with the precise indication of “municipality building”). In April 1912, a series of documents circulated between Tianjin, Beijing and Vienna as regards an overdue “sanitary report” [Sanitätsbericht] concerning the “two chiefs of staff, 56 marines, 13 municipal employees and seven coolies” installed in the “old temple complex whose dilapidated condition [was considered] beyond any adaptation [or] inner reconstruction”.93

Two different ground plans exist about the “yamen site”: one plan (signed by the head of police “K. Schiener, 1912”) situates the complex within the larger urban fabric along the Chinese main street to the right (south), with “Yamenstrasse” in the lower section of the plan (west) and a dense row of small Chinese houses to the left (north) (Fig. 51a, cf. the larger map in Fig. 54a), while an astonishingly precise “Sketch plan of the present spatial distribution” (most probably by the signing evaluator of the sanitary report of 1912) indicates the full programme of the rooms around the open courtyard, with its two-storeyed entry to the south and two smaller structures (washrooms and toilets in the centre) (Fig. 51b).

Historical photographs have survived in the Austrian State Archives (Graphic Collections of the War Archives); they show Austrian navy officers and marines, as well as Chinese policemen in and around the affected structures, the precise context of which could not exactly be determined (Figs. 52a-g, compare with Szuk’s, Klein’s and Holy’s visits between 1903 and 1909, Figs. 17–19).

93 HHStA GesA Peking 87 (Militärquartier Tientsin), Kobr to Beijing delegation “concerning the living conditions of the marine detachment”, 3, 12 and 17 April 1912.
Fig. 51b Detailed plan of the Yamen site in Chinese quarter of the Austro-Hungarian concession (c.1912)
[Austrian State Archives, Vienna]
Figs. 52a,b Photographs (undated) labelled on the back as “Yamen of the Austrian detachment in Tientsin” (above) and “Street scene in the Austro-Hungarian settlement, [sergeant] Homayr” [Austrian State Archives, Photographic Collection of the War Archive]
Figs. 52c,d  Photographs (undated), labelled on the back as “Our Austrian detachment in Tientsin” (above; nota bene, the Austrian flag) and “living quarters [Mannschaftswohnungen]” [Austrian State Archives, Photographic Collection of the War Archive]
Figs. 52e-g Photographs (undated), most probably in and around the Austrian marines and police station [Austrian State Archives, Photographic Collection of the War Archive]
A small file containing written internal reports and official press coverage has been found in the Austrian State Archives; it covers the arguably most decisive event during the short period of Austria-Hungary’s presence in Tianjin: the flood disaster of 30 August 1911. According to a note on 2 September by Felix Stumvoll, Consul of the Austro-Hungarian concession in 1911, “heavy rain and a typhoon started in the afternoon of 29 August and lasted “some thirty hours as a non-stop tempest”. This led, as summarised by the provisional concession secretary Mitura one day after the incident, to a “colossal accumulation of a mass of water on the side of the Italian settlement near our border that could not drain off through the outlet under Via Vittorio Emanuele towards the ‘disputed land’. This resulted in the water mass spilling over the higher border area and two streams towards the collection tank of our settlement, which was filled up in the shortest amount of time”. According to the report by our chief of police, K. Schiener, “the flood caused two casualties and heavy damage to some one hundred mud houses”; it was triggered by the inadequate steam pumping station”. All the other concessions were also affected, most dramatically the French and British ones.

The devastation inflicted on large parts of the Austro-Hungarian concession gave rise to mutual accusations by the Beijing delegation, with von Storck and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Vienna\(^95\) on the one side, and Consul Stumvoll, a consulted expert (engineer Bruno Moser\(^96\)), and the concession secretary Eduard Andres versus the H.G.B., with Hugo Accurti, on the other side (see the dispute of the latter two below). An article from the Chinese local newspaper Xinghua ribao (lit.: Awakening China Pictorial\(^97\)) was attached to the internal reports and highlighted with a red pencil; it reported on 1 September 1911 about the strong rainfall on 30 August 1911 (naming “the 7th day of the 7th month of the 3rd year of the Xuantong Era” as the Chinese date) and depicted a scene of the Chinese inhabitants cleaning their devastated houses and streets after the incident (Fig. 53).\(^98\)

Until the present study, scientific investigations had not managed to reconstruct the urban architectural history of the Austro-Hungarian concession. With reference to this fact, the recent discovery of the concession’s official implementation plan, together with a unique set of photographs and a detailed description of the entire project, must count as a milestone towards assembling all the components of the mosaic of Tianjin’s global history. More than one hundred years after it saw the light of day, the whole document was rediscovered in April 2020 by the writing author, ordered to be digitalised, and is now presented here in all its completeness for the first time. Given that there is no indicated authorship or date (c.1911), this ‘spectacular’ document was most likely produced as a report about the aftermath of the massive flooding disaster over the concession on 30 August 1911. It was attached to further diplomatic correspondence, the context of which was lost when it was separated from the hand-written material (stored in the nearby Austrian State Archives) and transferred to the ‘Picture Archives and Graphics Department’ of the Austrian National Library in Vienna.

The document comprises three items. First, a bound album with a red cover entitled “Oesterr.-ungar. Niederlassung Tientsin” contains 115 black-and-white photographs glued on greenish cardboard pages. All photographs are hand-numbered from 1 to 115, and these numbers refer to the second item: a German text of fifteen typewritten A4 pages, entitled

---

\(^{94}\) The package of documents was compiled by Stumvoll, in: HHStA F63/3 (307, Verzeichnis der Berichte vom 29.12.1911), Stumvoll to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tianjin 3 February 1912.

\(^{95}\) While Accurti quoted several of his (supposedly) earlier warnings about overdue earthworks in the affected area, von Storck quoted his own remarks about “the extended pond of stagnant water” and “greatest calamity within the ‘disputed land’ as regards veritable foci of typhoid during the summer months” (HHStA F63/3, Storck to the Ministry of 28 March and 5 April 1911).

\(^{96}\) In a commissioned assessment report, civil engineer Bruno Moser reconfirmed the inefficiency of the pumping station and of the earthworks towards the border with the Italian concession. Other reports by Franz Bauer and a French engineer were attached, as well as von Storck’s photographic study of 29 August 1911 (see below). HHStA GesA 102 (Settlement), von Storck, k.u.k. Geschäftssträger Peking, Tianjin 9 October 1911.

\(^{97}\) I thank my colleague Georg Lehner for his translation; about the issue of publicity in Tianjin, including the pictured newspaper, see Fang 2011, 21.

\(^{98}\) Other newspapers reported on the incident, such as: Tagblatt für Nordchina (“Starker Sturm über Tientsin, große Schäden”), China Times (“Heavy rains in Tientsin”), Tientsin and Peking Times (“Hurricane in Tientsin”), all on 31 August 1911; and Min-Schin-Pao (Tientsin 1 and 4 September 1911). Newspaper clippings in HHSTA F63.3 (307).
Fig. 53  Press cutting from the Chinese newspaper Xinghua ribao (30 August 1911) reporting on strong rainfall in Tianjin and destroyed houses in the Austro-Hungarian concession [Austrian State Archives]
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Figs. 54a,b Overall map and detail of the Austro-Hungarian concession (c. 1911), recently rediscovered at the Austrian National Library, Vienna [Austrian National Library, Picture Archives and Graphics Department]
“Description and explication of the individual photographic shots” (Anonymous 1911). Both the photographs and the text (it is also translated here in English) are reproduced in the appendix to this publication for the first time. The third item is a large hand-drawn, hand-coloured “Map of the Austro-Hungarian Concession in Tientsin, 0.6 square kilometre” on 69 × 51 cm transparent drawing paper (Figs. 44a,b), in its amount of information being similar to the aforementioned version from c.1906 (Figs. 41a,b). As paratextual devices, an arrow pointing north and a scale bar in British imperial units (feet) were added, together with a coloured legend indicating “large streets” (in blue; see the dominant bent Hsin-Lung-Dschie to the left-hand side, to the north, with the adjacent yamen “municipality building”), “housing blocks of the H.B.G.” (in white) and “building plots of the H.B.G.” (in brown). Additionally, the neighbouring administrative sections (the “Chinese riverside” and the Japanese, French, Russian, and Italian concessions), the “Pai and Hai Rivers”, and the eastern rail tracks of the “Imperial Chinese Northern Railways” were indicated.

If we compare the “built structures” on this map of 1911 with the above-mentioned maps of 1899 by Feng Qihuang (see Fig. 5a/c), 1900/1902 by Noah Drake (see Figs. 5b/d and 7), 1902 in the internal Count Montecuccoli report (see Fig. 9) and 1905/6 (Figs. 39, 40), we notice how little was actually constructed during the short Austrian-Hungarian intermezzo by the Hotung Construction Company: a modest urban ensemble of roughly five by five streets within a small loose triangle stretching from the ‘Austrian bridge’ to the border with the Italian concession.

A small selection of these unique photographs will be discussed here to illustrate the completed projects. Starting the visual tour with a view from the western ‘Chinese side’ just south of the ‘Austrian bridge’ provides us with a couple of photographs (Figs. 55a,b) of the consulate and secretariat buildings (compare with Fig. 26a from 1905), the neighbouring houses of the Taussig Company (the map indicates ‘Fischer’99 and the Belgian Tramway Company house with its two-storeyed loggia, which are followed south along the river (see map in Fig. 32) by the plot of the (Johann) Brunner Construction Company (see his involvement below) and further undeveloped street blocks up to the border with the Italian concession.

Looking north from the bridge, we can see the church Notre-Dame-des-Victoires (erected by the French in 1869, destroyed by war, and then rebuilt) across the confluence of the Hai and Pai Rivers, just outside the Austro-Hungarian concession (Fig. 55c) and, closer to the bridge inside the concession, the great market hall, which is visually overshadowed by a giant Japanese billboard (Fig. 55d). On the map, the site is indicated as “Market Hall” [Markthalle] (Anonymous 1911, 15). According to the earlier Fischer report of 1907 (see above), “it covered 5220 m²”100.

If we follow the path over the ‘Austrian bridge’, the view opens towards the concession (Fig. 55e, compare with Fig. 35b looking the other way round towards the Chinese police station) and, from there, along the riverbank in its status of work in progress towards the bridge in full swing function (Fig. 55f).

Just south of the bridge along the Austrian riverside, the main entrance to the consulate comes into view (Fig. 56a) while the concession’s main street, called Baron Czikann Street [Baron-Czikann-Straße], leads directly into the main building ensemble by the Hotung Construction Firm H.B.G. (Fig. 56b): a set of “half European, half Chinese, so-called semi-foreign houses” (c.f. Ludwig 1907, 234). Towards the first intersection with Consulate Street [Konsulatsgasse] to the right-hand side stands a two-storey brick building with, according to the text description, “a watch shop in the basement and the executive office of the H.B.G. on the first floor, and a first-class Chinese hotel attached” (Anonymous 1911, 2). On the photograph, the tracks and overhead cables of the passing electric tramway are visible (Fig. 56c, cf. the sketch on Fig. 30a).

On the opposite side, the market hall entry has a richly decorated and unplastered brick façade (Fig. 56d). Along the main street, typical European shop façades with sunblinds above all windows are lined up on both sides while busy Chinese workers are passing by. We see “a Chinese pharmacy in the basement and the storage facilities of a Chinese pawn

99 Fischer himself mentioned the site of the Gottlieb Taussig Company as “the only native [Austrian] firm to have taken profit from the good location of our settlement” (Fischer 1907).

100 In 1907, Fischer stated that the market place housed with its adjacent rectangular drill ground, the Austrian “sub-detachment of 30 marines under the command of the Linienschiffsfähnrich [ship liner sergeant] A.P. Homayr” (Fischer 1907). As we tried to explain above, the navy partly moved into the yamen (compare Figs. 51–52).
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Figs. 55a-f  Black-and-white photographs, in “Oesterr.-ungar. Niederlassung Tientsin” (c.1911), a bound album recently rediscovered at the Austrian National Library, Vienna [Austrian National Library, Picture Archives and Graphics Department]

55a: View towards the Austro-Hungarian concession across the river with, from left to right: the consulate, the secretariat building, and the Taussig/Fischer Company building. 55b: View towards the Austro-Hungarian concession across the river with, from left to right: the secretariat building, the Taussig/Fischer Company, and the Belgian Tramway Company. 55c: View across the river towards the north, with Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, a French church, just outside the Austro-Hungarian concession. 55d: View towards the Austro-Hungarian concession across the river, featuring the L-shaped market building and a giant Japanese billboard. 55e: View towards the east across the ‘Austrian Bridge’, with the Baron-Czikann-Street in the background. 55f: The swinging section of the ‘Austrian Bridge’, photographed along the new quay buildings under construction.
Fig. 56a: The Austro-Hungarian consulate with its original main entry oriented towards the riverside. 56b: A view towards the concession’s main street, Baron Czikann Street [Baron-Czikann-Straße]; to the right, the building of the Hotung Construction Company and to the left, the entry to the market hall. 56c: Seat of the Hotung Construction Company; cables and tracks of the tramway can also be seen. 56d: Entry to the market hall. 56e: On Baron Czikann Street: a shop façade with a Chinese pharmacy in the basement and the storage facilities of a Chinese pawn shop on the first floor. 56f: View into Yamen Street, with the former Chinese municipality building behind to the further right.
Figs. 57a-c Black-and-white photographs, in “Oesterr.-ungar. Niederlassung Tientsin” (c. 1911), a bound album recently rediscovered at the Austrian National Library, Vienna [Austrian National Library, Picture Archives and Graphics Department]

57a: The theatre of the Hotung Construction Company on Baron Czikann Street. 57b: The last houses along Baron Czikann Street, looking north-east towards the Italian concession. 57c: The undeveloped section between the Austro-Hungarian and Italian concessions in the background, with its Vittorio Emanuele Street and tower-like consulate building.
shop on the first floor” (Fig. 56e). While a photographic shot into the side street called Yamen Street offers a rare view towards the rougher brick façades of lower residential houses on the right and, in the background, the aforementioned “municipality building which was installed in a former Chinese temple” (Fig. 56f, cf. Fig. 52a). Towards the second half of the Czikann Street, a “Chinese Singsong-Theatre of the H.B.G.” (Fig. 57a) stands close to the large H.B.G. theatre, which “rarely opened”, as the attached description text admitted (Anonymous 1911, 2–3).

After some hundred metres, the Austro-Hungarian concession suddenly comes to an end (Fig. 57b). It gives way to an open, rather deserted view towards the Italian concession to the east, “with its Via Vittorio Emanuele Street, the new [Italian] consulate building to the left, and a recently built private mansion to the right” (Fig. 57c) (Anonymous 1911, 4–5).

Finally, a long series of photographs documents the flooded area right on the eastern edge of the core section of the Austro-Hungarian concession: this section is marked with a ‘wave symbol’ on the map (see Fig. 54a) and labelled a “disputed land” [Strittiges Terrain] towards the railway. To show some of them in the present context (see Illustrations 55–82 in the full version of the photographic album of 1911, Appendix), we present the eclectic mansion of Hugo Accurti (the director of the H.B.G. and secretary of the concession). It was situated close to the Italian concession and neighboured the concession’s coal shop. However, when this photograph was taken the house was surrounded by a large pool of waste water (Fig. 58a). Another photograph depicts the flooded areas around minor Chinese houses nearby (Fig. 58b).

Those ‘backyard’ photographs of the Austro-Hungarian concession are useful today for a critique of the master narrative about the supposed efficiency of Western-Chinese development projects. Information that circulated back then in the international press (like the above-quoted 1907 Vienna speech by Vice-Consul Ludwig) seems to have survived from a present-day perspective and help the ‘official’ reinvention of Tianjin’s global rebirth by local Chinese municipal politicians (see below), continue to summarise international development efforts through a rather positive storyline, while the problematic — or even ‘failed’ — histories behind this overall picture are most often missing. As we can see in these photographs, the flood control of the wider river system across the city and the inner urban drainage system of Tianjin were far from settled in the following years. In particular, the dramatic after-effects caused by a “typhoon on 30 August 1911” (as Hai-Ho Conservancy Board reports confirmed for that year)101 had severe consequences for the Austro-Hungarian concession. And it is likely that our rediscovered photographic album, with its 115 black-and-white photographs and the attached 15-page typescript (see the full document in the appendix) had been ordered by the Vienna-Budapest administration back in the European motherlands.

Beyond the great narrative of Western engineering knowledge and technology102 being imported and applied to modernise China, the ongoing problems of failing drainage, sewage, and flood protection systems — with their rather disturbing ‘anti-hygienic non-modernities’ aspect (to borrow in reverse Ruth Rogaski’s denomination of a regime of ‘hygienic modernity’ which united the efforts of all present Concession Powers)103 — demonstrated the “fragile system of maintaining the seaport of Tianjin” and, also, the difficult “segmented administrations of Tianjin and its vicinity to negotiate and mediate their conflicting agendas” (Kan 2007, 81). To add a somewhat critical observation on the all-too-easily

---

101 In our photographic album (see Appendix), the author repeatedly mentioned the flood of 30 August 1911 (see the legends to his Illustrations 62, 64 & 65, 68, 70, 72–75). However, this was not a unique incident: in the aforementioned annual report of the Hai-Ho Conservancy Board, flooding was mentioned as a recurring problem during the 1890s (Hai-Ho Conservancy 1919, 13–15), but the incident on 30 August 1911 was explicitly mentioned: “On the 30th August [1911] a typhoon caused the level of the water at the North Fort to rise to the unprecedented height of 13 ft 3 T.D.” (Hai-Ho Conservancy 1919, 28). Additionally, the problem of the enormous “storage capacity” and the great differences between “low water” and “flood tides” of the river was reported to be a constant one. Another flood was reported in 1912, and “flood relief” was declared one of the largest issues for decades to come (Hai-Ho Conservancy 1919, 38, 159, 185).

102 A good example is William McLeish’s short individual eye-witness report in 1917, *Life in a China Outport*, in which he concluded that “the Tientsin community, native and foreign, was the first in China to push river conservancy to practical success” (McLeish 1917, 10). However, in his short introduction to the foreign concessions, he also commented on the little relevance of the Austro-Hungarian concession; “the Austrian area being nothing else than a deep cut into the densely populated Native City” (McLeish 1917, 14).

103 “In spite of the power of hygienic modernity to transform urban space and urban behaviours, it did not achieve a seamless hegemony, nor should it be seen as a monolithic entity” (Rogaski 2000, 31).
Figs. 58a–f Black-and-white photographs, in “Oesterr.-ungar. Niederlassung Tientsin” (c. 1911), a bound album recently rediscovered at the Austrian National Library, Vienna [Austrian National Library, Picture Archives and Graphics Department]

58a: The eclectic house of Hugo Accurti, a director of the Hotung Construction Company, stands in the background, muddy flood water in the middle ground, and Chinese children on the right-hand side in the foreground. 58b: A view into the dirty backstreets of Chinese houses in flood water. 58c: The ‘Charity school’ [Armenschule] on the edge of the drainage pool inside the Austro-Hungarian concession. 58d: ‘Chinese school’ with playground and pupils standing in rows. 58e: European (Austrian?) man in white suit, surrounded by Chinese men and shoeless, bare-chested Chinese children standing around the flooded mud areas inside the Austro-Hungarian concession. 58f: The concession’s still muddy and unpaved waterfront in 1911; above the far horizon rises the French cathedral.
Michael Falser

narrated and supposedly one-dimensional and homogenising effects of a first peak of globalisation around 1900, Austria-Hungary only had a very limited share within these large-scale technological regimes at play through the Western Concession Powers, whereas Great Britain, France, and Germany were in the first row of actors after 1900.

Back to our case in the Austro-Hungarian concession itself and in addition to infrastructure and housing projects, education was another ‘civilising’ element in the written and photographic report of 1911. As already depicted through a sketch plan above (cf. Fig. 46), the “charity school [Armenschule]” is next in the photographic documentation of 1911 (Fig. 58c). Additionally, the “Chinese school with playground (Fig. 58d) nearby was converted”, according to the accompanying text to the photographic album, “into an isolation hospital [Isolierspital] during the plague in the springtime of this year” — the epidemic having occurred between 1910 and 1911 (Anonymous 1911, 8–9).104

The colonial habitus of Western men in white suits and spotless uniforms next to shoeless bare-chested Chinese children standing in flooded mud areas (Fig. 58e) visibly stands out in this unique photographic series, which also comprises depictions of “the old cemetery” and the “private cemetery of the Chu Family”, a series of seven roundish earthen heaps (cf. Appendix of the Photographic Album Fig. 83). So does the fact that the Austro-Hungarian civilising (here engineering) mission was far stronger on rhetoric and planning than on concrete achievements. This latter aspect becomes clear if we compare an upstream view of the concession’s still muddy and unpaved waterfront in 1911 (Fig. 58f) with a similar view photographed seven years earlier (cf. Fig. 28).

If this unique photographic album was made just after the dramatic flooding caused by the typhoon of 30 August 1911 to document the infrastructural fragility of the river and of the flood and waste water control system within the Austro-Hungarian concession, one may wonder about the status of the concession ‘just before’ this incident. In this context, another internal report has survived in the Austrian State Archives. It was drafted by von Storck, signed “Peking, 29 August 1911” (supposedly just one day before the destructive typhoon over Tientsin!), and addressed to Count Alois Lexa von Aehrenthal, the acting Minister of Foreign Affairs in Vienna.105 In his nine-page typescript, Storck justified his personal visit to the concession to form an opinion about the “continuous attacks against the houses built by the Hotung Construction Company in Tientsin” and finally disproved the rumours “that they were declared unsuitable for Europeans”. However, he admitted that for his explanation he had departed from “the self-evident prerequisite that rich people with a desire for luxury would themselves never intend to take up residence in our settlement, which was far remote from traffic (up to now even poor Europeans had moved here), but it was to do for those businessmen and craftsmen with lower aspiration who still intended to first earn their money out here”.

At the start of his attached, annotated survey containing thirteen photographs, Storck positioned three older photographs about the “original condition of the settlement in its first five years” (i.e. 1901–1906, depicting “old mud hut and population”, the old floating pontoon bridge “with a view towards Austro-Hungarian concession in 1906”, and “better Chinese houses of old style”) (Fig. 59a), against another pair of photographs, dating from “some years later (1908), a couple of years of the activities of Accurti and the Hotung-Baugesellschaft” and from 1911, with a view down the paved main street, with Chinese pedestrians, a tramway car and a rickshaw (Figs. 59b,c). Storck then added a page of photographs taken left and right of the main street and along it (Fig. 59d), with a rare view of the so-called “Marine-Grundstück” [navy grounds, which were never developed into planned barracks, see our discussion above], “some semi-foreign houses along the north side of the main street”, and a “European house at the H.B.G. gateway” (on the left edge of the photograph, while depicting a busy gate towards “Tongji chayuan” for “Tea Garden” and the small sign “Caution Tramcars” on its signpost). The next photograph was taken down the main street from the Italian side, with the double tracks and electric traction overhead system of the tramway on the right-hand side, and the serialised European-style brick houses on the left-hand side.

104 Rogaski reminds us that just as the Austro-Hungarian concession was being installed in 1902, “a devastating cholera epidemic swept through all the enclaves of Tianjin” (Rogaski 2000, 37).
105 Wilhelm Ritter von Storck to Count Alois Lexa von Aehrenthal, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Beijing, 29 August 1911 (nine-page typescript with thirteen photographs), HHStA.A.R. F63/4 (246).
Fig. 59a  Photographs attached to the report by Wilhelm Ritter von Storck, secretary of the Austro-Hungarian legation in Beijing, signed on 29 August 1911 [Austrian State Archives]

Fig. 59a  Collage of three photographs depicting the Austro-Hungarian concession in 1906 (from left to right): “old mud hut and population”, the old floating pontoon bridge “with a view towards the Austro-Hungarian concession in 1906”, and “better Chinese houses in the old style”

Fig. 59b  Photographs of the main street (Baron Czikann Street) taken in 1908/1911
Fig. 59d Page of photographs from the Storck report of 1911, from top: grounds of the navy; semi-foreign houses on the north side of the main street; and "Tongji chayuan" [Tea Garden] at the great gateway situated behind the Austro-Hungarian consulate [Austrian State Archives]
Since this was one main objective of Storck’s report, the next four photographs focused on different types of backstreet within the new urban street grid: while “the side street behind the walls of the consulate compound” was clean and electrified, and opened the view towards a two-storey house façade with a serialised brick ornamentation, folded sunblinds above the windows, and stylised vases along the eaves (Fig. 60a), the one behind the H.B.G. building, lined by Chinese mud houses (some of them with thatched roofs, their doors and windows covered with simple lattice work), was unpaved and, as the author indicated, “deep faces and dirt deposits were to be recognised even under the new and fierce regime” (Fig. 60b). Somewhere in between these extremes, two other photographs documented unpaved, but better maintained, narrow and busy side streets [Nebenstraße] perpendicular to the main street (Figs. 60c,d, compare with the map in Fig. 54b). The final three photographs indicate the sharp edge between the ‘developed’ streetscape near the eastern border with the Italian concession, including the vernacular mud structures of the Chinese habitations, which in most cases were relics of the pre-Austro-Hungarian period (Fig. 61a), the house of Hugo Accurti (Fig. 61b, in the background), and the view down Czikann Street from the Italian borderline (Fig. 61c).

Through this report and the aforementioned photographic documents, it becomes evident that infrastructural, hygienic and architectural standards, both as regards the new brick or older mud houses themselves and official structures (vs the anonymous-vernacular reality) and maintenance (or lack of care) of streetscapes, varied greatly in relation to their proximity to the Baron Czikann Street, the neat showcase of the Austro-Hungarian concession. Without a doubt, the typhoon-induced flood disaster in August 1911 also constituted a crucial threshold. On the one side stood the pre-1911 structural achievements of the Hotung Construction Company, which had already slowed down considerably before and around 1910 and were not fundamentally updated after the 1911 disaster (some voices were even heard demanding the demolition of neglected projects). On the other side, we find the post-1911 desire of the Austro-Hungarian concession’s new administrators (particularly when Consul Schumpeter arrived in 1912, see below) to take further development back in their own hands.

It also seems that the local Chinese agency gradually changed after 1911, although the 1911 Chinese Revolution, incoming refugees, and the tensions in the run-up to World War I in 1914 were also noticeable in the small Austro-Hungarian concession (see below). By juxtaposing the Austrian map of 1901 (cf. Fig. 9) with a close-up section of the above-quoted Chinese one of 1912 (Fig. 62, cf. Fig. 1), again we become aware of how ‘cartographic discourses’ (after J.B. Harley) produced different visual languages with competing territorial and social claims (cf. the different Chinese and European maps in Figs. 5 and 6). While the Austrian map covered only the urban architectural achievements of the occupying foreign power and left ‘the other place empty’ without any further indications, the Chinese map also indicated — under the large overall English letters “Austro-Hungarian” — many local, ‘indigenous’ sites in Chinese, amongst them the “Tianxian Tea Garden”, to the east just behind Austria’s most representative building, the “consulate” (indicated in brackets).

Finally, the 1911 disaster also had consequences for individual actors on the Austro-Hungarian side: for many years, Hugo Accurti’s double role — as secretary of the Austro-Hungarian concession on the one side, and as director of the Hotung Construction Company on the other — made a neutral controlling role possible. The H.B.G.’s annual business reports clearly point to its gradual decline after 1908/9 (see above) and the flood disaster of August 1911 certainly added momentum to the downward spiral at the local level. However, the decline of Accurti himself was a truly ‘global affair’. In the aftermath of a dispute with the new secretary Eduard Andres (the latter lodged a criminal complaint against Accurti as regards legal and financial irregularities), Accurti, together with his wife Daisy, were found guilty on 20 October 1911 of false testimony; the process took place in the Italian city of Fiume, where he was born, and they were sentenced by the Consular High Court in Constantinople (where legal affairs of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy concerning the ‘Orient’ were dealt with) “to three weeks of enforced arrest”, a punishment that shortly after was weakened by the highest authorities to “three weeks of house arrest”. The mitigating factor for this was a curious (real or staged) act of local solidarity: a “Petition by 69 Chinese merchants and notable citizens” from the Austro-Hungarian concession dated 19 January 1912. The original document, with all stamped signatures, including (as the document puts it) one “signing with a peacock feather, the sub-prefect in the rank of a Vice-Salt Controller, Li Wen Hsi” (Figs. 63a,b) as well as Arthur von Rosthorn’s translation letter to
Figs. 60a-d Four photographs from the Storck report of 1911 showing several side streets, from top left to bottom right: “Side street behind the walls of the consulate compound” (60a), dirty backstreets with Chinese mud houses and the backs of houses built by the H.B.G. (60b), busy side street with “Sing-Song-Girl houses, covered up by roofs made of straw mats” (60c); unpaved side street (60d) [Austrian State Archives]
Figs. 61a-c  Photographs from the Storck report of 1911. From top to bottom: Street with original mud houses (61a), the Accurti house (61b, in the background) and a view down Czikann Street as seen from the border with the Italian concession (61c) [Austrian State Archives]
Fig. 62 Close-up of “Map of Tientsin” of 1911 (compare with Fig. 1), with Chinese indications of local buildings; all “Austro-Hungarian” sites are mentioned in brackets. Also indicated are: the “Jintang” Bridge; the Austrian consulate with its attached “Tianxian” Tea Garden; to the south, the “Shuntai” site (Fischer & Co.) and the Tramway Company; and to the north of the bridge, the Austro-Hungarian marine detachment barracks [Library of Congress, Geography and Map Division, Washington D.C., USA]
Vienna, could be located in the Austrian State Archives.106

[...] We beg for mercy, clemency and indulgence in this affair of a punishment of a civil servant [...] Mr Accurti has held office in this settlement for eight years, he understands the temper of the Chinese very well, can speak Chinese himself and the Chinese population loves him very much; additionally, he is very clement, righteous, incorruptible and reasonable. This is why the inhabitants of the settlement trust him. He took up his duties in 1902 after the Boxer Uprising, he understood the suffering and the pain of our people and had mercy with it. That we are still alive is due to all his merit alone. With our signatures, we petition that he should be given back his position as the secretary of the settlement.

Figs. 63a,b Petition by 69 Chinese merchants and notable citizens” from the Austro-Hungarian concession of 19 January 1912 (folded and read from right to left; the beginning and concluding parts are shown here). [Austrian State Archives]

3.5. The final years of Austria-Hungary’s concession era in Tientsin and its dissolution (1913–24)

The last Austro-Hungarian players entered the diplomatic stage in China towards World War I: Arthur von Rosthorn became the Beijing-based Austro-Hungarian “plenipotentiary minister” from 1911 onwards while Hugo Schumpeter was appointed the new k.u.k. Consul in Tientsin in 1912. In 1912, in a report to the Vienna-based Ministry of Foreign Affairs Schumpeter complained about the meagre development of ‘his’ concession: “With the exception of our main street and the quay section of some 200 metres, [it had] stayed the same half-dilapidated Chinese village [Chinesendorf] as when he had taken it over”. As we shall see in further detail below, there were difficulties from with Schumpeter’s “enforced modernisation” project [Zwangsmodernisierung] from the outset. Constant disputes with the local population (new, poorer migrants rushed into the area after the 1911 revolutionary upheavals) slowed down modernisation. The validity of ownership titles was never clearly established. Confiscations were complicated, as were eventual demolitions of pre-existing houses as a prerequisite for the construction of any new building. Additionally, the full drainage of the unsanitary stagnant water and the relocation of thousands of Chinese graves were little successful. While the borderlines with the Italian neighbours were updated, the ones with the neighbouring Chinese quarters and the Chinese railway company whose tracks ran along the eastern edge of the concession (see the illustrations in the annexed Photographic Album from c.1911) stayed unresolved. However, in a veritable wave of expropriations, which continued even after World War I broke out in 1914, arguably a fourth of the approx. 40,000 Chinese inhabitants may have lost their houses. Finally, the First World War completely changed the situation for Austro-Hungary in Tientsin. As regards its physical architectural presence in the form of an official consulate, it ended in 1924.

- Negotiating demarcations towards the outside
  — Forcing expropriation towards the inside

When Chinese land was occupied in 1901 and the Austro-Hungarian concession then created in 1902 (see above), borderlines between it and neighbouring areas were only vaguely described. Some of them remained a source of constant discussion. One particular section of the boundary line, running from the Hai River towards the neighbouring Italian concession (Fig. 64) to the southern end of the Austro-Hungarian concession, was already discussed in a draft resolution by Hugo Accurti in December 1907: this concerned a mutual and fair exchange of territory of “15,677 Mou” (one Mou or Mow equalling 666 m²), as he explained in his sketch plan for “Grenz- und Canalstraße” and its legend (Figs. 65a, b).

More than five years later, in April 1913, a report by Arthur von Rosthorn to the new Minister of Foreign Affairs, Count Leopold Berchtold, discussed “the new demarcation line between the Austro-Hungarian and the Italian concessions”; this concerned “a centred line along a new main street to cross Via Carlotto and Via Roma” on the Italian side (an Italian set of maps was added to the report) and the still roughly named “main streets II–IV” on the Austro-Hungarian side (Figs. 66a, b). Shortly after, Count des Fours Walderode reported from Beijing that “the new border demarcation between the Austro-Hungarian and the Italian concession became legally valid [rechtsskräftig] on 14 July 1913.”

Much more difficult was the unnerving debate about individual border stones on the boundary with
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107 The ministers in the k.u.k. Beijing legation were: Moritz Freiherr von Czikann (1896–1905), Eugen Ritter von Kuczynski (1905–11), and Arthur von Rosthorn (1911–17); the Tientsin consuls were: Carl Bernauer (1901–08, interim Consul Ernst Ludwig 1905–06), Erwin Ritter von Zach (1908), Miroslav Kohr (1908–12), Felix Stumvoll (1911), and Hugo Schumpeter (1912–17).
108 At this point, China exchanged personnel who, in common diplomatic language, were named “envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary”, with the international powers.
109 Schumpeter to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 7 July 1913; quoted in Lehner 1995, 434.
110 Detailed correspondence between Tientsin and Vienna in 1914–15 was published in Hörtler 1984, II:35–83.
111 HHStA GesA Peking 103 (Settlement Grenzregulierungen 1902/06), Accurti, Tientsin 29 December 1907.
112 After the assassination of the Crown Prince Franz Ferdinand in June 1914, Count Leopold Berchtold (from 1912 the k.u.k. Minister of Foreign Affairs) backed the ultimatum to Serbia that would lead to the First World War which, in our conceptional “Habsburgs going global” approach, had direct consequences (or better: global reverse effects) for the Austro-Hungarian presence in Tientsin (see below).
113 HHStA F63.4 (399), Rosthorn to Count Berchtold, Beijing 21 April 1913.
114 HHStA F63.5 (410) Des Fours to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 18 July 1913.
Fig. 64 The Italian concession plan ("Tien-Tsin – Pianta concessione Italiana") with its urban development and taxation sections ("villaggio") and its north-western borderline with the "Concessione Austriaca" [Austrian State Archives]
Figs. 65a,b  Plan by Hugo Accurti in 1907 mapping out several exchanges of territories between the Austro-Hungarian and Italian concessions [Austrian State Archives]
Figs. 66a,b  Maps of the final exchanges of territories between the Austro-Hungarian and Italian concessions when they entered into force in July 1913 [Austrian State Archives]
the neighbouring Chinese quarters.\textsuperscript{115} In 1914, this process culminated in a dispute between the Austrian Consul and his Chinese counterpart, the local Chief of Police, Jang-Gi-Teh, about the precise boundary of the concession and the related question of modernising the Shizijie [Shizi Street]. Attaching a series of Chinese newspaper clippings about the affair (like the Peking Jih-Pao, Tagblatt für Nord-China or Peking & Tientsin Times) to the letter, Schumpeter himself claimed that “The precise plan had already been drafted in 1904 [and] the relevant border stones were never moved […], but may have been buried in the context of the recent earthworks. Furthermore, the stone concerned still [did] carry the initials of Austria-Hungary, despite signs of decay”. Thereupon, the Chinese side claimed that “the Austro-Hungarian concession had no right to install new border stones” and further stated in a subsequent meeting: “I, [speaking for] the Governor of the Zhili Province, acknowledge that the honourable Consul intends to repair the street concerned, but this street is an entirely Chinese street [my emphasis]. The Chinese authorities alone have the duty to repair it”.\textsuperscript{116} According to these written documents, it seems that the attached map in the Schumpeter report of April 1914 (Fig. 67) showing the demarcation between the “Austro-Hungarian settlement” (on the left side of the map) and “Chinese territory” never reached full diplomatic acknowledgement from both negotiating sides — contrary to the Austro-Italian deal in 1913 — and complaints from Chinese citizens continued throughout the next years.

However, moving borderlines as such was not the only problem. As early as late 1912, Consul Miroslav Kobr commented on the particularly complicated property conditions along the riverbank: there stood many miserable mud huts [elende Lehmhütten] in narrow and tortuous side alleys, whose expropriation and demolition was a precondition for the further development of the settlement.\textsuperscript{117} A few months later, in February 1913, he drafted his “Report concerning the planned melioration work”, including a map concerning the “expropriation project along the southern section of the Bund” (Fig. 68a), a concrete list of houses, and an English draft proposal (signed “Tientsin, 4 February 1913”) for the overall “cost estimate for the expropriation of land and houses, levelling and metalling, construction of stone gutters and underground drains, etc. for 23,642 taels”.\textsuperscript{118} In December 1913 the full development plan was re-issued, displaying the properties of the H.G.B., as well as the planned, newly acquired and already expropriated land (Fig. 68b).

\textsuperscript{115} These circumstances were documented in Hörtler’s PhD thesis, including a collection of “Files about the Austrian Tientsin concession (Hörtler 1984, II:35–66).  
\textsuperscript{116} HHStA GesA Peking 103 (Settlement Grenzregulierungen), Schumpeter reports from 14 April and 25 July 1914.  
\textsuperscript{117} HHStA F63.4 (393), Kobr to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 11 November 1912.  
\textsuperscript{118} HHStA F63.4 (393), Kobr to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 16 February 1913.
**Fig. 68a** Plan of the “Expropriation project at the southern section of the Bund” of the Austro-Hungarian concession, issued in “Tientsin, 3 February 1913” [Austrian State Archives]

**Fig. 68b** Plan of the Austro-Hungarian concession, issued “as of 31 December 1913”, with a legend indicating the “property of the Hotung Baugesellschaft” (red), “other property” (green), “newly bought land” (red lines), and “expropriated land” (cross-hatched in red) [Austrian State Archives]
What Schumpeter actually intended, however, when he was appointed as the Consul in 1912, was not necessarily to bring more Austrians or other Europeans to the concession since, with WWI in the air, no additional investors would have been prepared to bring funds to China. Instead, through a process of internal segregation, he tried to develop a socially higher stratum of the Chinese population. In a series of internal reports to the Vienna-based Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1913 and 1914, Schumpeter proposed new quay constructions, earthworks, streets and sewers, suggested hiring new “consulting engineers”, and reflected about a new taxation system, expropriation rates, building regulations, and higher standards for buildings; he even proposed selling the inefficient Hotung Construction Company (to the Crédit Foncier d’Extrême-Orient, whose head, G. Bourboulon, was the main shareholder of the H.B.G.) and reported on a “high demand for properties [große Nachfrage nach Grundstücken] which justified a more rigorous selection of potential buyers under conditions of a better design (front gardens), executed or approved by European architects and striving for higher standards of hygiene”.119

Indeed, Schumpeter would reiterate this approach — a segregation along Chinese class lines — in the internal annual “Trade Reports of the k.u.k. Austro-Hungarian consulate in Tientsin” of 1914 and 1915. In the 1914 report, he proudly listed the work in progress: “further earthworks of the expropriated northern parts between Czikann Street and Riverside Street [Uferstraße], the parcelling out of the emptied building area, which to a large extent has been bought by Chinese, and has already started to be developed with new houses in European style” and “further breaches [Durchbrüche] along the southern Bund for a second main street with better connection to the two bridges, [and] the creation of a new border road [Grenzstraße] towards the Italian concession”. Through our contemporary lens, his satisfied conclusion had a hidden cynical undertone: “The expropriations of the area between both main streets forced many Chinese inhabitants of the settlement to leave so that now only 30.000 Chinese live in the concession, in comparison to some 40.000 before the expropriations started”.120

Sections of his text in the 1915 trade report need to be quoted since they reflect what I would like to call a fractured reality during the last active days of the Austro-Hungarian concession: wishful thinking of a supposedly bright future with “Chinese of the better class” in “European-styled houses” on the southern side (at the time a decaying development project from the early days of the Hotung Construction Company in the originally respectable centre of the concession) and an “original Chinese village” on the northern side, which had survived as an antagonist reminder of a pre-modern, i.e. pre-colonial past:

In this year many Chinese in the southern section had been expropriated and the old huts torn down. Infills, streets, and sewers [followed]. The newly parcelled-out land was, owing to its rather high price, almost all bought by Chinese from the better class. The Chinese fear the outbreak of riots and buy land (and also properties) in our and other concessions in order to instantly build houses into which they can already move into, or would right away move into in the case of a revolution. The construction of new houses in the European style exhibits satisfying progress so that our concession is top in the building trade amongst all settlements. The southern section of our settlement has nice wide streets, pavements, sewers and electric lighting, and with its houses in foreign style and those under construction with front yards, it starts to take on a European appearance. […] The property of the H.B.G. makes no noteworthy progress. The houses on both sides of Czikann Street make no good impression, and perform very poorly as regards their construction, solidity and health-related conditions. These realities stand in the way of a rational development of our concession. The final part, north of Czikann Street, has retained the character of a Chinese village, which it always had from earlier times.121

In August 1915 Schumpeter even translated this observation of different developmental stages within...
the small Austro-Hungarian settlement into a scheme of “three sharply separated classes as regards the hygiene of the settlement”.

**“Habsburgs going global”? The imaginaire of new expansions and coalitions at the end of empire**

While Schumpeter formulated his hygiene, segregation, and development priorities scheme for the some 0.6 square kilometre of the Austro-Hungarian concession, he even projected the macro-situation of the global warfare-cum-diplomacy constellation of 1915 — the first full year of the First World War, in which the defence of internal European peripheries in fact completely absorbed the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy — onto the micro-constellation of the international concession set-up across Tientsin. In what may be conceptualised as the final imaginaire of “Habsburgs going global” in East Asia, in a letter of 12 July 1915 addressed to Baron Stefan Burian von Rajecz (from January 1915 the new Austrian Minister of Foreign Affairs), Schumpeter proposed applying “the upcoming peace negotiations [in the WWI context, MF] to the extension of the Austro-Hungarian concession at the expense of the Italian and Russian settlements”. Schumpeter attached a “plan of the foreign concessions of Tientsin” displaying their official delimitations and his colour-shaded vision, which followed the conceptual aesthetics of older warfare, occupation, and annexation maps (Fig. 69), and explained what he had in
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**Fig. 69** “Plan of the Foreign Concessions of Tientsin”, attached to an internal report to the Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs by Consul Schumpeter in July 1915, proposing to annex the Italian, Russian and Belgian concessions to the Austro-Hungarian and German concessions [Austrian State Archives].
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122 The first class referred to the southern section “with new houses with septic tanks and connection to the sewers according to sanitary standards valid in every European city”; the second concerned “the constructions of the H.B.G., where for the most part Chinese lived with their primitively built shops, where no sewerage system was possible, where dirty whorehouses were run by Chinese without any understanding of cleanliness, and where the most necessary demands of the sanitary police needed to be applied”; the third section comprised “the hopeless rest of the settlement as we found it in 1901, with houses made of wooden frames and mud covering and c.0.7 people per square metre, a population density unthinkable under European standards”. As regards the lowest class, Schumpeter saw the “only solution in successive expropriation, full demolition and complete rebuilding” HHStA F63.5 (451), Schumpeter to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tientsin 4 August 1915.
mind: while the concessions of Austria-Hungary (currently “too small to live in and too large to die in”) and the German Reich were positioned at both ends of the overall concession constellation, and therefore separated from each other, Great Britain was interested, as it also was in the sphere of global open trade flows, in “blocking access” to key infrastructural positions, which was, in the micro-perspective of Tientsin, the international railway station within the Russian sector. To overcome this risk, Schumpeter argued that the Austro-Hungarian and German concessions ought to be merged across the Russian territory at the earliest possible moment, for “unfavourable peace negotiations” at a later point would encourage Italy to swallow up the Austro-Hungarian territory and Great Britain to annex the German concession. In order to reinforce his reasoning, Schumpeter attached a four-page typescript to the report under the title “Tientsin, its trading and political importance and future”, foreseeing a prosperous future for the Austro-Hungarian Empire with a new boost “to export Austrian weapon factories and steelworks” to post-war China.123

While the Sino-Austrian contact zone underwent a considerable segregation process as regards local poorer Chinese vs incoming richer Chinese, one contact situation appearing to be similar to the one experienced during the earlier days of the Austro-Hungarian concession, when the opening celebrations at the consulate and iron bridge (1905–06) had brought Austrian representatives together with Yuan Shikai and his Chinese colleagues (see above), ensued again when WWI broke out. This time, both sides made a last and, ultimately, hopeless effort to strengthen their relations by mutually acknowledging their imperial traditions. For this reason, the Austrian delegation officially welcomed Yuan Shikai’s 1915 enthronement as Chinese emperor (which only lasted a few months, from 12 December 1915 to 22 March 1916). Shortly after, Karl I. became heir to the throne of the Austrian-Hungarian Monarchy (Archduke Franz Ferdinand’s assassination in Sarajevo in 1914 having finally triggered World War I) and his enthronement as King of Hungary on 30 December 1916 was also celebrated, at least modestly, in the Tientsin consulate in the presence of high representatives from the German concession (Lehner 1995, 484). It is likely that important Chinese representatives were also present as they had been some ten years before. This speculation is all the more relevant because, as I explored above, both expropriated and still undeveloped slots were, to a much lesser extent, sold by Austro-Hungarian land developers to rich Chinese residents from the city, but many former Qing officials moved to Tientsin and Shanghai.

Domestic political instability peaked with the founding of the Republic of China in 1912 and elite Chinese showed a great deal of interest in land situated in concession areas — these were considered safer. Indeed, the Trade Report of 1917 stated that “properties and/or houses in the Austro-Hungarian concession were purchased by the president of the Republic of China, Feng Guozhang [see below]; the military governor of the Zhili province Cao Kun and his brother Cao Rui; Wang Zhanyuan, general from Hebei and others”.124 Most probably Yuan Shi-Kai himself was also one of these new plot owners in the Austro-Hungarian concession, but it is most unlikely that he actually built and then used a villa in the short years before his early death in June 1916 (see below).

When World War I broke out in 1914, at first China declared its neutrality and international business in Tientsin continued. Yet in 1915 Schumpeter formulated the aforementioned plan to merge the Austro-Hungarian and the German concessions (see the map above), but with the Dual Monarchy’s further misfortunes during World War I, all further plans for Tientsin became obsolete. In a global chain reaction to the European side of the war, Great Britain would indeed, as Schumpeter had foreseen in his 1915 report, strategically undermine trade activities of the Central Powers in Asia; the concessions of Austria-Hungary and the German Empire became increasingly isolated.

However, the very global set-up of the concession system in Tientsin had created an entangled cosmopolitan network — one of infrastructural and logistical interdependencies and mutual obligations beyond current affairs (cf. Sheehan 2000). In our case, the Austro-Hungarian concession, together with the Italian and Russian ones, received electricity and the tramway logistics from the Belgian concession (Belgium was a member of the Allies’ side of the war, but the power supplier itself had its seat

123 HHStA F63.5 (451), Schumpeter, k.u.k. Vicekonsul und Amtsleiter an den Minister des k.u.k. Hauses und des Äußeren, Stefan Baron Burian (Tientsin 12 July 1915).
124 HHStA GA Peking 29, Handelsbericht für das Jahr 1917, as mentioned in Hörlter 1984, I:86.
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in the Austro-Hungarian concession) while its water supply was in the hands of a British company with its seat in the Chinese City (Liu 2011).

Yet it was all in vain. Under pressure from the Allies and with its own hopes to regain control, amongst other things, of the Shantung Peninsula and its German naval base, Tsingtau (as both were called in German), China declared war to the German Empire and, therefore inevitably, to Germany’s confederate, the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, on 14 August 1917. This had immediate consequences (Hörtler 1984, I:118–22): on the same day, the Austro-Hungarian concession was handed over to China, with Chinese soldiers taking over the area and hoisting the Chinese flag on the consulate building. While the diplomatic corps was given safe conduct back to Europe, soldiers and marines were captured by the Russian army and held in Siberian detention camps, or escaped, supported by the Tianjin German Relief Fund [Tientsin Hilfsaktion] and could eventually find asylum in China (Mervay 2018). Austrian property (including three ships of the Austrian Lloyd in Shanghai) was confiscated and, after a short sixteen years (1901–1917), activities in the Austro-Hungarian concession in Tientsin came to a sudden end.

The fate of the former Austro-Hungarian concession and its consulate

In the following couple of years, the Austro-Hungarian concession was supervised by representatives from the Netherlands, which stayed neutral throughout World War I (Gotteland 2016, 52). In 1919, Arthur von Rosthorn — k.u.k. Beijing-based delegate before World War I (cf. Rosthorn 1901) and, after the war, an unswerving ‘legitimist’ defending Austria’s monarchic past (Unterrieder 1978) — voiced his support for the dissolution of the various concessions in Tientsin and Shanghai, and their “merging into one great settlement under broadest independence and an internationalised set-up” in his German pamphlet Our relation to China before and after the war (Rosthorn 1919, 17).

Following the Treaty of St. Germain (signed in 1919), China became a sovereign member of the League of Nations, and §§ 113–7 provided that Austria would officially “cede to China all her rights over the buildings [and] other public property”.125 After 1919, the former German and Austro-Hungarian concessions were turned into the First and
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125 As § 115 put it: “Austria, so far as she is concerned, cedes to China all her rights over the buildings, wharves and pontoons, barracks, forts, arms and munitions of war, vessels of all kinds, wireless telegraphy installations and other public property which belonged to the former Austrian-Hungarian Monarchy, and which are situated or may be in the Austro-Hungarian Concession at Tientsin or elsewhere in Chinese territory. It is understood, however, that premises used as diplomatic or consular residences or offices, as well as the effects and furniture contained therein, are not included in the above cession […].” Online: http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/other/dfat/treaties/1920/3.html (retrieved 26 June 2020).
Second Special Administrative Areas [Sonderverwaltungszonen] (Rasmussen 1925, 267) (Fig. 70).

Surviving documents in the Austrian State Archives can help us reconstruct the fate of the most important building of the former Austro-Hungarian concession: the consulate. While the delegate of the Dutch embassy in Beijing, Oudendijk, was named to represent the interests of Austria in China, the acting Austrian honorary consul, Paul Bauer,\textsuperscript{126} was in charge of selling the property in 1923. In his corre-

\textsuperscript{126} The Viennese Paul Bauer had worked from 1901 in the Chinese Maritime Customs and Imperial Posts, and was Honorary Consul in Tientsin between 1922 and 1938 (Agstner 2018, 366; Compare with the Introduction by Georg Lehner).
spondence with the Federal Chancellery [Bundeskanzleramt] in Vienna, Bauer summed up the “overall property covering 7,093 Mou, including both buildings, the stables, the additional official residences in the shed [Dienstwohnungen in der Re­mise] and the gatekeeper’s lodge” and reported on a “final sales amount of 43,079 taels [for the property] with a list of all furniture and fixtures, and 12,071 taels for the tennis court”; he named the buyer: the Chinese business man Chi Chi Chai in Tientsin”.  
In a letter dated May 1923, Bauer mentioned a slightly higher sales amount of “65,000 taels plus 500 dollars for Mr Schumpeter (for his investment in the consulate’s bathroom fittings)” and signed, next to the official stamps of the Chinese party, the Dutch legations, and the “Austrian consulate, Tientsin”, responsible on the contract (Fig. 71), while he himself “took personal charge of the consulate archives” and “waited for further instructions”. With his last letter on the last day of the year of 1923, Bauer reported that he had handed over “all business material, the office inventory and all deposits, as well as the archives of the shut-down k.u.k. consulate and the Austrian welfare organisation for the prisoners of war [Kriegsgefangenenfürsorge] in Vladivostok, [as well as] the letter of hypothecation [Verpfändungsurkunde] of the Hotung Construction Company and the estate of J. Brunner […] to Vice-Consul Rolf Geyling”.  
While this purchase contract made it possible to hand back the most prominent physical evidence of the Austro-Hungarian concession to independent China, the consulate’s operational memory was repatriated to Austria. In this ‘global back-translation’ — from in-situ working documents in the concession into archival material back in the motherland — the great oblivion awaiting the Habsburgs’ only project in the Far East only deepened. Unfortunately, the cohesion of the written reports and their visual attachments was partly destroyed as they were deposited in two separate Viennese storage locations: at the Austrian State Archives, and the Picture Archives and Graphics Department of the National Library. It is due to this filing error that the most prominent visual document — the rediscovered photographic album (c.1911) with its written description and a map — was not cross-referenced to the relevant written files and thus escaped the notice of (inter-)national research until today. It is the present book’s ambition to try and re-unite some elements of these written and visual sources.

In 1923, the year when the Austro-Hungarian consulate buildings were finally sold, Sun Yat-sen’s famous claim that China still was a “hypo-colony and a slave to many countries” (quoted in Marinelli 2018, 195) was still a fact around Tientsin: its “hyper-colonial” setting — “divided among multiple imperialisms” (as Ruth Rogaski reformulated it 2004, 11) — endured. The concessions of France, Italy and Japan remained intact until the end of World War II in 1945–46 (Fig. 72). Finally, the city was ‘liberated’ by the Red Army in 1949, and the People’s Republic of China was proclaimed in the same year. It is this political tipping point that we applied throughout the book to change the imperial-era denomination of Tientsin into a designation for a post-imperialist and liberated city: Tianjin. What followed was almost a half-century of a (post-)Maoist reading of former concession cities (such as Shanghai or Tientsin) as sites of international imperialism, national shame, and humiliation. However, a gradual “undoing the colonial city” in the mid-1980s (Western 1985, cf. Bernstein 1988) led to Tianjin obtaining the ‘National Famous Historical and Cultural City’ label. Then, in the early 2000s, the city’s contested concession history slowly turned into cultural heritage within a truly global framework.

127 HHStA A.R. F8/241, Paul Bauer to the Bundeskanzleramt, Tientsin 18 April 1923. Other sources spell the buyer as „Ji Jinzhai“.  
128 HHStA A.R. F8/241, Paul Bauer to the Bundeskanzleramt, Tientsin 18 May 1923.  
129 HHStA A.R. F8/241, Paul Bauer to the Bundeskanzleramt, Tientsin 31 December 1923. Rolf Geyling was an Austrian architect who had “arrived an Tjantin via Siberia in 1920, and there he worked until his death in 1952” (Kögel 2020, 92). In 1925, a much more famous Austrian architect, Adolf Loos, would send in (without final success) a set of drawings for a large building complex of the “China Permanent International Trade Exhibition”, see Rukscheio/Schachet 1982, 596–8.
Fig. 72 Map of Tientsin published in 1945 by the U.S. Army Map Service [Wikipedia Commons]
4. The former Austro-Hungarian concession as part of a global heritage theme park?

While the “changing basis of legitimacy of the PRC” (People’s Republic of China) since the late 1990s is located in a change of strategy “from socialist ideology to cultural heritage” ['cultural heritage' in Chinese was translated as wenhua yichan] (Madsen 2014), this turn has touched upon three temporalities. Certainly, instrumentalising the past to stabilise the present towards a better future has been a (self-) civilising mission-strategy in nation-building all over the world from the nineteenth century onwards (Falser 2015). However, China’s enforced global competition at the turn of the new millennium produced a new heritage regime, which has captured the interest of many researchers since the last decade. Certainly, this last chapter is not meant to come to a definite and overall judgement about the present heritage process across Tianjin; the politics and business of cultural heritage in the city are far too complex and multi-layered, especially for a Western foreigner with no knowledge of Chinese and no access to the city’s development agenda below the official surface. Rather, I intend to take up some already established observations recently made by Chinese and international researchers and re-group them, after a short tour d’horizon of other areas, around my own case study of the former Austro-Hungarian concession as a present-day spot of touristic commodification. Together with my 2018 photographic documentation about the physical appearance of former concession areas today (including the Italian, British and French ones), I hope to offer a selection of speculations which, ideally, could be taken up by other international researchers, in particular Chinese ones who enjoy easier access to the local dynamics of Tianjin.

From a general viewpoint about the new relevance of the cultural heritage sector in China, several studies have already pointed to the fact that many local Chinese authorities were motivated to appropriate “heritage as improvement” slogans (Oakes 2013) as an effective tool of governance to enhance social cohesion, use “heritage policies as part of the effort of modernization and development” (Harrell 2013, 287), and attract foreign investment both to help build up the newly created heritage environments and then attract (inter)national tourists to come and experience these. In the past ten years, numerous edited volumes, such as Heritage Politics in China (Blumenfeld & Silverman 2013) or Chinese Heritage in the Making (Maags & Svensson 2018), have helped map out a full set of these newly fabricated and highly contested configurations. Sometimes they embed contradictory meanings, ranging from the intangible heritage of “reinvented traditions” (after Hobsbawm & Ranger 1983) to shifting representation modes in museums and commemorative sites. Moreover, those new developments may result in the simultaneous production of urban renaissance and re-imagination, punctual architectural conservation next to often blatant destruction of ‘authentic’ architectural fabric, and in-style façade reconstructions alongside full-scale inventions. I would like to propose as a working hypothesis that all of these variations have turned former concession areas in Tianjin into highly interesting, but also slightly uneasy hybrids to be studied, read and contextualised.

The post-1990s economic transformation of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) has also turned previously socialist urban planning schemes into almost capitalistic ones, and those centred most prominently around the deltas of the Pearl River and Yangtze River (in China’s south and east, with the former colony of Hong Kong and Shanghai’s former concession site) and the Bohai Bay (in the north, with Beijing and the larger port area in and around Tianjin) have become veritable hotspots. Even if this ideological shift can also be observed in the case of Tianjin, the ambivalent, even Janus-faced nature of the entangled process of devaluation and revaluation of concessional architecture and urban space pre-dates the 1990s. As we will show through a prominent case in the former Austro-Hungarian concession, Chinese elites had already discovered concession areas for their own housing projects in the context of the 1911 revolutionary upheavals and the post-WWI decolonisation process (see below). This continued, in spite of dramatic regime changes, over the following decades: in the post-1949 liberation era through to the (late) Maoist period, Tianjin’s concession past was often labelled as feudal and im-
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130 See the introduction, “Mapping the Chinese heritage regime” (Maags & Svensson 2018, 11–38) for an overview of the immense amount of recent heritage studies about the Chinese context, both in Chinese and English, which cannot all be analysed and quoted in this final chapter.
perialistic backwardness, and in some areas (as in the former Italian and Austro-Hungarian concessions) commercial activities decreased, and the building stock was gradually abandoned, decayed and was eventually demolished. Nevertheless, some elements of concession architecture survived rather well; most prominently in the former French and British concessions, some banks and department stores continued to operate in their commercial functions while many buildings were repurposed by CCP elites (the British Club became an elite CCP club), and officers of the PLA (People’s Liberation Army of the later Communist Party) were given former concession homes (such as in the Wudado area, see below).

Researchers have already stated that the ‘story of the new-and-old’ already took off with deconstruction and reconstruction in the late 1990s, when urban developers also discovered the legacy of the “Western-style villas […] in the post-treaty port Tianjin” (LaCouture 2010, compare with LaCouture 2021). However, the strategic branding strategy of Tianjin as a truly global and cosmopolitan city must be dated to the post-2000 years. As Chinese researchers have also noticed, this has helped transcribe the urban and architectural legacy of the concession era “from a symbol of imperialistic penetration into a site of cultural heritage” (Hong 2018). Two initiatives in this direction can be mentioned here: in 2004, Tianjin celebrated its 600th birthday and books such as “Tianjin Image” [Tianjin yinxiang] or exhibitions such as “Tianjin seen through a hundred years of China” [Zhonghua bainian kan Tianjin] in the Tianjin Museum of Modern History [Jindai Tianjin Bowuguan], a quasi-private enterprise and neither an academic nor an official city venture, summarised the story line not only for the local public, but also for the increasing number of international visitors to the city.

Although these examples are useful when studying the commercialisation and politicisation of heritage as such, I am, of course, particularly interested in the physical transformation of still-standing historical parts of Tianjin’s former concession areas. In this regard, the concessions’ historical access to the fluvial transport infrastructure came to the forefront again, and their ‘panoramic’ reinvention resulted into what I would like to call here a world’s fair-like cultural heritage theme park, evoking an atmosphere of “cosmopolitan Tianjin”; after all, it is no accident that it is often called a “permanent Exhibition of World Architecture” — wanguo jianzhu bolanhui).131

In this process, the Hai River Waterfront Comprehensive Development and Transformation Project (cf. the Haihe Conservancy Commission one hundred years earlier) was a major player. It picked up speed since 2003 when Dai Xianglong (ex-governor of the Bank of China and good friend of Wen Jiabao, a native of Tianjin and China’s Prime Minister between 2003 and 2013) became the city’s mayor (cf. Chauffert-Yvart et al. 2020).

What I conceptualise as a (Hobsbawnian) ‘reinvention of tradition’ means here that not only a good number of key historical monuments from the concession era itself are still visible, and is being restored, but that recent additions have often been carried out in an approximate ‘in-style’ manner. This will become clearer when looking at some of the photographs taken during my 2018 visit to Tianjin. Passing the former concession areas of the German Empire (Figs. 73a,b) and Great Britain (Figs. 74a,b) to the south and France in the centre (Fig. 75a,b), we approach ‘our’ case study, Austria-Hungary’s former concession land, in the northern section (facing the equally reinvented ‘traditional Chinese City’ to the west, Figs. 76a,b). What happens there is best introduced through its previously neighbouring concession, Italy, which has already been extensively studied with regard to the aforementioned recent ‘heritagisation’ process across the city (Figs. 77a,b).

Since 2000, the Tianjin municipal government has been turning the former Italian concession into Yishifengqingqu (literally: ‘scenic area in the Italian style’). Critical architectural historians in the last decade interpret this as “an Italian-flavoured, aristocratically tinged, business park with Chinese characteristics, […] striving to obliterate the colonial past, and aiming at marketing the former colonial buildings in order to attract foreign and wealthy domestic customers” (Marinelli 2009, 419; cf. Zhang & Liu 2013, Zhu 2015, Marinelli 2018, Lu & Mengin 2020).

---

[131] Taking up this reference to World’s Fairs is interesting when comparing the historical and reinvented panoramic representations of the concessions along Tianjin’s Hai River with the ephemeral display of the ‘rue des nations’ at the Exposition universelle of Paris in 1900; various ‘national’ pavilions were built in their distinctive architectural languages, while those nations’ colonial possessions, from Africa to Asia, constituted an exotic display at ‘Colonial Exhibitions’ such as in Paris 1931 (cf. Falser 2020, vol. 1, 281–339).
Figs. 73a,b  Old depictions and/or postcards of the concession period alongside new photographs taken by Michael Falser in Tianjin in December 2018: *Deutscher Klub* in the former German concession in Tientsin (above, on a historic postcard); today in Tianjin, the *Concordia Club* is bordered to the left by a much higher new Chinese building with a stylised clock tower (below). [Dubreuil private collection; Michael Falser, 2018]
Figs. 74a,b Old depictions and/or postcards of the concession period alongside new photographs taken by Michael Falser in Tianjin in December 2018: The Victoria Park, Gordon Hall and the Astor House Hotel in the former British concession in Tientsin (above, as depicted in Drake's *Map and short description of Tientsin* of 1900), and the former Astor Hotel today enlarged on the right side by new Chinese ‘in-style’ additions (below). [Drake 1900, no page; Michael Falser, 2018]
Habsburgs going global. The Austro-Hungarian Concession in Tientsin/Tianjin in China

Figs. 75a, b Old depictions and/or postcards of the concession period alongside new photographs taken by Michael Falser in Tianjin in December 2018: An old postcard of the Concession française (above), and a completely new Chinese riverfront in Tianjin today, quoting the past flair of Tientsin’s former French concession on the same spot (below). [Dubreuil private collection; Michael Falser, 2018]
Figs. 76a,b Old depictions and/or postcards of the concession period alongside new photographs taken by Michael Falser in Tianjin in December 2018. An old postcard depicting the “Chinese City” gate (above), and the new “Chinese gate to the old Chinese town” clashing with apartment skyscrapers from presumably the same period in the 2000s (below). [Bristol University collection; Michael Falser, 2018]
Figs. 77a,b  Old depictions and/or postcards of the concession period alongside new photographs taken by Michael Falser in Tianjin in December 2018: An older postcard of the Italian concession (above), and the recently reinvented Marco Polo Square of the former Italian concession and its newly reconstructed fountain, with its column and a crowning goddess of peace, today holding a politically correct olive branch instead of the original sword (below). [Bristol University collection; Michael Falser, 2018]
When the ‘renovation-cum-reinvention process’ of exotic Italy was initiated by the local government in the hope that Italian firms would invest into a Sinol-Italian joint venture, it was combined with the “re-location of 5000 families” and the closure of local factories or shops (Hong 2018, 82–7; quoting Zhong 2009), leading to local protest — a topic about which Chinese researchers, in particular, critically published.132 While the meant-to-be-picturesque façade reconstructions around illustrious Marco Polo Plaza and Dante Square de facto turned the spot into a ghost town at night (the renovated Italian concession stood empty for many years), it was opened to the public in 2011, designated a four-star tourist attraction in glossy promotional publications, and advertised as a site of ‘Historical and Stylistic Architecture of Tianjin’ by the municipal government in 2013.133 In this context, the new-old cultural heritage theme park of ‘Little Italy’ became an important part of the ‘to-be-continued’ (and rather re-invented) concession-time success story of modernisation, cosmopolitanism, international cooperation and, even, multilateral friendship.

Within this promoted success story of ‘global Tianjin’, we can see that the narrative of ‘historical Tientsin’ as a — supposedly — productive international contact zone between pro-reform Qing officials (like Li Hongzhang in the 1870s to Yuan Shikai) and Western powers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century also resurfaced as a topos in Chinese research and local development strategies: first, in an aesthetic sense, as a — supposedly — intellectual platform where external and international modernisation schemes had been exchanged (Hong 2018);134 and, second, in a physical sense, when concrete heritage promotions highlighted those urban sites where — supposedly — active or retired Qing officials and members of the Chinese imperial family built up their hybrid-style ‘small foreign villas’ (or xiao yang lou). As we shall see, these places were now not only being rediscovered, but even reinvented. In order to illustrate the second observation, I would like to conclude this final chapter with two cases that will lead us from former British concessions all the way back to ‘our’ Austro-Hungarian concession.

The Five Avenues Historic District (Wudadao) in the former British concession, with its hundreds of suburban villas, counts today as the most prominent urban heritage section of Tianjin, one where the above-mentioned Janus-faced devaluation/revaluation process becomes visible. While Chinese research does mention the previously pejorative, Communist labelling of the areas as an “imperialist breeding ground and hiding place for Qing nobles, warlords, and bureaucrats” (Yang 1994 to Hong 2018),135 we know that the villas continued to be valued as precious living spaces through all the various regime changes over the last hundred years. As a consequence, they survived physically, gradually became a point of pride and today are being turned into an architectural heritage parcours (cf. Liu, Butler & Zhang 2019; Lu & Mengin 2020).

In this game, the historically almost forgotten and little researched Austro-Hungarian concession plays a small (but as I claim here, instructive) role. The famous Yuan Shikai has even been turned here into a useful figure to bridge the past and the present: if he indeed had repeatedly shown a specific interest and anecdotal presence in the Austro-Hungarian concession during his lifetime until his death in 1916 (e.g., signing the concession contract in 1903, opening the consulate in 1905, and supervising the “Austrian bridge” of 1906, see above), his legacy as Tientsin’s great ‘inter-national’ cultural broker and political moderniser also needed to be revived on a physical and permanent basis. As we shall see below, ‘his villa’ was indeed ‘located’ and turned into the most relevant selling point for the touristic commodifica-

132 In this context, critical voices, such as the famous Tianjin writer Feng Jicai, backed ‘real’ urban heritage preservation against the authorised destruction of a number of age-old neighbourhoods and districts such as the Southern City/Nanshi (Feng in 2000/1, quoted in Zhang 2001, 56; Hong 2018, 80; Marinelli 2018, 214).

133 Maurizio Marinelli termed this Tianjin’s strategy of a “past-presentness of the metropolis’s globalizing ambitions” (Marinelli 2018, 217).

134 The so-called Self-Strengthening Movement, also known as Foreign Affairs Movement, was a first serious official endeavour to learn from the West, with a series of prominent pro-reform Qing officials to be appointed as governor-generals of Zhili (now Hebei) Province, from Li Hongzhang in the 1870s to Yuan Shikai. Or, as Chinese research framed it: “The coexistence of foreign powers’ presence and activities within the international modernization ventures within the interaction between the two (first Chinese railway, postal service, stamps and newspaper), forged a new identity for Tianjin” (Hong 2018, 72).

135 “Five Great Avenues” (wudadao) suffered damage during and after the Cultural Revolution (1966–76), when Communist rhetoric labelled the former foreign concessions “not only as the breeding ground for foreign imperialist’s running dogs and slaves but also as hiding places for displaced Qing nobles, warlords, and bureaucrats in their conspiracy to divide and control China” (Yang 1994, 39–40; translated in Hong 2018, 78).
Figs. 78a,b  Photographs taken by Michael Falser in Tianjin in December 2018 in the former Austro-Hungarian concession: Above: A view from the north-west of the former ‘Chinese’ side across the river towards the former Austro-Hungarian concession: the surviving ‘Austrian Bridge’ stands in the middle ground and the concession itself in the background to the left-hand side. Below: A view across the ‘Austrian Bridge’ towards the former Austro-Hungarian concession; its former, white consulate building is in the background to the right-hand side.

[Michael Falser, 2018]
Figs. 79a-c Photographs taken by Michael Falser in Tianjin in December 2018 in the former Austro-Hungarian concession:

79a: The newly reconstructed ‘Austrian church’ in the former Austro-Hungarian concession, together with a new monument in old European style commemorating the “1948 Beijing & Tianjin Liberation Battle”, as the attached plate puts it; 79b: A recent view across the Salzach River in the Austrian city of Salzburg showing a suspension bridge and the Protestant Church on the right-hand side; 79c: The Protestant Church in the Austrian city of Salzburg

[Michael Falser 2018, 2020].
tion of a new, massive Austrian Style Riverfront where once only a few, small-scaled ‘original’ structures of the short-lived Austro-Hungarian concession stood, along the Hai River.

Yet how should we approach the former Austro-Hungarian concession today in the absence of any detailed plan of the overall area? While acknowledging that further architectural studies should be initiated as a next step, similarly to those already underway for the British and French concessions, I propose to conclude this chapter with a snapshot of the current situation. To this end, I decided to use photographs taken during my short visit of the site in late 2018 — one hundred years after the concession’s dissolution in 1917 in the context of World War I — and set them in direct relation to the above-mentioned rediscovered primary source, namely, the c.1911-report with its map and 115 black-and-white photograph illustrations.

Thus, during a sunny early-December day of 2018, my tour started on the former ‘Chinese side’ of the Hai River looking south-east towards the former Austro-Hungarian concession (Fig. 78a): in the foreground, a new four-lane highway, in the middle ground the old ‘Austrian bridge’ of 1905, converted from a swing bridge (see Appendix III. 13, 92) into a structure on fixed pylons. In 2018, the background was a disturbing mix of recent megalomaniac in-style building blocks along the waterfront (see Appendix III. 86, 87) and skyscrapers on the far horizon. Walking closer to the bridge (Fig. 78b), one could see the former consulate building being dwarfed by giant apartment high-rises in the background.

On the left-hand side, adjoining to a brand new, supposedly in-style quotation of a church building (Fig. 79a). Only detailed research in Austria brought the ‘authentic’ source to light: combined with an iron suspension bridge over the local river, the historicist brick building of the Protestant Christ-Church in Salzburg, built in 1863–67 (Figs. 79b,c), served as an artistically much more elaborate model for this scale-distorted and detail-flattened reconstruction in the 2000s, the Chinese authorship of which could not be identified yet for this research.

But this is not yet the full story: some commemorative value has been added to this artificial, old-new bridge-church ensemble, in order to transform it into a Chinese lieu de mémoire (after Pierre Nora). A new signpost, on a totally new square with a surprisingly conventional triumphal monument in old European style in front of the faked Austrian church, refers to its concession-era construction, but also as a spot where military forces of the PLA (People’s Liberation Army of the later Communist Party) supposedly joined in the context of the “1948 Beijing & Tianjin Liberation Battle”. It concludes thus: “Jintang Bridge is a symbol building of Tianjin liberation with double value of cultural relic and historical memory. In 1984, Jintang Bridge was ranked as Tianjin’s protected cultural relic and patriotism education base”.

From the bridge, a good perspective opens up towards the former consulate as a still white, but mutilated structure (Fig. 80a): its overall cubage and all its façades have been remodeled (see Appendix III. 3, 4), its original riverside-oriented main entry closed and over-mounted with a kitschy, larger-than-life relief of the Viennese Waltz-playing Johann Strauss (1825–1899) (Fig. 80b). As if this was not enough, the information plates at the new, square-side entrance of the building, which is today officially listed, are misleading as regards date and period, original position, and authenticity (Fig. 80c).

In the meantime, the consulate’s former secretariat building has vanished (see Appendix III. 5, 9) without any comment or indication on the small site map.

Continuing the photographic survey of 2018 into the former concession area along the former Baron Czikann Street, one passes the old brick entrance to the historical covered market (Fig. 81a); its overall silhouette, relief, glass-walled entry and surrounding urban setting (see Appendix III. 17) have been remodeled (or is it a totally new structure?). A good example of the gradual blurring of conceptual boundaries between authentic, original, transgenerational ‘historic monuments’ on the one side, and their prestige-and-image-oriented simulacra on the other,

---

136 One information board in misspelt French and English dates the period of existence of the “Original consulate of Austria-Hungary”: “August 1869 to September 1899” (it actually opened, as explained above, on 22 September 1905, and was sensu stricto in diplomatic operation until 14 August 1917, when the Chinese declared war to Austria-Hungary). A second plate in Chinese displays a site map of the original position, but conceals its originally twined configuration with a vanished secretariat building. Finally, a third board, with golden letters on a black background, classifies the “Former Austrian Consulate” at the level of “Important protection” within the “Historical and Stylistic Architecture of Tianjin” programme of the Tianjin Municipal People’s Government. Thus, it simulates the protection of a building, the originality and authenticity of which have de facto been lost to a considerable extent.
awaits us further down, where the new quote of a supposedly ‘historical’ gate leads to the “Wealth Mansions” (Fig. 81b), a nearby cluster of giant gated-community towers.

Walking on takes us to one of the many helpless scenarios where the quoting of old imperial European (this time not Austrian, but French) grandeur actually turns into abandoned postmodern assemblages of urban renaissance infills. The original Fountain of Apollo (c.1670) at the Versailles Castle near Paris has made its global journey as a replica not only to the 1992 Chimei Museum in China’s renegade Taiwan, or to the ‘Sky City’ development of suburban Hangzhou in 2007 (together with a replicated Eiffel Tower) but, also, as a rather low-quality replica, to Tianjin (Fig. 81c).

Figs. 80a-c Photographs taken by Michael Falser in Tianjin in December 2018 in the former Austro-Hungarian concession:
80a: The present condition of the former Austro-Hungarian consulate in Tientsin, seen from the still standing ‘Austrian Bridge’. 80b: A new decorative façade element on the western side of the former Austro-Hungarian consulate: a relief of Austria’s famous ‘Waltz King’ Johann Strauss (compare with Fig. 86b). 80c: A series of commemorative and explicatory signboards attached to the former Austro-Hungarian consulate.

[Michael Falser, 2018]
Figs. 81a-c Photographs taken by Michael Falser in Tianjin in December 2018 in the former Austro-Hungarian concession:

81a: The present condition of the market hall in the former Austro-Hungarian concession (compare with Fig. 56d). 81b: Historicised new entry gate to the ‘Wealth Mansions’ high-rise, somewhere inside the former Austro-Hungarian concession. 81c: An empty fountain with dull replicas of the famous Fountain of Apollo at the Versailles Castle near Paris.

[Michael Falser, 2018]
While open-access Internet platforms like Love-Pik circulate impressive aerial photographs (Fig. 82) with misleading headings such as “Old buildings in Tianjin concession area”, headlines like “Day trip to Tianjin is historical journey” in the Chinese newspaper China Daily in 2011 propagate this vista with the caption: “Austro-Hungarian architecture lines Tianjin’s Hai River” (Morgan 2011) (see the illustration in the Preface). When I took the same view in 2018 from a new bridge further down across the Hai River (in the meanwhile more skyscrapers were built in the far horizon), looking back towards the north-east along the former riverfront (the ‘Austrian bridge’ is visible on the far left-hand side), the giant in-style complex built in the post-2000 years became more visible (Fig. 83a). It is now part of a reinvented “former Habsburg quay, which today constitutes the new ‘Austrian Style Riverfront’” (Jovanovic 2020, 100) and possesses, it must be admitted here, the undeniable qualities of an open, car-free, pedestrian-friendly space of urban renaissance (Fig. 83b). However, a close-up inspection only reveals a sad series of late Habsburg-styled quotations from Vienna’s Gründerzeit buildings both before and after 1900 (Fig. 83c).
Figs. 83a-c  Photographs taken by Michael Falser in Tianjin in December 2018 in the former Austro-Hungarian concession:

83a: A view from the bridge in the south-west towards the former Austro-Hungarian concession. 83b, c: Views along the newly created ‘Austrian Style Riverfront’ (above), and newly ‘Habsburg-styled’ buildings (below)

[Michael Falser, 2018]
However, while on the path along the riverfront towards the north, another ‘historical’ ensemble comes into view: if we compare my photographic view across the river (see Fig. 83a) with an undated photography of the same view, probably taken around 1920 (Fig. 84a), the first, more imposing house to the right is a currently publicised highlight (Fig. 84b): golden letters on a historical information board (most probably itself dating from a city government historic preservation project from the early 2000s) announce that it was “The Former Residence of Mr Yuan”, currently graded as “Very Important Protection” (Fig. 84c). At this point of playing a cat-and-mouse game with Tianjin’s concession history and the reinvented legacy of the great Chinese moderniser Yuan Shikai in the name of the city’s ‘inter-national’ and cosmopolitan flair (see above), we realise that authentic sites, wishful reconstructions, or even complete inventions overlap and even contradict each other (cf. Hong 2019). What a US-American scholar in the early 1980s photographed and interpreted as a “baroque Salzburg”-styled mansion (which at that time was “used for the Mu An Middle School”, see Western 1985, 342) was described as “designed by British and German architects for Yuan Shikai in 1908 in the British Queen Anne Style [and] listed as a historical building in 1985 by the Tientsin Municipal Government” according to a Chinese PhD thesis in the mid-1990s (Fang 1995, 161–3). Until today (Nield 2015) the building has been advertised in local and international city guides as a highlight under the name: “Yuan Shikai House” (Lu & Mengin 2020). However, having found neither any historical photographs nor any written evidence from the Austro-Hungarian concession era for the present research, I would argue that the proposed construction date of 1908 sounds rather unlikely.

Moreover, W.U. Yanlong’s publication *A panorama of the historic architecture in Tianjin* (2007) tells yet another story. This time, the myth of ‘Yuan Shikai living in the villa’ has been changed into “Former residence of the Yuan Family” (in the entry heading) but re-introduced through the backdoor in the descriptive text: “The Former Residence of Yuan Shikai [sic] was built in 1918 [when he had already been dead for two full years, MF] under the supervision of Yuan Naikuan, nephew of Yuan Shikai, […] a supporter for his uncle to restore the monarchy, served once as Minister of Agriculture and Commerce [and] moved to Tianjin after his retirement” (Wu 2007, 215). But even this construction date sounds too early when considering that such a prominent house was not even mentioned in Rasmussen’s famous *Illustrated History of Tientsin* of 1925.139

It is more likely that the building, with its decidedly neo-Renaissance (and not “British Queen Anne”) style — somewhere between a south German (cf. Heidelberg’s Renaissance structures) and north German Weser-Renaissance or Dutch inspiration — was bought as a to-be-developed lot in the mid-1910s by Yuan Ski Kai, but only built on towards the very end of, or shortly after World War I, when the Austrians had already left and the Dutch supervised the former Austro-Hungarian concession. One possible architect for the project may have been the Austrian Siegfried Scheyer who, according to a short obituary in the *Ostasiatische Rundschau* [East Asian Review] of 1 June 1930, was “a well-known Austrian architect and builder, who in the years between 1914 and 1919 made a name for himself while building places for Chinese dignitaries in the Austrian concession”.140

---

137 I would like to thank Maurizio Marinelli for this shared information about the project. Unfortunately, my own research could not discover any original material about the context, agency and date of this initiative.


139 However, he did mention Tientsin’s former Y.M.C.A. building on the west side of Taku Road as being “occupied for many years by the Yuan Shi-Kai family and then known as ‘Yuan Kung Kwan’” (Rasmussen 1925, 253).

140 “Siegfried Scheyer”, in: Ostasiatische Rundschau, 11th year, No. 11 (1 June 1930), 368.
Figs. 84a-c Photographs taken by Michael Falser in Tianjin in December 2018 in the former Austro-Hungarian concession:

84a: Historical photograph (most probably around 1920) of the ‘Yuan Shikai Villa’, as it is called today (photographed inside the building in December 2018). 84b: “The former residence of Mr. Yuan” as it stands today, introduced by official signboards erected by the Tianjin Municipal People’s Government. 84c: Official signboard introducing visitors to the so-called “former residence of Mr. Yuan”, today a listed building graded “Very important protection”.

[Michael Falser, 2018]
Figs. 85a,b Photographs taken by Michael Falser in Tianjin in December 2018 in the former Austro-Hungarian concession:

85a: Opposite the so-called “former residence of Mr. Yuan”: the so-called “Feng Guo Zhang Residence”, also graded “Very important protection”. 85b: A third, totally new ‘historical building’ neighbouring the so-called “former residence of Mr. Yuan”.

[Michael Falser, 2018]
Seen from an overall standpoint, the “Regulations to Protect Tianjin’s Historical Architecture” (fostered by the state and municipality, and promulgated in 2005 by the city’s People Congress), the repeated but unsuccessful efforts to catapult parts of the concessions onto the UNESCO World Heritage List (Debelle & Lu 2014), or even the recent preservation strategies aided by experts (compare Nobuo & Xu 2010 and Du 2010 with Tse-Kang & Rung-Yi 2017) have all become part and parcel of the effort to turn Tianjin’s concession legacy into a veritable ‘heritage theme park’ (a term which I use after Lowenthal 2002) — a fussy mix of over-restored or heavily beautified ‘original’ buildings and façade-simulating replicas. The former Austro-Hungarian concession is not exempt from this. While in front of the so-called ‘Yuan Shikai House’, the so-called ‘Feng Guo Zhang Residence’ (Fig. 85a) — equally graded “Very Important Protection” — may still contain some historical core structure behind its recent ‘enhancement’ through a superimposed skin of falsified brick façade, the neighbouring building — with its entrance featuring golden pillars and Chinese lions — is pure historical fake, thus impairing the authentic value of its prominent next-door neighbour: the potentially real ‘historical’ building of the ‘Yuan Shikai House’, even if it may not date from the Austro-Hungarian concession era itself (Fig. 85b).

The story is not over yet. If we continue walking towards the south along the new ‘Austrian Style Riverfront’, giant sight fences with colourful renderings of an imaginary aerial perspective (cf. Fig. 5a) announce a new megalomaniac development project (Fig. 86a). At the southern tip of the concession, towards the historical border with the former Italian concession, we reach the culmination point of what I called a veritable world’s fair or heritage theme park atmosphere. If in the past two decades historical concessions such as those in Tianjin or Shanghai — with their still standing, restored, and enhanced architectural legacy — have become “in a sense ‘lifestyle showcases’ of their respective national identi-
Fig. 86a, b Photographs taken by Michael Falser in Tianjin in December 2018 in the former Austro-Hungarian concession.

86a: Signboard on the giant sight fences of a new vast complex at the southern tip of the former Austro-Hungarian concession (see previous page).

86b: A cultural heritage theme park in the newly staged contact zone of two former concessions (Austria-Hungary and Italy) in Tientsin: in front, a copy of a statue of Austria’s Waltz King, Johann Strauss (compare with Fig. 80b); in the background, the newly built “Drum Tower in Italian-style town” (in the words of a tourist brochure for Tianjin) as a ‘Giotto’s Florentine campanile-like stage set’ and new landmark.

[Michael Falser, 2018]
ties” for the national and local Chinese tourism-cum-heritage industry (Marinelli 2010a), then this photographic survey of 2018 culminated in a truly global simulacrum devoid of all historical authenticity. Under exclusively Chinese agency, the cultural heritage stereotypes of Tientsin’s two neighbouring former concessions is now artificially brought back together into one visual contact zone (Fig. 86b): in front of ‘Giotto’s Florentine campanile-like stage set’ and invented new landmark — named “Drum Tower in Italian-style Town” in the glossy Tianjin Guide (Tianjin Guide 2018, 33) welcoming visitors to China’s ‘Little Italy’ — Austria’s prime musical heritage figure, Johann Strauss (cf. Fig. 80b) played his Viennese waltz in the setting sun of a clear and cold December day in 2018 when I took these photographs. One hundred years after the Austro-Hungarian concession in Tientsin was handed back to China, its reinvented riverfront in today’s Tianjin had become a veritable “Fauxstria”\(^\text{142}\) (Jovanovic 2017/2020).

\(^\text{142}\) “At first, this production of ‘Fauxstria’ [faux in French for ‘faked/false’ in English] appears to have an anti-colonial tint, as the marketing of ‘Europe’ for middle-class Chinese consumers provincializes the architectural legacy of former colonial powers. Yet, its very production embodies the logic of imperialist capitalism which binds distant sites of dispossession for the purposes of profit” (Jovanovic 2017, 4).
However, it would also be too easy to point an all-too critical European finger at China’s — and Tianjin’s — recent heritage turn: in a globally entangled and transcultural reciprocity to the city’s re-invented past as an international concession, comparable processes have also been taking place in former ‘imperialist motherlands’ like Italy and Austria. If, in colonial times, concessions were rightly regarded as “miniatures, with modifications, of the countries they represent” (see my opening quotation from the book by Mrs Burton St. John, *The China Times Guide to Tientsin and Neighbourhood*, 1908), the same holds true for the European heritage industry’s tendency to over-commodify their national and cultural capitals today.

In Europe, too, local administrations are trying hard to cater for picture-perfect and camera-ready scenarios of old imperial grandeur for an ever increasing volume of cultural tourism, such as from East Asia. In this sense, *Habsburgs going global* is not only alive and well in Tianjin, but also in my home town: Vienna (Fig. 87).

5. Conclusions

A theme running through my chapter has been that of paradoxical constellations.

On the one hand, a veritable boom in scientific interest for the history of treaty port concessions in China (which lasted from the 1860s to the 1940s) could be detected. This interest does not only concern research in the political, diplomatic, and (‘world trade’-related) economic networks of international collaboration, but also in the logistics, techniques, and instruments that were required to plan, implement, and control the infrastructural, urban, and architectural development of concession systems. All these aspects together, in their micro set-up in concessions around 1900, are often viewed as important founding factors of those entangled processes spanning the world that since the symbolic threshold of 2000 have often been summed up as ‘globalisation’.

While mapping out the current status of knowledge about the history and physical afterlife of Tianjin, China’s most relevant concession (which assembléd nine foreign nations from all over the globe, from Japan and Russia to Europe and the USA), this publication has uncovered a seemingly paradoxical transformative moment: a shift from *Tientsin’s contested history to Tianjin’s glorious heritage*. Although Chinese historians continue to take an active part in investigating this foreign-ruled chapter in their ‘own’ country’s recent past, inventive municipal politicians and developers are trying hard to reformulate Tianjin’s concession legacy, namely, pan-imperialistic aggression and humiliating exploitation, into a positive, ‘to-be-inherited-and-to-be-continued’ success story of modernisation, cosmopolitanism, international cooperation and, even, multilateral friendship. This re-invention of a once contested past thus fits in with Tianjin’s self-branding ambitions of the present as a global city for the future.

In this great reworking of history, the urban and architectural fabric of the once most impactful concessions of France, Great Britain, and Italy is gradually being turned into a cultural heritage hybrid of restored original monuments, in-style reconstructed façades, and reinvented urban spaces. With the fabric being ‘themed’ after, or even enhanced with the enduring cultural stereotypes of these former international powers, the overall result may be characterised as a *global theme park atmosphere*.

On the other hand, one small element — the concession of Austria-Hungary — had, so far, been left out of this dual process. What I called here a process from *Tientsin’s history to Tianjin’s heritage* was structured in a two-fold inquiry: a) this chapter provided for the first time in scientific research the much-desired missing puzzle piece in the short urban architectonic history of the Austro-Hungarian concession between 1901 and 1917 in Tientsin; and b) it situates its historical fabric within the current ‘heritagisation’ of the Chinese economic boom city ‘global Tianjin’.

For the first working step, a coherent set of sources from Austrian libraries and archives, both written (published and unpublished) and visual (cartographic and photographic) was evaluated to contextualise the different factors of the ambivalent Austro-Hungarian concession project: its political circumstances on the ground (from military occupation and unequal contract in 1901–02 to surrender and handover in 1917); its ambivalent press coverage back home (from great fanfare to cartoonish critique) compared to eye-witness reports from Hungarian and Austrian visitors to the concession; its main Austro-Hungarian actors (from honourable consuls to dubious contractors and tragically absent local investors) and their local counterparts (from visiting General Governor Yuan Shikai in his imperial grandeur to some 30,000 resisting Chinese
residents); its logistical challenges (from peripheral river quay consolidations to the unpopular relocation of 7000 graves out of the core zone); and, finally, its institutional/legal set-up (from statutes of a construction company to local taxation and even violent expropriation).

Above all, for the first time, so far unknown ‘spectacular’ primary — visual — sources were introduced, depicted and discussed. In addition to many new maps, plans and photographs that I found as attachments to the many letters between actors in the Tientsin concession, the Austro-Hungarian legation in Beijing, and the European capitals of Vienna and Budapest, the most important finding was certainly a c.1911 bound album of 115 black-and-white photographs together with a fifteen-page typewritten description and a site plan: the Appendix contains the first full length publication of this album, presented with its original German legends and my English translations. The entire set of visual material — almost 250 illustrations in my chapter alone — was used as a guide to re-contextualise the developmental stages of the Austro-Hungarian concession from its beginning to its end: from establishing the first and most important architectural markers of diplomatic presence (the consulate buildings) and of an ‘engineered’ civilising mission (the new ‘Austrian’ iron swing bridge, de facto party borrowed from a third party) to greater urban planning efforts (establishing a new ‘rational’ texture over the pre-existing local Chinese lane system, connecting the concessions to the cross-concession system of water supply, electricity, and public tramway).

However, the photographs not only documented the completed few buildings and urban grid of five-by-five streets; they revealed, right ‘behind the few shining façades’ of the concession, a rather disturbing reality: one of relocated Chinese graves, several expropriated and abandoned buildings, empty plots owing to the lack of (inter-)national investors, social segregation and, worst of all, dirty backstreets where local Chinese inhabitants stand around giant pools of waste water, helpless during the flooding catastrophe brought about by a typhoon on 30th August 1911 — clearly, an effective drainage system was never successfully installed. These unique visual documents created around 1911 reveal that the Austro-Hungarian concession, as part of the ‘inter-national’ set-up in Tientsin, must be evaluated from an overall historical perspective as a project of imperialistic hubris, commercial disinterest and as a political failure.

From a broader conceptual viewpoint, this finding enables us to tweak the all too easily appropriated master narrative — historically as well as currently — about a once successful international concession network in Tientsin and its enduring legacy of a once powerful laboratory for a promising future. In a more nuanced reading of the facts, neither did Tientsin in the concession era exclusively set new standards through “enforced modernisation” (as Austria-Hungary’s Consul for Tientsin, Hugo Schumpeter claimed in 1915) or lead to “hygienic modernity” or even to a “revolution” (as current research is framing it, cf. Rogaski 2000 and 2004 with Singaravelou 2019). Nor should Tientsin’s history as a concession be allowed to be easily exploited and overvalued as a supporting element for Tianjin’s (and China’s) over-ambitiously staged path into global modernity today.

It is this last facet of the gradual appropriation of Tientsin’s history after 1900 as Tianjin’s heritage after 2000 that stood at the centre of the second part of this contribution. The Tientsin-Tianjin nexus was contextualised within China’s astonishing transformation from a (late) Maoist socialist ideology (until the 1990s) that downgraded previous international concessions like Shanghai or Tientsin as sites of imperialistic exploitation and national humiliation to a market-oriented ideology that upgraded these concessions, now in the context of almost capitalist planning schemes (in the 2000s), to the status of once innovative test sites of a global modernity through international cooperation and friendship.

In this context, Tientsin’s past as a concession was rediscovered as a ‘to-be-inherited-and-continued’ legacy of cosmopolitanism by inventive municipal administrators and developers of the current Tianjin megacity of some fifteen million people — with its outspoken ambition of global outreach. Under the new ‘cultural heritage regime’, diverse former concession areas are now being systematically ‘re-discovered, re-activated and re-presented’ as sites of progress: well-researched case studies of this process already cover the former British, French and Italian concessions. However, the current fate of Italy’s former neighbour, Austria-Hungary’s concession, has not been covered thoroughly yet by the expanding field of cultural heritage studies.

Given that such a scientific lacuna is due to the above-mentioned lack of historical data, the present publication made use of a rediscovered set of visual primary sources (a plan, description, and 115 photographs of the Austro-Hungarian concession from
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c. 1911) as a comparative backdrop and guide for my photographic survey in the spot in 2018 — some hundred years after the concession was handed back to China. What was mapped out for the first time on the basis of this visual evidence and comparison can be summarised as a mixture of conservation, restoration, reconstruction, and reinvention of Austria-Hungary’s urban and architectural legacy.

Physical mementos span a wide range: from partly restored/enhanced original fabric and/or partially remodelled in-style additions à l’Autrichienne (the ‘Austrian Bridge’ and the former consulate building) to mock-up façades with old-style commemorative garnish (a recent flat replica of a whole Protestant church from Salzburg, Austria next to a new memorial to the glorious 1948 Communist Liberation). This small ‘original ensemble’ is today accompanied by a scenario involving a newly reinvented ‘Austrian Style Riverfront’, which is framed by flat in-style series of giant bank and office buildings.

As a focus point in this stage set of urban renaissance, the ambivalent person of the military governor and transient emperor Yuan Shikai is currently being reinvented as a cultural broker. This is happening not only in a ‘historical’ sense, whereby he is portrayed as an ‘inter-national’ mediator between the Concession Powers and China, and a national reformer towards future development and modernisation. His enduring presence on-site seems to require some ‘physical’ proof as well: the so-called Yuan Shikai Residence (most probably built several years after his death in 1916) has been staged in the style of a house museum next to other ‘prominent’ neighbours.

Further south, the photographic tour in 2018 culminated at the old trans-imperial contact zone between Austria-Hungary and Italy. This spot has been commodified through recent Chinese agency and for a primarily Chinese tourist industry into a global theme park of cultural heritage stereotypes imported from Florence and Vienna. In a transcultural sense, Habsburgs going global has come full circle in the name of the Austro-Hungarian concession: from an ambivalent history caught between national disinterest and local failure between 1902 and 1917 to an ambivalent heritage of close-to-fake one hundred years later.
Appendix

Photographic Album “Austro-Hungarian Concession, Tientsin” (c.1911), with original typescript description in German and translated in English
Erklärung und Beschreibung der einzelnen Aufnahmen.

I. Quaisstrasse nördlich der Drehbrücke.

(Bild 1 - 12 inkl.)

Wenn wir von der Hauptstrasse der Niederlassung kommend links auf die Quaisstrasse abbiegen, so erblicken wir zuerst die Quaisstrasse entlang schauend, auf die Hauptstrasse nach Nebenstraßen der brachliegenden Bebauung in Bewegung befindliche Fahrzeuge aus südlicher Richtung.

Bild 1: Die Straßenfront der Quaisstrasse mit den Häusern der Firma G. Taussig und der belgischen Tramwaygesellschaft im Hintergrund rechts; auf.

Bild 5: das Konsulatsneubaugebäude und das Haus der Firma G. Taussig.

Bild 5 & 4: das Konsulatsgebäude.

Bild 6: das Konsulatsneubaugebäude.

Bild 7: das Haus der Firma G. Taussig.

Bild 8 & 9: das Konsulatsneubaugebäude rechts das Administrationsgebäude der Tramwaygesellschaft.

Bild 8 & 9: gleichermaßen das letztere.

Bild 10: Eingang zum Grundstück der Baufirm Johann Brunner.

Die folgenden 5 Bilder zeigen die Quaisstrasse südlich der Drehbrücke von dem gegenüber liegenden Ufer aus aufgenommen und zwar zeigt:

Bild 10: die beiden Konsulatsgebäude und das Haus der Firma Taussig;

Bild 11: in der Reihefolge gegen rechts zu das Konsulatsneubaugebäude, das Haus der Firma Taussig und das Administrationsgebäude der Tramwaygesellschaft;

Bild 12: schließlich wieder das Haus Taussig und das der Tramwaygesellschaft.

II. Hauptstrasse der Niederlassung und sonstige Häuser der Hotungbaugesellschaft. (Bild 13 - 42 inkl.)
Erklärung und Beschreibung der einzelnen Aufnahmen

Explanation and description of the individual photographs

I. Quaistraße nördlich der Drehbrücke (Bilder 1–12 inkl.)
Quay Street to the north of the swing bridge (Illustrations 1–12)

Wenn wir von der Hauptstraße der Niederlassung kommend links auf die Quaistraße abbiegen, so erblicken wir zuerst die Quaistraße entlang schauend, auf

Coming from the main street of the concession and turning left onto Quay Street, we can see, looking down Quay Street,

Bild 1 die Straßenfront der Quai-
straße mit den Häusern der Firma G.
Taussig und der belgischen Tramway-
gesellschaft im Hintergrunde rechts; auf
Illustration 1 the frontage of Quay Street, with the buildings of the G. Taussig Company and the Belgian Tramway Company in the background to the right,

Bild 2 das Konsulatsanegebäude
und das Haus der Firma G. Taussig.
Illustration 2 the Consulate annexe building and the G. Taussig Company building.
Illustations 3 & 4
the Consulate building
Bild 5 das Konsulatsnebengebäude

Illustration 5 the Consulate annexe building

Bild 6 das Haus der Firma G. Taussig

Illustration 6 the G. Taussig Company building
Bild 7 links dasselbe, rechts das Administrationsgebäude der Tramwaygesellschaft

Illustration 7 to the left side, the same as before; to the right side, the Tramway Company’s office building

Bild 8 gleichfalls das letztere

Illustration 8 likewise, the latter
Die folgenden 3 Bilder zeigen die Quaistraße südlich der Drehbrücke von dem gegenüber liegenden chinesischen Ufer aus aufgenommen und zwar zeigt

The following three illustrations show Quay Street to the south of the swing bridge, photographed from the Chinese riverbank opposite, and depict
Bild 11 in der Reihenfolge gegen rechts zu: das Konsulatsnebengebäude, das Haus der Firma Taussig und das Administrationgebäude der Tramwaygesellschaft;

Illustration 11 from left to right in the following order: the Consulate annexe building, the Taussig Company building and the Tramway Company's office building;

Bild 12 schließlich wieder das Haus Taussig und das der Tramwaygesellschaft.

Illustration 12 and finally, once again, the Taussig and Tramway Company buildings.
II. Hauptstraße der Niederlassung und sonstige Häuser der Hotungbaugesellschaft
(Bild 13–42 inkl.)
Main street of the concession and other houses of the Hotung Construction Company [Hotung Baugesellschaft, or H.B.G.] (Illustrations 13–42)

Bild 13–36 inkl. zeigen die Häuser der Hauptstraße unserer Niederlassung, wenn man aus der Chinesenstadt über die Drehbrücke kommend durch die Hauptstraße unserer Niederlassung gegen die italienische Konzession zu fortschreitet.

Illustrations 13 to 36 show the houses along the main street of our concession, if we walk from the Chinese City over the swing bridge and down the main street of our concession towards the Italian concession.

Illustration 13 shows the main street viewed from the middle of the swing bridge; in the top right corner, we can see the turret of the Consulate building.

Illustration 14 shows the main street after crossing the swing bridge; to the left is the Market Hall of the Hotung Construction Company, to the right we can see the wall of the Consulate’s garden.
Bild 15 zeigt die entgegengesetzte Seite aus gleicher Position mit Ausblick gegen die Drehbrücke und dem chinesischen Polizeitaotai Yamen im Hintergrunde.

Illustration 15 shows the opposite side from the same location, facing the swing bridge and looking out to the Chinese Police Taotai Yamen in the background.
Illustration 16 depicts the first of the houses of the Hotung Construction Company to the right-hand side when passing the Consulate Garden; on the ground floor there is a Chinese watchmaker, on the first floor there is the executive office of the Hotung Construction Company. The adjacent house to the right, there is a first-class Chinese hotel, also belonging to the Hotung Construction Company.

Illustrations 17 & 18 show the first building to the left along the main street when passing the so-called Marine Property (which also belongs to the concession), and the main entry to the Chinese Market Hall, which in Illustration 108 is viewed in its entirety from the Chinese riverbank opposite. Next to the Market Hall, we find a large Chinese pharmacy, I Shan Tang, depicted on the following photograph.
Illustration 19  On the first floor of the building housing the Chinese pharmacy, there are storage facilities of a Chinese pawnshop.
Illustration 20  Continuing our walk, we reach the bend in the main street already visible in Illustration 14.
Bild 21  Hier erblicken das linke Eckhaus der zur Linken der Hauptstraße einmündenden Yamenstraße; in dem betreffenden Hause ist im ersten Stockwerk ein kleines Teehaus, zu ebener Erde ein Wasserverkäuferladen untergebracht.

Illustration 21  Here we see the left-hand corner building of Yamen Street, which joins the main street on its left side; in this building, there is a small teahouse on the first floor, and a water seller shop on the ground floor.
Illustration 22 shows a complete view of Yamen Street from the vantage point of the main street. To the right of the street we can see three one-storey houses, whose building types are almost always those of structures not on the main street owned by the Hotung Construction Company. In the middle of the background one can see the concession’s Municipal Building, formerly a Chinese temple, which was adopted for this purpose.

Illustration 23 depicts the main street after passing the bend shown in Illustration 20. On the right edge of the photograph, we can see a Chinese residential property that was built by the Hotang Construction Company only last summer; as an unornamented, sober structure, it only has windows on the first floor. In the background of the photograph, one can see the faint outlines of an habitation. It was built recently on the territory of the Italian concession, not far from its main street and at the same level. Here we can notice quite clearly the considerable difference in elevation between a long section of our main street and the Via Vittorio Emanuele in the Italian concession. The two interruptions in the alignment of houses to the right mark the positions of the Singsong Theatre and the large Chinese Theatre of the H.B.G. (see also Illustrations 26 & 29).
Before we pass the Singsong Theatre on the right, we will see a rather large Chinese cake shop to the left.
Illustration 25  A little bit further up, also to the left, we can see a small restaurant. On these sections of the main street the building condition of houses starts to deteriorate.
Dem eben erwähnten Restaurant gegenüber liegt auf der rechten Straßenseite das chinesische Singsongtheater der H.B.G.

**Illustration 26** On the opposite side of the aforementioned restaurant, thus on the right-hand side, is the H.B.G.’s Chinese Sing-song Theatre.

Weiter fortschreitend erblicken wir links ein Gebäude mit Billardzimmern und Kegelbahn zu ebener Erde, welches nach mehrmonatigem Stillstand vor kurzem wieder eröffnet wurde. Der Besuch ist ein schwacher.

**Illustration 27** Walking further down, on the left-hand side we catch sight of a building with billiard rooms and a bowling alley at ground floor level. After being shut for several months, it reopened recently. The number of visitors is low.
Adjacent to this building is a large Chinese restaurant, seen here in full frontal view. It has been closed for more than a year and seems difficult to lease.

Opposite this restaurant is the large Chinese theatre of the H.B.G., which was closed for a major part of the last [and] this season.

Illustration 30 depicts a view towards the Italian concession, similar to Illustration 23, after walking past the large theatre. The newly built house on the Italian main street in the centre of the background seems to be much closer now. On the left edge of the aforementioned photograph there is a type of housing that dominates this last section of the main street — in Illustration 31 this is in the foreground. All houses of this type only possess a narrow walkway, have been built in an irrational manner and, to a large extent, are in a severely damaged condition.
Illustration 31  On this picture, this state of affairs is even clearly visible on the photographic reproduction. The house on Illustration 31 contains a barber-shop on the ground floor and a small third-class restaurant on the first floor.

Illustration 32  shows the main street of the concession looking back from a point not far from the Italian border. On this photograph, the aforesaid type of housing, with its strongly projecting front section and narrow walkway, is clearly visible. Business premises on the ground floors of these types of housing are very difficult to lease and have stood empty for a long time.
Bild 33 zeigt einen Ausblick vom Ende unserer Hauptstraße gegen die Via Vittorio Emanuele zu; zur Linken ist das neue italienische Konsulatsgebäude, zur Rechten ein vor kurzem errichtetes Privathaus ersichtlich; der übrige Teil der italienischen Hauptstraße ist zum großen Teil noch unbaut; die angrenzenden Terrains sind durchwegs bedeutend tiefer gelegen und müssen bei Aufführungen von Neubauten angeschüttet werden.

Illustration 33 depicts a panorama from the end of our main street towards the Via Vittorio Emanuele; to the left we can see the new Italian Consulate building, and to the right a recently built private property; to a large extent, the remaining section of the Italian main street is still undeveloped. The adjacent plots of land are altogether on considerably lower ground and need to be raised before new construction.

Bild 34 das linke Eckhaus der Haupttrasse an der italienischen Grenze derzeit von Herrn Accurti bewohnt.

Illustration 34
The left-hand corner building on the main street at the Italian border is currently occupied by Mr. Accurti.
Illustration 35 depicts a European residential property on the opposite side of the street. The land on the left side of the photograph, which lies at a lower level, is already part of the Italian possession. At this point, a culvert runs northwards under the main street towards the opposite side and the disputed land in our concession. This culvert drains much of the rainwater away from the lower sections of the Italian concession towards the disputed land in our concession (see also Illustration 36).
Bild 36 zeigt die Rückseite des auf Bild 34 ersichtlichen Wohnhauses; zur Rechten des Bildes befindet sich ein bedeutend tiefer gelegenes Kohlengeschäft unserer Niederlassung. Die italienische Grenze verläuft etwas links der Mitte dieses Bildes.

Illustration 36 shows the rear of the residential property pictured in Illustration 34. On the right side of the picture, there is a coal merchant at a considerably lower ground level in our concession. The Italian boundary runs somewhat to the left of the centre of this photograph.

Bild 37 zeigt die Häusertypen der in einer Nebenstraße befindlichen chinesischen Wohnhäuser der H.B.G.

Illustration 37 shows the types of housing featured by H.B.G. Chinese residential properties along a secondary road.
Bild 38 zeigt das Parallelgässchen zur Hauptstraße hinter dem großen chinesischen Theater der H.B.G.

*Illustration 38* depicts a small alley running parallel to the main street behind the large Chinese theatre of the H.B.G.

Bild 39 eines der besser gebauten chinesischen Hotels der H.B.G.

*Illustration 39* shows one of the Chinese hotels built by the H.B.G. to a higher standard.
Illustration 40 depicts the third (and last) European-built residential structure of the H.B.G. It is currently occupied by a Chinese comprador working for a rather large Tientsin firm.

Illustrations 41 & 42 show two of the H.B.G.’s Chinese brothels; to a large extent, they are in a more or less neglected state.
III.  Sonstige Niederlassung und Sammelbassin (Bilder 43–67)

Other parts of the concession and the reservoir (Illustrations 43–67)


Coming down the northern end of the Riverside Road, we turn first into Hsin Lung Chie, the Chinese road that, running parallel to the main street, handles most of the heavy goods through traffic.

Bild 43 zeigt den Eingang dieser Straße von der Uferstraße aus gesehen, zur Rechten und zur Linken Bamboo warengeschäfte, welche zum großen Teil landwirtschaftliche Geräte verkaufen.

Illustration 43 shows the entrance to this road, seen from the Riverside Road, with bamboo products stores to the left and right that mostly sell agricultural equipment.
Bild 44 zeigt dieselbe Straße im Rückblick gegen die Uferstraße in der Höhe der Kreuzung der Hsin Ling Chie mit der Yamenstraße; auf der rechten Straßenseite erblickt man das Geschäftsabzeichen des zweitgrößten Pfandgeschäftes unserer Niederlassung.

Illustration 44 depicts the same street looking back towards Riverside Road at the level of the junction between Hsin Ling Chie and Yamen Road; on the right-hand side one can see the business sign of the second-largest pawnshop in our concession.
Bild 45 zeigt gleichfalls die Hsin Lung Chie nach Kreuzung der Yamen-Straße; die Unterbrechung zur Rechten der Häuserfront bezeichnet einen Herrn Emil S. Fischer gehörenden Bauplatz, welcher von dem Genannten nach dem Brande angekauft wurde und seit nahezu drei Jahren brach liegt, ohne das geringste Steuerertrags abzuwerfen.

Illustration 45 also shows Hsin Lung Chie after the Yamen Street junction; the interruption to the right of the row of houses has to do with a plot bought by Mr Emil S. Fischer after a fire that has been lying idle for almost three years without raising any tax revenue.
Bild 46 zeigt die verlängerte Hsin Lung Chie, welche im letzten Semester zwecks möglichster Entlastung der Hauptstraße von schwerem Fuhrwerkverkehr bis zur italienischen Grenze weiter ausgebaut wurde, so daß die Hauptstraße der Niederlassung nunmehr in ihrer ganzen Länge von Lastenverkehr unberührt bleiben kann.

Illustration 46 shows the extended Hsin Lung Chie road, which was further developed last summer up to the Italian boundary in order to relieve the main street from heavy horse-drawn vehicles as much as possible, so that the concession’s main street will be undisturbed by heavy goods traffic along its entire length at last.
Bild 47 zeigt das Munizipalitätsgebäude der Niederlassung mit einem Matteverbau (vide auch Bild 22).

Illustration 47 depicts the Municipal Building of the concession with a covering of mats (see also Illustration 22).

Bild 48 den Vorhof und das Mittelgebäude der Munizipalität, in welchem sich die Dienstwohnungen des chinesischen Polizeiwachtmasters und der Unteroffiziere befinden sowie die gemeinsamen Waschräume der Polizeimannschaften. Das Hintergebäude, welches in ungefähr den gleichen Dimensionen aufgeführt ist und in welchem sich die Depoträumlichkeiten befinden für die Polizeiuniformen und Dienerwohnungen, ist nicht sichtbar.

Illustration 48 Here one can see the front yard and the intermediate structure of the Municipal Building in which the Chinese police constables and sergeants have their official lodgings, as well as the shared washrooms of the police squads. The rear building, which has a comparable dimension and contains the police uniforms depot and the servant flats, is out of sight.
Illustration 49 depicts the rear of the main building, photographed from the staircase of the intermediate building (see Ill. 48).

Illustration 50 shows the fire hose of the Municipality. With the help of the Tientsin-based agent Fischer & Co., it was delivered by Czermak (a firm from Teplitz [Germany]) and mounted on a four-wheeled waggon in order to provide the stability that was previously lacking. This four-wheeled waggon was produced in the machine shop of the Tientsin-based firm Bourgery & Co. for 310 Tls.; the proposal by the firm Fischer & Co. to deliver such a waggon for 800 Tls. was turned down.
Bild 51 zeigt eine der größten, an der Yamenstraße gelegenen Färberieen unserer Niederlassung. Das betreffende Grundstück wurde seiner Zeit nach den Boxerunruhen als Marinekaserne des k.u.k. Detachments in Tientsin verwendet.

Illustration 51 depicts one of the concession’s largest dye works, based in Yamen Street. The plot concerned was used shortly after the Boxer Uprising for barracks to house marines of the k.u.k. detachment to Tientsin.

Bild 52 zeigt die Kanalstraße, eine südliche Parallelstraße zur Hauptstraße am Südende des ausgebauten Teiles der Uferstraße beginnend. Zur Linken des Bildes ist die Grenzmauer des der Firma Johann Brunner gehörigen Grundstückes ersichtlich. Im Hintergrunde erblicken wir in der Mitte das Gebäude der größten chinesischen Kaoliangspiritus Brennerei unserer Niederlassung.

Illustration 52 shows Canal Street, a street that runs parallel to the south side of the main street and begins at the southern end of the developed section of the Riverside Road. On the left side of the photograph one can see the boundary wall of a plot belonging to the Johann Brunner Company. At the centre of the background, we can spot the building of the largest Chinese Kaoliang distillery in our concession.
Bild 53 zeigt die Kanalstraße vom anderen Ende aus gesehen; zur Rechten erblicken wir den eben genannten Kaoliangspiritus Brennerei, zur Linken einen Teil des Maschinengebäudes der Pumpstation.

Illustration 53 depicts Canal Street seen from the other end; to the right, we can make out the aforementioned Kaoliang distillery, and to the left a section of the pumping station’s machinery building.

Bild 54 zeigt das im Süden der Hauptstraße gelegene Herrn Emil S. Fischer gehörende chinesische Theater, das dritte (!) große Theater der Niederlassung. Das Gebäude ist sehr primitiv und wenig feuersicher gebaut, und befindet sich außerdem im reparaturbedürftigen Zustande.

Illustration 54 shows the Chinese theatre of Mr Emil S. Fischer, situated to the south of the main street and the third (!) large theatre in the concession. The building is built in a very simple way and with very little attention to fireproofing; additionally it is in need of repair.
Diese und die nunmehr folgenden Bilder zeigen gleichzeitig das Sammelbassin unserer Niederlassung.

The following photographs show the reservoir in our concession.
Illustrations 57–59  show the reservoir facing west in the direction of the Peiho [River], photographed with medium and very low water levels. The last photograph clearly indicates the dimensions of the reservoir — those originally indicated (with a red marking line) in the concession secretariat’s report of 6 July 1906 (line 27) and what was later effectively excavated.

Bild 60 zeigt eine von Bild 58 weiter nach links gelegene Partie des Sammelbassins.

Illustration 60 shows a section of the reservoir that is situated further to the left in comparison to Illustration 58.

Bild 61 zeigt eine Partie des Sammelbassins gegen Osten in der Richtung der italienischen Grenze; bei niedrigem Wasserstande aufgenommen.

Illustration 61 shows a section of the reservoir facing east towards the Italian boundary, photographed at low water level.
Illustration 62 depicts approximately the same section at high water level on 30 August of this year. The past water level in Illustrations 57 to 59 is indicated by a dashed line. Clearly, we can gather from this how little the present system is able to prevent flooding triggered by extraordinary strong rainfall. The issue of the improvement of the present drainage system was discussed extensively in our report of 9 October 1911 (line 1937) for the k.u.k. Legation in Beijing. We need only mention here that the flooding of the old cemetery happened in a matter of hours, owing to abnormal water ingress from the border area of the Italian concession, whereas the pumping out of these masses of water with the help of the actual pumping system necessitated two full days.

Illustrations 64 & 65 show again, for comparison purposes, the reservoir facing south, both with a normal water level and the high water level of 30 August 1911. In the first photograph, the marking lines of the reservoir as originally planned and its actual dimensions after excavation are visible.
Bild 67 zeigt die unmittelbar an der italienischen Grenze gelegenen zweitgrößte chinesische Schule der Niederlassung (unter Chinese Verwaltung befindlich) mit dem davor befindlichen Turnplatz. Die Schule war zur Zeit der Pestepidemie im Frühjahr dieses Jahres als Isolierhospital eingerichtet worden.

Illustration 67 depicts the concession’s second largest Chinese school (under Chinese administration), which is situated right next to the Italian boundary, together with its sport facilities. During the plague epidemic in the springtime of this year, the school was turned into an isolation hospital.


Illustration 66 reproduces a photograph of the entire surface of the reservoir, taken from the top of the entrance lock, which was depicted in Illustrations 57–59 with a dashed line.
IV. Grenzgebiet zwischen der italienischen und unserer Niederlassung (Bilder 68–76 inkl.)

Border area between our concession and the Italian one (Illustrations 68–76)


Illustration 68 shows the border area in front of the aforementioned school. One can already see on this photograph the earth fills that were made in the border area immediately after the floodings of 30 August of this year. These embankments should prevent the future inrush of water masses from the Italian grounds against the reservoir in our concession.

Bild 69 zeigt an der italienischen Grenze in der Richtung gegen die Hauptstraße weiter fortschreitend einen anderen Teil des Grenzgebietes bei normalem und ...

Illustration 69 shows another section of the border area, when progressing further from the Italian border towards the main street, with a normal water level...
Bild 70  ... beim Hochwasserstande vom 30. August 1911 zu einer Zeit, als das Wasser bereits zum Teil durch den Wasserdurchlass der Via Vittorio Emanuele (vide Bild 35) gegen das strittige Terrain unserer Niederlassung zu abgeflossen war.

Illustration 70  ... and then with the high water level of 30 August 1911, at a moment in time when some of the water was already running off through the culvert of Via Vittorio Emanuele (see Illustration 35) towards the disputed land in our concession.

Bild 71  zeigt eine der an der Grenze der italienischen Niederlassung führenden Parallelstraßen zur Hauptstraße, durch welche sich das Hochwasser am 30. August d.J. einen Weg gegen das Sammelbassin zu bahnte; dieselbe mündet bei dem auf Bild 70 am linken Rande ersichtlichen chinesischen Wohnhaus an die italienische Grenze.

Illustration 71  shows one of the streets running parallel to the main street in the area bordering the Italian concession, through which flood water made its way against the reservoir on 30 August of this year; this street leads to a Chinese residential property at the Italian border, which can be seen on the left edge of Illustration 70.
Bild 72 & 73 zeigen dieselbe Straße in normalem Zustande resp. zu Zeiten des Hochwasserstandes vom 30. August d.J.

Illustrations 72 & 73 show the same street first under normal circumstances, and then at the time of flooding on 30 August of this year.

Illustrations 74 & 75 show the border area of our concession close by the main street. The earth fills recently made in this border area are clearly visible. In the background, to the left (indicated as x) we can see the residential property of Mr Accurti. The small Chinese house on Italian territory at the centre of Illustration 75 was half-submerged during the flood on 30 August this year.
Illustration 76 shows the same Chinese house, photographed from the opposite side.
V. Strittiges Terrain (Bilder 77–85 inkl.)

Disputed Land (Illustrations 77–85)

Bild 77  Wir überschreiten nunmehr die Hauptstraße an der italienischen Grenze und haben auf einen Ausblick auf das im Herbst dieses Jahres infolge der großen Regenfälle völlig unter Wasser gesetzte „strittige Terrain“ vor uns. Im Hintergrunde ist der Damm der nordchinesischen Eisenbahn sichtbar.

Illustration 77  Now we cross the main street at the Italian border and see, in front of us, the “disputed land” that was entirely flooded following torrential rainfall last autumn. In the background, we can see the railway embankment of the [Imperial] Chinese Northern Railways.

Illustrations 78 & 79  zeigen eine Aufnahme in gleicher Richtung von dem auf Bild 77 mit (x) bezeichneten Stege aus.

Illustrations 78 & 79  show a photograph of the bridge, indicated by (x) in Illustration 77, taken from the same vantage point.
Bild 80 zeigen eine Aufnahme von dem oben bezeichneten Punkte gegen die Hauptstraße zu, mit den beiden Eckhäusern unserer Hauptstraße gegen die italienische Grenze zu.

Illustration 80 shows a photograph, taken from the aforementioned vantage point facing the main street, with both corner buildings in our concession right against the Italian border.


Illustration 81 At the boundary with the disputed land, facing the Italian concession and continuing in the direction of the railway embankment, we can first look back at the concession’s eastern section — the entirely flooded, disputed land. The arrow in the picture indicates the location of the swing bridge, which can be seen on Illustration 15, on the western edge of our concession.
Bild 82 zeigt ungefähr die gleiche Partie jedoch von der Höhe des Eisenbahndammes aus aufgenommen. Die beiden Pfeile bei a) und b) zeigen die Breitenerstreckung unserer Niederlassung vom Peiho gegen die italienische Niederlassung zu und gleichzeitig die Längenausdehnung unserer Hauptstraße.

Illustration 82 shows approximately the same section; it is, however, taken from the top of the railway embankment. The two arrows a) and b) indicate the full expanse of our concession, from the Peiho River to the Italian concession and, at the same time, the length of our main street.

Bild 83 Den Eisenbahndamm gegen Westen zu fortschreitend erblicken wir auf das strittige Terrain und im Vordergrunde den Privatfriedhof der Familie Chu, am rechten Rande des Bildes ganz im Hintergrunde die Konturen der an der Biegung des Peiho und der Einmündungsstelle des Kaiserkanals gelegene Kathedrale (α) (vide Bild 101)

Illustration 83 Walking westwards towards the railway embankment, we catch sight of the disputed land and, in the foreground, of the private cemetery of the Chu Family; on the right edge of the photograph, far in the background is the outline of the cathedral (indicated by α), located in the bend in the Peiho [River] at the confluence with the Imperial Canal (see also Illustration 101).

Illustration 84  shows an additional photograph of the disputed land even more westwards; to the left lies part of the Chu family’s private cemetery while the contours of the cathedral are indicated by (x). The large building in the background at the centre of the picture is the new, large, first-class Chinese pawnshop in the concession. The chimney to its right in the background already belongs to the power station of the Tientsin Tramways and Electricity Company, situated on Chinese territory.

Bild 85  zeigt schließlich das große Pfandhaus der Niederlassung aus größter Nähe aufgenommen, zur Rechten unter (β) die eben genannte auf chinesischem Gebiet neben der katholischen Kathedrale gelegene Elektrizitätsanlage.

Illustration 85  finally shows the concession’s large pawnshop photographed very close. To the right (β) we can see the aforementioned power plant, next to the Catholic cathedral, on Chinese territory.
VI. Quaibauten (Bilder 86–93 inkl.)

Quay constructions (Illustrations 86–93)

Bild 86 zeigt die regulierte südlich der Drehbrücke gelegene Uferfront, vom südlichen Ende des ausgebauten Teiles der Uferstraße aus gesehen. (Die rote Linie markiert den ungefähren Verlauf des Schwemmlandes, welches im Frühjahr 1912 ausgebaggert werden soll). In der Verlängerung der Betonabdeckung ist im Hintergrunde Mitte rechts das Holzgerüst des bei den Quaiarbeiten nördlich der Drehbrücke in Verwendung stehenden Rammbockes sichtbar.

Illustration 86 shows the managed riverbank to the south of the swing bridge, photographed from the southern end of the developed section of the Riverside Road. (The red line indicates the approximate course of the alluvial land, which is scheduled to be dredged in Spring 1912). In the background, to the right of the centre in the prolongation of the concrete covering, we can see the wooden scaffolding for the ram that is being used for quayside construction work to the north of the swing bridge.

Bild 87 zeigt die gleiche Front in nächster Entfernung von der Drehbrücke unmittelbar nach Schließen derselben; ein dichter Menschenstrom bewegt sich auf dem Gehsteig der Brücke zur Linken gegen das chinesische Ufer zu. Das Schwemmmland tritt deutlich hervor.

Illustration 87 shows the same waterfront, photographed at closer range from the swing bridge, immediately after its closing. A dense stream of people is moving along the left-hand walkway towards the Chinese riverbank. The alluvial soil is clearly visible.
Bild 88 zeigt die gleiche Front etwas nach links verschoben.

Illustration 88 shows the same front, but slightly more to the left.

Bild 89 ungefähr der gleiche Ausblick bei geöffneter Drehbrücke von dem auf Bild 90 mit (x) bezeichneten Landungssteg der Fährstation aus aufgenommen, bei deutlich sichtbarem Schwemmland.

Illustration 89 is almost the same view, photographed from the landing stage of the ferry (indicated by (x) in Illustration 90), with the swing bridge in open position; the alluvial soil is clearly visible.
Bild 90 zeigt die regulierte Quaifront südlich der Drehbrücke in ihrer ganzen Längeausdehnung, von der Drehbrücke aus aufgenommen. Das Schwemmland südlich der Drehbrücke ist in seiner ganzen Breitenausdehnung sichtbar.

Illustration 90 photographed from the swing bridge, shows the entire length of the managed quay front to the south of the swing bridge. The entire width of the alluvial land to the south of the swing bridge is visible.

Bild 91 zeigt die gleiche Uferfront von einer am Ende der nördlich der Drehbrücke ehen in Bau befindlichen Quaikonstruktion gelegenen Position aus betrachtet bei geöffneter Drehbrücke. Das Schwemmland südlich der Drehbrücke erscheint wie bisher durch eine rot punktierte Linie markiert.

Illustration 91 shows the same riverfront, viewed from a point at the end of the quayside, which is under construction, to the north of the swing bridge, with the swing bridge open. The alluvial land to the south of the swing bridge is indicated as before by a red dashed line.
Illustration 92 shows the quay wall under construction to the north of the swing bridge, photographed facing south from the endpoint of the riverbank construction, at the junction with the Hsin Lung Chie Road (state of work around mid-September 1911).
Bild 93  *die gleiche Konstruktion gegen Norden. Diese und das vorhergehende Bild zeigen deutlich wieviel mit Rücksicht auf die Abbröckelung der Uferfront im Süden der Drehbrücke die Konstruktion nördlich der Drehbrücke zwecks Erreichung einer gradlinigen Uferkontur nach einwärts gerückt werden musste.*

*Illustration 93  presents the same construction, facing north. This picture and the previous one clearly show how much, with respect to the crumbling of the riverbank to the south of the swing bridge, construction works to the north of the bridge needed to be moved inwards in order to achieve a straight bank.*
VII.  Uferfront nördlich der Drehbrücke (Bilder 94–115 inkl.)

Riverfront to the north of the swing bridge (Illustrations 94–115)

Bild 94 zeigt die Uferfront unserer Niederlassung nördlich der Drehbrücke bis zur Biegung des Peiho neben der Kathedrale, welche im Hintergrunde des Bildes in der Mitte sichtbar ist. Am rechten Rand des Bildes ist die neue Quaikonstruktion nördlich der Drehbrücke deutlich hervorragend sichtbar. Sowohl aus dieser als aus den nunmehr folgenden Aufnahmen ist deutlich zu ersennen, dass die Mehrzahl der Häuser nördlich des ausgebauten Teiles der Uferstraße ziemlich nahe an das Ufer herangerückt sind, so daß zur Durchführung der weiteren Quaiarbeiten entsprechende Expropriationen erforderlich sein werden.

Illustration 94 shows the riverfront of our concession to the north of the swing bridge all the way to the bend in the Peiho [River] next to the cathedral, which is visible in the background at the centre of the picture.

Bild 95 zeigt unsere Uferfront knapp hinter der in Konstruktion befindlichen Quaiwand nördlich der Drehbrücke; am linken Rande des Bildes ist ein Holzlager am Flussufer, weiters der Rammbock der neuen Quaikonstruktion, im Hintergrunde (x) eine chinesische Zigarettenfabrik auf chinesischem Gebiet sichtbar. Das Bild ist von einem der zahlreichen flussaufwärts gehenden Yaluholzflöße aus aufgenommen.

Illustration 95 shows our riverfront just behind the quay wall under construction to the north of the swing bridge; on the left edge of the photograph we can see a woodyard on the river bank, then the ram for the new quay construction; in the background stands a Chinese cigarette factory (x) on Chinese territory. This photograph was taken from one of the many Yalu wooden rafts travelling up the river.
Bild 96 zeigt eine Aufnahme in entgegengesetzter Richtung gegen die Kathedrale zu.

Illustration 96 shows a picture in the opposite direction, towards the cathedral.
in gleicher Richtung von dem auf Bild 96 sichtbaren Flosse aus weiter gegen Norden schreitend.

Illustration 97 was photographed, continuing northwards, from the rafts depicted in Illustration 96 in the same direction.
Bild 98 in gleicher Richtung noch weiter nördlich, zur Rechten ein chinesischer Getreidespeicher mit zum Teil durch Holzkonstruktion geschützten Uferfront mit Landungsbrücke.

Illustration 98 was photographed even further north, in the same direction: to the right a Chinese granary with a landing jetty, whose riverbank is partly protected by a wooden construction.

Bild 99 zeigt denselben Teil der Uferfront gegen Süden gesehen mit Landungsbrücke (vide auch Bild 112).

Illustration 99 shows the same section of the riverfront facing south, with a landing jetty (see also Illustration 112).
Bild 100 zeigt den Verlauf unserer Uferfront nördlich der Drehbrücke bis zur Flussbiegung an der Kathedrale von einem Punkte nahe der Flussbiegung aus aufgenommen. Wie ersichtlich ist der Dschunkenverkehr auf unserer Uferfront mangels einer regulierten Uferfront ein spärlicher, während am gegenüberliegenden chinesischen Ufer zahlreiche Dschunken angelegt haben. Punkt a (im Hintergrunde) bezeichnet ein auf dem sogenannten Marinegrundstück der Niederlassung aufgestelltes großes japanisches Reklameschild (vide auch Bild 108)

Illustration 100 shows the course of our riverfront to the north of the swing bridge up to the bend in the river at the cathedral, photographed from a vantage point close to the bend. As we can see the junk traffic along our riverbank is sparse owing to a lack of river management, whereas numerous junks have docked on the opposite Chinese side. Point a (in the background) indicates a large Japanese advertising sign, which was set up on the so-called Marine Property of the concession (see also Illustration 108).
Bild 101 zeigt die katholische Kirche auf chinesischem Gebiet an der Mündung des Kaiserkanals (linke Bildseite) und an der Biegung des Peiho gegen Osten (rechts) gelegen (Aufnahme von unserer Uferfront aus).

Illustration 101 shows the Catholic church on Chinese territory, situated at the mouth of the Imperial Canal (left side of the picture) in the bend in the Peiho [River] (right) facing east (this photograph was taken from our riverbank).

Bild 102 zeigt eine Aufnahme gegen die Mündung des Kaiserkanals zu, von der Sohle unserer Uferfront an der Flussbiegung aus aufgenommen; der Dschunkenverkehr an diesem Kreuzungspunkt der Wasserstraßen ist ein äußerst reger. Auf dem Bilde sind auch deutlich die Anschwemmungen an der Biegung unserer Uferfront gegen Osten ersichtlich.

Illustration 102 is a photograph taken from the underside of our riverbank in the river bend facing the mouth of the Imperial Canal; junk traffic at this waterway intersection is very busy. On this picture one can also see clearly the alluvial soil in the bend in our riverfront facing east.
Illustration 103 shows the same view, just a little further left, featuring a Chinese police station and, to the left, a ferry that connects both riverbanks.

Illustrations 105 & 106 show the same views as we progress towards the east along our riverfront.
Bild 104 zeigt die Kathedrale aus unmittelbarer Nähe, von unserer Uferseite aus gesehen.

Illustration 104 shows the cathedral at close range, seen from our riverbank.
endlich zeigt unsere, für den Verkehr weniger geeignete hochgelegene Uferfront östlich der Kathedrale, von der Grenze unserer Niederlassung und der Chinesenstadt am Peihoufer aus aufgenommen.

Illustration 107  finally shows our high riverbank, which is not very suitable for traffic, to the east of the cathedral, photographed from the border between our concession and the Chinese City running along the bank of the Peiho.
Die nun folgenden Aufnahmen zeigen unsere Uferfront nördlich der Drehbrücke bis zur Kathedrale vom gegenüberliegenden chinesischen Ufer aus aufgenommen.

The following pictures show our riverfront to the north of the swing bridge up to the cathedral, photographed from the Chinese riverfront opposite.
Illustration 109 shows our riverfront somewhat further north, with the same motif.

Illustrations 110 & 111 These two photographs were taken from thatched junks on the river. Two identical points in the two pictures are indicated by (x). The well-built Chinese house whose river frontage is protected by a wooden construction belongs to a potter.
Illustration 112 shows a section of the riverfront (as depicted on Illustrations 98 & 99) from the opposite side. The Chinese house behind the wooden construction on the river frontage is a large cereal business.
Bild 113 zeigt die gegenüberliegende chinesische Uferfront mit großen Strohlagern und einem Töpferwarengeschäft.

Illustration 113 shows the Chinese riverfront opposite, featuring large straw storage areas and a pottery shop.


Illustrations 114 & 115 show another section of our riverfront lying even further north — the two junks could already be seen in Illustration 110 in the background on the left — not far from the river bend nearby the cathedral. The chimney in Illustration 114 is part of the power station of the Tramway Company, standing on the Chinese side to the east of the cathedral (see also Illustrations 84 & 85).
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Glossary of Chinese-English transcriptions

Baihe 白河 (called Haihe 海河 [Hai River] below the confluence of Baihe and Grand Canal
Boxer Uprising, see Yihetuan 義和團 Movement
Chengli 城裏, lit. ‘within the city (walls)’, native city, “Chinese city”
Da Yunhe 大運河, Grand Canal
Dagu 大沽, Taku
Dong fuqiao 東浮橋, i.e. Eastern Pontoon Bridge
Dongmen 東門, i.e. East Gate
Dutong Yamen 天津都統衙門, i.e. Tianjin Provisional Government
Eastern Pontoon Bridge, see Dongfu qiao
East Gate, see Dongmen
Haihe, i.e. Hai River, see Bai He
Haiho, see Hai He and Bai He
Hedong 河東/Ho-tung, Hotung, today Tianjin’s Hebei (lit. ‘north of the river’) district
Hedong, see Hedong
Hsin-Lung-Dschie, see Xinglong jie
Hsiu-tsai College, see Sanqu shuyuan
Jamen, see Yamen
Jinmen baojia tushuo 津門保甲圖説 [Explanation of the Tientsin/Tianjin baojia plan]
Jingtang Bridge 金湯橋, Chin Tang Bridge
Five Avenues Historic District in the former British concession, see Wudadao
Guandi miao 關帝廟, Temple of the War God
Guandi
Grand Canal, see Da Yunhe
Jamen, see Yamen
Mu/Mou 畝 [area measure]
Paiho, see Bai He
Pei Ho, see Bai He
Salt Inspectors Office, see Yanguan ting
Sanguan miao 三官廟, Sanguan temple
San-chu Shuyuan/Hsiu-tsai College, see Sanqu shuyuan
Sanqu shuyuan 三取書院, Sanqu Academy
Shanxi huiguan 山西會館, House of the Shanxi trading guild
Shi-dse-dji, see Shizijie
Shizijie 十字街, Shizi Street
Shuntai yanghang 順泰洋行 (Fischer & Co.)
Taku, see Dagu
Tang Shaoyi 唐紹儀, Tientsin’s Customs Daotai
Tianjin fensi 天津分司, Office of the Circuit Intendant of Tientsin
Tientsin Provisional Government (TPG), see Dutong Yamen
Tientsin – Tianjin (Pinyin transcription system, as a city in post-1949 liberated China)
Tianjin ‘Exhibition of World Architecture’ — wanguo jianzhu bolanhui 萬國建築博覽會
Tianjin wei 天津衛, administrative rank of the city of Tianjin from the times of the Ming dynasty Yongle era (early 15th century) to the Qing dynasty Yongzheng era (1720s), later subsequently changed to zhou 州 (department) and xian 縣 (circuit)
Tianjin Museum of Modern History [Jindai Tianjin Bowuguan 近代天津博物館]
Tianxian Tea Garden, Tianxian chayuan 天仙茶園
Tongji chayuan 同集茶園 for Tea Garden
Tutung Yamen, see Dutong Yamen
Wenhua yichan 文化遺産 [cultural heritage]
Wudadao 五大道, Five Avenues Historic District
Xinglong jie 興隆街 Hsin-Lung-Dschie, main road in the Austro-Hungarian concession
Yamen 衙門, or Jamen
Yanguan ting 盐官廳, Salt Inspector’s Office
Yen Kuan, Salt Inspectors Office, see Yanguan ting
Yihetuan 義和團 movement (Boxer Uprising)
Yishifengqingqu 意式風情區, literally: ‘scenic area in the Italian style’, former Italian concession
Yuan Shikai 袁世凱, General Governor of the Zhili province
Academia Sinica Archive (Taiwan) 68
Accurti, Gino (general manager of the Hotung Baugesellschaft) 109, 114
Administrative Archive [Verwaltungsarchiv], Vienna 48
Aehrenthal, Count Alois Lexa von (Minister of Foreign Affairs in Vienna) 118, 140
Airone (Austrian vessel) 15–16
Alps 92
America (American concession) 31, 55, 84
Andès, K. J. 29
Andres, Eduard (k.u.k. consulate secretary, Austro-Hungarian concession) 109, 131, 143
Anxi 22
Armenschule [also see: charity school, Austro-Hungarian concession, Tientsin] 121, 139–140, 224
Aspern (Austrian vessel) 35
Astor House Hotel Guide to Tientsin 105
Astor House Hotel (in the British concession of Tientsin) 105, 164
Auer, Alois 17
Aufsichtsrat [supervisory board] 114
Australian National University 49
Austrian Academy of Sciences (Vienna) 12
Austrian Lloyd 34, 77, 79, 85, 89, 157
Austrian National Library (incl. Picture Archives and Graphics Department) 7–9, 12, 17, 36–38, 47, 54, 131, 133, 135–137, 139
Austrian Style Riverfront (Tianjin) 11–12, 171, 174–175, 179, 184
Babo, August Wilhelm von 29, 30
Babo, Maximilian Freiherr von 29
Baihe/Haihe [Bai/Hai River] 16, 25, 36, 38–39, 61
Bank of China 162
Baron-Czikann-Straße [Baron Czikann Street] 91, 110, 134–138, 141, 143, 145, 154, 171
Batang 22
Batu Khan 23
Bauer, Franz (member of the district council of the Austro-Hungarian concession) 118, 131
Bauer, Paul (Austrian acting honorary consul in Tientsin, 1922–38) 35, 158–159
Baufirma Johann Brunner [see Brunner Construction Company] 193
Beijing-Hangzhou Grand Canal 60
Beijing Legation Archive (Austria-Hungary) 48
Beijing & Tianjin Liberation Battle (1948) 170–171
Belgian Tramway Company 104, 134–135, 189
Belgium 31, 38, 42, 47, 55, 102, 156
Berchtold, Count Leopold (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Vienna) 148
Bohai Bay/Sea/Gulf of 7, 35, 95, 161
Bombay 15, 79
Bosnia and Herzegovina 53
Bourboulon, G. (member of the supervisory board of Hotung Baugesellschaft) 114, 154
Bourgery & Co. (firm in Tientsin) 221
Boxer Uprising, Boxers 8, 48, 54, 61, 71, 82, 89, 109, 115, 147, 222
Braun, Ansgar 31
British Admiralty 24, 60
British Club, Tientsin 162
British Concession 53, 87, 118, 162, 164, 168
Brunner Construction Company, Tientsin 134, 193
Brunner, Johann (member of the district council of the Austro-Hungarian concession) 109, 118, 121, 134, 153, 159, 179, 193, 222
Budapest 8, 44, 71, 80, 109, 114–115, 138, 183
Buddha, Buddhist 22, 80–81, 84
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Summary (in English and in Chinese)

International concessions were strictly delimited enclaves within key trading cities, ceded to and governed by foreign powers after 'unequal treaties' resulting from military campaigns. Concessions also came into being in China, from the second half of the nineteenth century to the first half of the twentieth. They are currently being rediscovered as a field of research on the preconditions of what we today call 'globalisation'.

Besides constituting a famous counterpart to Shanghai and its International Settlement, the concessions of Tientsin (today’s Tianjin), a city to the south-east of Beijing close to the Bohai Bay, indeed 'spanned the globe': nine nations were represented, from Japan, Russia, and six European countries to the USA. The histories of the British, French, or Italian quarters have been rather well explored and today their physical fabrics are still visible to a remarkable extent — currently, they are even being commodified by the Tianjin Municipal Government as a cultural heritage site endowed with 'cosmopolitan flair' — whereas one element has almost fallen into oblivion: the Austro-Hungarian concession.

A theme running through the main contribution of this book has been that of paradoxical constellations.

On the one hand, we can observe that the study of port concessions in China (which lasted from the 1860s to the 1940s) could be detected. This interest does not only concern research in the political, diplomatic, and economic networks of international collaboration, but also in the logistics, techniques, and instruments that were required to plan, implement, and control the infrastructural, urban, and architectural development of concession systems. All these aspects together, in their micro set-up in concessions around 1900, are often viewed as important founding factors of those entangled pro-
processes spanning the world that since the symbolic threshold of 2000 have often been summed up as 'globalisation'.

本书对中国最典型的租界天津——其集结了世界版图上的日俄欧美九个国家——的历史及其后世的物质变迁进行了学术成果综述。此外，本书的导论部分阐述了三个主要原因，解释这一租界势力的历史性缺席以及研究盲区。这三条原因逐一被置于全球化逻辑语境中。

On the other hand, one small element — the concession of Austria-Hungary — had, so far, been left out of this dual process: the global trend to research China's (Tianjin's) concession history and the local agency behind the 'heritagisation' of urban and architectural remains. In the introduction to this contribution, three major reasons for this grand historical absence and scientific neglect of one Concession Power were formulated and each one was set in relation to a very global logic.

首先，奥匈帝国租界在1902至1917年运营失败。如今看来，全球和本地的矛盾纠缠，导致了哈布斯堡王朝对于殖民主义/帝国主义的“走向全球”计划的政治上经验不足，经济上缺乏热情，同时各种实际问题又接踵而至（例如，中国居民的土地征用，资本和投资匮乏，基础设施上的基本经验不足）。这也意味着，对比其他能进行更有效建设的租界势力，奥匈租借实际上只完成了少量的都市基础建设。因此，奥匈帝国零星的建筑遗址在接下去的半个世纪被人遗忘也不足为奇。雪上加霜的是，天津租界带有的类帝国主义的历史，在（后）毛泽东时代是中国客观学术研究的禁区。这一情形一直持续到1990年代，即便那时国外考察项目也被严格限制。

First, the implementation of the Austro-Hungarian concession between 1902 and 1917 was a failure. Owing to what we called an entangled global-local circumstance, the Habsburgs’ insufficient political experience with, and economic disinterest for any colonial/imperialist 'going global' projects (see the introduction by Georg Lehner) unfortunately overlapped with too many problems on the ground (expropriation of Chinese residents, no funds or investment, poor infrastructural know-how). This means that, in comparison to more efficient building projects by other Concession Powers, very little urban architectural fabric was de facto completed, and it is hardly surprising that these sparse physical reminders of Austria-Hungary easily fell into oblivion for the next half-century — all the more so given that Tianjin's concession qua imperialist history was a (post-)Maoist taboo for unbiased Chinese research.

While mapping out the current status of knowledge about the history and physical afterlife of Tientsin, China's most relevant concession (which assembled nine foreign nations from all over the globe, from Japan and Russia to Europe and the USA), this publication has uncovered a seemingly paradoxical transformative moment: a shift from Tientsin's contested history to Tianjin's glorious heritage. Although Chinese historians continue to take an active part in investigating this foreign-ruled chapter in their 'own' country's recent past, inventive municipal politicians and developers are trying hard to reformulate Tientsin's concession legacy, namely, pan-imperialistic aggression and humiliating exploitation, into a positive, 'to-be-inherited-and-to-be-continued' success story of modernisation, cosmopolitanism, international cooperation and, even, multilateral friendship. This reinvention of a once contested past thus fits in with Tianjin's self-branding ambitions of the present as a global city for the future.

In this great reworking of history, the urban and architectural fabric of the once most impactful concessions of France, Great Britain, and Italy is gradually being turned into a cultural heritage hybrid of restored original monuments, in-style reconstructed façades, and reinvented urban spaces. With the fabric being 'themed' after, or even enhanced with the enduring cultural stereotypes of these former international powers, the overall result may be characterised as a global theme park atmosphere.

另一方面，奥匈帝国租界，作为（上述历史中的）微小成分，至今仍被排除在中国（天津）租界史这一全球研究趋势和都市建筑遗产化背后的本地经错这双向过程之外。本书的导论部分阐述了三个主要原因，解释这一租界势力的历史性缺席以及研究盲区。这三条原因逐一被置于全球化逻辑语境中。
until the 1990s, a time when foreign *in-situ* investigations were also restricted.

而导致奥匈帝国租界这段故事至今无人知晓的第二点原因也在书中被点明:在从中国调回奥地利的过程中,领事文字材料错误地与其影像资料分离,致使部分档案资料“遗失于翻译中”。而部分资料的不可利用,即,仅有文字通信可用而相应的绘图、草稿和照片散佚,其后果就是,德国和奥地利20世纪50年代后进行的大部分研究仅聚焦于天津政治和外交史,而无法涉及奥匈帝国租界的都市建筑背景。这些研究材料主要容身于丰富却未被发表的博士论文中。而本书首次以英语将其总结。

A second reason for the hitherto untold story of the Austro-Hungarian concession was also discovered: archival sources were partially ‘lost in translation’ during their repatriation from China back to Austria, when written consular material was erroneously separated from its visual attachments. As a consequence of this partial unavailability of material, whereby only written correspondence was at hand whereas plans, sketches, and photographs had gone astray, German/Austrian research since the 1950s has, for the most part, dealt with Tientsin’s political and diplomatic history, while the urban architectural context of the Austro-Hungarian concession has never been examined. Primarily hidden in rich, but unpublished PhD theses, this research material is summarised here for the first time in English.

其三,富有悖论的是,哈布斯堡王朝短暂的租界运动在现今中国保留下的那些少量的都市构造和建筑遗址,由于上文所述的遗产制造运动的作用而继续被侵蚀。

Third, we argued that paradoxically the small amount of urban fabric and architectural remains of the Habsburgs’ short campaign that still exist in China are being further eroded owing to, precisely, the above-mentioned heritage-making at play.

而我们提出的“从天津的历史到天津的遗产”的演变过程,建构在双重探讨上: a) 在1901—1917年间奥匈帝国天津租界这段短暂的都市化建筑史研究中,本研究首次补齐了那块梦寐以求的缺失拼图；b) 该书将这一租界的历史框架置于当前经济高速发展的“国际天津”的“遗产化”语境下。

What we called a process from Tientsin’s history to Tianjin’s heritage was structured in a two-fold inquiry: a) this contribution provided for the first time in scientific research the much-desired missing puzzle piece in the short urban architectural history of the Austro-Hungarian concession between 1901 and 1917 in Tientsin; and b) it situated its historical fabric within the current ‘heritagisation’ of the Chinese economic boom city ‘global Tianjin’.

本研究的第一步,是评估奥地利图书馆和档案馆的系统资料,包括出版和未出版的书写材料,也包括了地图照片等视觉材料,以期对含糊不清的奥匈租界的各项因子语境化。具体包括:当时实际政治局势（从1901—1902年的武装占领和不平等条约,到1917年的投降和移交）；奥匈本国游移不定的媒体报道（从热烈的鼓吹到,漫画版简化而夸张的批评），尤其对比匈牙利和奥地利租界游历者的见闻；奥匈方面所扮演的角色（高尚的领事,不光彩的承办者,悲剧性缺席的当地投资者）以及本地人相对应的角色（包括前来参观的、保存帝国荣耀的总理大臣袁世凯,也包括中国三万多起义者）；其物资运输方面遇到的挑战（从周边河流码头的加固,到不得人心的迁坟,将7000多座坟墓迁出市中心）；最后还包括了机构和法律的设立（从建筑公司条例到当地的税收政策,还涉及暴力征缴）。

For the first working step, a coherent set of sources from Austrian libraries and archives, both written (published and unpublished) and visual (cartographic and photographic) was evaluated to contextualise the different factors of the ambivalent Austro-Hungarian concession project: its political circumstances on the ground (from military occupation and unequal contract in 1901–02 to surrender and handover in 1917); its ambivalent press coverage back home (from great fanfare to cartoonish critique) compared to eye-witness reports from Hungarian and Austrian visitors to the concession; its main Austro-Hungarian actors (from honourable consuls to dubious contractors and tragically absent local investors) and their local counterparts (from visiting General Governor Yuan Shikai in his imperial grandeur to some 30,000 resisting Chinese residents); its logistical challenges (from peripheral river quay consolidations to the unpopular relocation of 7000 graves out of the core zone); and, finally, its institutional/legal set-up (from statues of a construction company to local taxation and even violent expropriation).

最重要的是,本书介绍讨论了一大批前所未知的、颇为壮观的一手文献（全文附于附录）。这批文献可以回溯到1911年左右,包括了手绘比例尺图纸,一本装有115页黑白相片的硬皮相册,外加15页打字机打印的介绍说明。整套文献被用作视觉和空间手册,可将奥匈租界自始至终各个发展阶段进行重新语境化,其包括了首先发生、也是最为重要的标志建筑的建立,即在外交上有标志意义的领事大楼和在制造业上有启发作用的建筑（新奥地利铁吊桥,实际上是部分照搬了第
Above all, for the first time, a so far unknown ‘spectacular’ primary source was introduced and discussed (and published in full length in the Appendix). Going back to c.1911, it comprised a hand-drawn scaled plan and a bound album of 115 black-and-white photographs together with a fifteen-page typewritten description. The entire set was used as a visual and spatial guide to re-contextualise the developmental stages of the Austro-Hungarian concession from its beginning to its end: from establishing the first and most important architectural markers of diplomatic presence (the consulate buildings) and of an ‘engineered’ civilising mission (the new ‘Austrian’ iron swing bridge, de facto a project by various national representations) to greater urban planning efforts (establishing a new ‘rational’ texture over the pre-existing local Chinese lane system, connecting the concessions to the cross-concession system of water supply, electricity, and public tramway).

诚然，照片不仅记录着完工的新建筑和“五横五纵”的城市路网。他们还揭示了在租界光鲜的外表下相当令人不安的现实：一片被迁移的坟地，一些被征用和废弃的建筑，因为缺少（国际）投资者而空置的土地，社会阶层的隔离，以及最糟糕的一点，肮脏的偏僻小道，1911年8月30号由台风引发的洪水灾害中，中国本地居民只能眼睁睁的看着周围的大片污水而无能无力，显然，这里并没有建成一个有效的排水系统。1911年前后这批独一无二的影像档案展启示我们，我们必须从整体历史角度，把奥匈帝国租界，这一天津市内的“国际”建制，作为帝国主义式傲慢的工程、作为一个失败工程来重新审视。

However, the photographs not only documented the completed few buildings and urban grid of five-by-five streets; they revealed, right ‘behind the few shining façades’ of the concession, a rather disturbing reality: one of relocated Chinese graves, several expropriated and abandoned buildings, empty plots owing to the lack of (inter)national investors, social segregation and, worst of all, dirty backstreets where local Chinese inhabitants stand around giant pools of waste water, helpless during the flooding catastrophe brought about by a typhoon on 30th August 1911 — clearly, an effective drainage system was never successfully installed. These unique visual documents created around 1911 reveal that the Austro-Hungarian concession, as part of the ‘inter-national’ set-up in Tientsin, must be evaluated from an overall historical perspective as a project of imperialistic hubris and as a failure.

From a broader conceptual viewpoint, this finding enables us to tweak the all too easily appropriated master narrative — historically as well as currently — about a once successful international concession network in Tientsin and its enduring legacy of a once powerful laboratory for a promising future. In a more nuanced reading of the facts, neither did Tientsin in the concession era exclusively set new standards through “enforced modernisation” (as Austria-Hungary’s consul for Tientsin, Hugo Schumpeter claimed in 1915) or lead to “hygienic modernity” or even to a “revolution” (as current research is framing it, cf. Rogaski 2000 and 2004 with Singaravélou 2019). Nor should Tientsin’s history as a concession be allowed to be easily exploited and overvalued as a supporting element for Tianjin’s (and China’s) over-ambitiously staged path into global modernity today.

而这个最后的一个方面，即将天津1900年后的历史逐步改编成天津2000年后的遗产，则是本书研究的第二部分内容。旧天津和现代天津的联结，发生在中国那令人惊讶的转型这一语境中：从（后）毛泽东时代（直到二十世纪九十年代）社会主义意识形态对于上海天津这种作为帝国主义掠夺和民族耻辱之所的国际租界的贬低，到以市场为导向的意识形态，在2000年以后在近乎资本主义的企划中将这些租界升级为国际合作，甚至是互为友谊的富有创意的试验地。

It is this last facet of the gradual appropriation of Tientsin’s history after 1900 as Tianjin’s heritage after 2000 that stood at the centre of the second part of this contribution. The Tientsin-Tianjin nexus was contextualised within China’s astonishing transformation from a (late) Maoist socialist ideology (until the 1990s) that downgraded previous international concessions like Shanghai or Tientsin as sites of im-
perialistic exploitation and national humiliation to a market-oriented ideology that upgraded these concessions, now in the context of almost capitalistic planning schemes (in the 2000s), to the status of once innovative test sites of international cooperation and, even, mutual friendship.

In this context, Tientsin’s past as a concession was rediscovered as a ‘to-be-inherited-and-continued’ legacy of cosmopolitanism by inventive municipal administrators and developers of the current Tianjin megacity of some fifteen million people — with its outspoken ambition of global outreach. Under the new ‘cultural heritage regime’, diverse former concession areas are now being systematically ‘re-discovered, re-activated and re-presented’ as sites of progress: well-researched case studies of this process already cover the former British, French, and Italian concessions. However, the current fate of Italy’s former neighbour, Austria-Hungary’s concession, has not been covered thoroughly yet by the expanding field of cultural heritage studies.

Given that such a scientific lacuna is due to the above-mentioned lack of historical data, the present publication made use of a rediscovered set of visual primary sources (a plan, description, and 115 photographs of the Austro-Hungarian concession from c.1911) as a comparative backdrop and guide for a photographic visit by the writing author in 2018 — some hundred years after the concession was handed over back to China. What was mapped out for the first time on the basis of this visual evidence and comparison can be summarised as a mixture of conservation, restoration, reconstruction, and reinvention of Austria-Hungary’s urban and architectural legacy.

For example, the scientist and his ambition to build a new scientific institution in the city, the Austrian Academy of Sciences, was also a symbol of the Austrian Empire’s cultural and political aspirations. However, due to the First World War and the dissolution of the empire, the academy was never completed. The building was taken over by the Chinese government and used for other purposes. In the 1980s, it was restored and repurposed as a museum dedicated to the history of science in China.

As a focus point in this stage set of urban renaissance, the ambivalent person of the military governor and transient emperor Yuan Shikai is currently being reinvented as a cultural broker. This is happening not only in a ‘historical’ sense, whereby he is portrayed as an ‘inter-national’ mediator between the Concession Powers and China, and a national reformer towards future development and modernisation. His enduring presence on-site seems to require some ‘physical’ proof as well: the so-called Yuan Shikai Residence (most probably built several years after his death in 1916) has been staged in the style...
of a house museum next to other ‘prominent’ neighbours.

Further south, the photographic tour in 2018 culminated at the old trans-imperial contact zone between Austria-Hungary and Italy. This spot has been commodified through recent Chinese agency and for a primarily Chinese tourist industry into a global theme park of cultural heritage stereotypes imported from Florence and Vienna. In a transcultural sense, *Habsburgs going global* has come full circle in the name of the Austro-Hungarian concession: from an ambivalent history caught between national disinterest and local failure between 1902 and 1917 to an ambivalent heritage of close-to-fake one hundred years later.

Chinese translation by Dr. Channa Li, Institute for the Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia (IKGA), Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna.
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