

Museums and Nationalism: The Political Discourse of the National Palace Museum in Taiwan



Yu-jhen Chen¹

¹ Project Assistant, National Museum of Taiwan History

ミューズ(美神)に捧げた社殿、それがミュージアム(博物館)。しかし近代の国民国家にとって、博物館は民族(国家)意識の醸成に欠かせない政治的装置でもある。とりわけ北京(中国)と台湾にある「故宮」は政治と切っても切り離せない。

Abstract

This paper aims to explore the relationship between museum and nation-state and to examine the political discourses of museums which are utilized to build up nationalism. In the museum study, previous researchers pointed out that, a museum has been considered as a stage of nationalism for the power of exhibition and display. Nevertheless, when it comes to modern China, the development of the nation and national museum seems more convoluted. Therefore, by exploring the case of the National Palace Museum, this paper discusses the relationship between the museum and nation-building in modern China and analyzes the transition of the museum and the political discourse of nations it represents in post-war Taiwan.

Keywords

National Palace Museum; Nation-State; Exhibition; Expanding Nationalism

Introduction: Museums and Nation-States

In a brief historical retrospect of the museum, the English “museum” is originally from the Ancient Greek Μουσείον (Mouseion), which denotes a temple dedicated to the Muses, who is the patron divinity of the arts and knowledge in Greek mythology. In the fifteenth and sixteenth century, with the geographic development and colonial movement in Europe, collecting exotic artifacts and unusual natural objects had become popular among aristocrats and bourgeoisies. These private collections were often displayed in so-called wonder rooms or Wunderkammer (the cabinet of curiosities) that were precursors to museums.

In his groundbreaking Book, *The Birth of the Museum*, Tony Bennett examines the relation between exhibition and state power by exploring the development of the museum. He points out that the museum is a “distinctive vehicle for the display of

power” (1995:94). In the Renaissance period, the aristocrats and the merchant class built private museums that collect rare artifacts and masterpiece to demonstrate the power and distinguish their status from the plebeian. With the emergence of absolutism in the sixteenth century, royal museums came to function mainly as institutions designed to display monarchical power within the limited circles of the aristocracy. Then in the eighteenth century, the outbreak of the French Revolution destroyed the order of old regime and created a condition of emergence for a new institution: the public museum. In the name of popular sovereignty, the collections in royal houses shifted into the hands of all citizens. The museum had migrated from a private and exclusive sphere into the public field (Bennett, 1995: 90-95).

Publicization is regarded as the main characteristic of modern museums. The proliferation of public museums in the eighteenth and nineteenth century is undoubtedly closely connected with the formation of nation-states in Western Europe.

According to Ernest Gellner's definition, the nation-state is the idea that state and nation should be congruent; Nationalism is primarily a political principle, which strives to make culture square with polity, to endow "a culture with its own political roof, and not more than one roof at that." (1983: 39-52) Nation-state became a new political unit and developed the craft of ruling which was different from old regimes. When the cultural border was connected with political boundary, the museum played a more crucial role in the power of the state. As Bennett points out, while the public museum emerged in the republican spirit which indicated the self-rule of people, it functions as an instrument for the reform of public manners on behalf of the ruling class (1995: 99).

Another museologist Eilean Hooper-Greenhill uses the Foucault's concept of the disciplinary society and point out that the publicization of the museum after the French Revolution created the emergence of new technologies of behavior management. During the modern age, the museum, like the prison and the school in the classical age, became one of the apparatuses that embodies state power and created "docile bodies" through disciplinary technologies (1992: 167). With the new principles of scientific taxonomy and rationality, the museum allowed governors to reorganize and reclassify the collections and to create a new "reason and truth." She notes that the museum functions as an apparatus for the production of knowledge which serves the collective interests of the state rather than the education of people (1992: 174-190).

Also, Simon Knell elaborates the relation between the museum and the nation-state. He analogizes the museum with the theater and considers the national museum as a scenography or a stage for the performance of myth of nationhood. However, he points out that the museum could be a more powerful institute than the theater because people are led to believe that all around them has arrived objectively and all is as it seems to be these things are not merely props (2011: 8). The foundation of the Great British Museum in 1753 is an example of the national museums shaping the nationality. As Flora Kaplan suggests, in the museum, with the trophies from all over the world, the British proudly displayed the spoils of their colonial control of distant trade and markets. The museum could be understood as a place where shows the glory of the great empire on which the

sun never sets and where they define and redefine "themselves" as a nation (2011: 164-166).

Another example is the Louvre Museum. In Carol Duncan and Alan Wallach's essay, they discover the profoundly historical and political meaning in the birth of the Louvre Museum. After the French Revolution, the Louvre, which was a Royal Palace, turned into a museum belonging to all French people. As Duncan and Wallach point out, the exhibition in the Louvre subtly embodies the state and the ideology of the state. By categorizing the paintings and arranging artistic genius, the exhibition in the Louvre museum demonstrates a linear evolution of culture, from Greece, Rome and the Renaissance to France. The French grand tradition of paintings was juxtaposed with the Greco-Roman sculptures in the exhibition hall. No one visiting the Louvre Museum can miss the image: France is the true heir of classical civilization (1980: 448-469).

In his classic book, *Imagined Communities*, Benedict Anderson explores the origin and spread of nationalism. In the additional chapters in 1991, he specifically points out that there are three institutions of power shaping the way in which the colonial state imagined its dominion: the census, the map and the museum. When it comes to the museums, Anderson suggests that the museum and the museumizing imagination are both profoundly political. In the late colonial period in Southeast Asia, instead of the brutal conquest, colonial regimes strives to create alternative legitimacies. Therefore, through colonial archaeology and the "scientific" and "objective" exhibition, colonial rulers were able to classify and display almost everything in the state, including peoples, regions, religions, languages, products, monuments, and so forth, in their own context, to bound the realms and to elaborate the legitimacy of their ancestry (1991: 163-187).

The above remarkable works provide a deep insight into the political function of the museum and its relation between the nation-state. Nevertheless, when it comes to modern China, the development of nation and national museum seems more convoluted and different from the experience of nation-states in the Western. Therefore, this paper examines the development of the National Palace Museum, which is a world-renowned museum with a unique history and profound political meanings. It is worthy to note that there are two museums which have the same

name *Gu Gong* (old palace, 故宫) in Chinese-speaking countries. One is the National Palace Museum located in Taipei, Taiwan, and other is the famous Palace Museum in Beijing, China. This peculiar situation reflected the dilemma of the Chinese nation. Therefore, by exploring the case of the National Palace Museum, this paper discusses the relation between the museum and nation-building in China and analyzes the transition of the museum and the political discourse of nations it represents.

Imaging China: the Birth and the Transition of Chinese Nationalism

i. Constructing China: The birth of the Palace Museum in Beijing

After the Xinhai Revolution, the Republic of China (hereinafter referred to as “the ROC”) was formally established on 1 January 1912. Influenced by the concept of the nation from the Western world, the regime in China shifted from a traditional imperium into a modern “nation-state.” As a new nation-state, the ROC inherited the sovereign and the territory from the Qing Dynasty. However, the traditional imperial dynasty consisted of multiple ethnic groups, primarily including Han, Mongol and Muslim Chinese and Tibetan, not to mention the fact that Qing Dynasty was ruled by the Manchu who are the ethnic minority rising from the northeast China.

How to inherit the legacy and borders of the monarchy in the process of modern statization was crucial issues for the new nation-state. Therefore, a political term of *Zhonghua minzu* (Chinese nation, 中華民族) was invented. All the ethnic groups were narrated that they belonged to the *Zhonghua minzu* sharing a common history and destiny. The change of political slogans advocated by the Republicans can be good examples of the nation-building works. During the revolution period, the slogan of the revolutionary was “Expel the Manchus, restore Chinese rule, and establish a federal republic,” which regarded the Manchus rulers as invaders and needed to be exiled. However, as soon as the 1911 revolution succeeded in overthrowing the Qing Dynasty, the government of the ROC, composed mostly of the former members of the revolutionary party, converted to the principles of “*Five races under one union*” (五族共和) and emphasized the harmony of the five major ethnic groups in China. The Five-colored flag representing the Han (red), the

Manchus (yellow), the Mongols (blue), the “Hui” (Muslim Chinese) (white), and the Tibetans (black) was adopted as the nation flag of the ROC.

In the historical context of nation-building and regime change, Tsai Yuan-Pei and other Chinese intellectuals referring the example of the Louvre in France, the Winter Palace in Russia, and the Royal Museum in German suggested reconstructing the imperial palace into a national museum belonging to the Chinese nation (Song, 2013: 13-14). Therefore, after the expulsion of Pu-yi, the last emperor of China, from the Forbidden City in Beijing, the Committee for the Disposition of Qing Imperial Possessions started to make a comprehensive inventory of the articles in the imperial palaces. On 10th October 1925, the Palace Museum was established in the Forbidden City and opened to the public.

On the opening ceremony of the Palace Museum, Huang Fu, the former Premier of Cabinet, said in his speech:

Today is the Double Tenth Day, the National Day of the Republic of China, and will also become the anniversary day of the Palace Museum. We will celebrate them together. That is, damaging the museum is equal to damaging the Republic. We shall stand up and protect it (quoted in Na, 1966:17).

Huang Fu’s speech connected the Palace Museum with the ROC. Those who are against the museum are against the whole nation. He pointed out the foundation of the museum is closely tied to the construction of the ROC. Like the examples of European nation-states, the nationalist government displayed the imperial collections accumulated throughout the *Sung* (宋), *Yuan* (元), *Ming* (明) and *Qing* (清) dynasties. From an imperial legacy to a public asset, the collection of the National Palace Museum created the sharing imagination of Chinese culture and diminished the ethnic variance.

From the administrative level, it also shows the uniqueness of the Palace Museum to the nation. In 1928 after the end of the Northern Expedition, the Nationalist Government officially took over the Palace Museum in Beijing and promulgated the “Palace Museum Organization Statute.” In the Article 1, it appointed “The Palace Museum is responsible directly to the National Government.” Then in February 1934, after the establishment of the Executive Yuan, highest executive organ of the Nationalist Government, the museum turned into a subordinate of the

Executive Yuan (Na, 1957: 70). Unlike other government-funded museums usually answering to the Ministry of Education, the Palace Museum has been administered directly by the Executive Yuan since 1934; and its director is a cabinet member of the Executive Yuan as same as the Minister of Education. The important role which the Palace Museum plays in the ROC cannot be overestimated.

Furthermore, faced with the threat from foreign intrusions, the Palace Museum started an epic journey and, strengthened its connection with the nation-state as a result. The outbreak of the Manchurian Incident on September 18, 1931, marked the beginning of Japanese military expansion in China. Considering the precarious situation in northern China, the government decided to move the most important collections out of the Forbidden City. Starting from February 1933, those cultural relics traveled over 10,000 miles and almost 14 years before they moved back to Nanjing in 1947 (National Palace Museum, 1995: 140-141). The nationalist government has accomplished the task that the Japanese journalist Nojima Tsuyoshi called “The great relocation of cultural relics in the history of civilization.” (2012: 124)

As Nojima Tsuyoshi points out, during the Second Sino-Japanese War, the Palace Museum was sacralized through the toilsome journey (2012:20). Even though faced with the war of “*wang guo*” (lost country, 亡國), the government still spent a significant amount of time and energy moving the collections of the Palace Museum with the headquarters. When the southward plan was announced in the first place, many citizens in Beijing demonstrated against the plan and criticized for abandoning its people (Beiping Morning Post, 8 Feb. 1933). To reduce the rage of citizens, the nationalist government reply: “Those collections are national treasures that represent the cultural essences accumulated for thousands of years. They are vulnerable and unrecoverable. Once our culture destroyed, there is no hope to restore our nation.” (quoted in Na, 1966: 60) This government’s reply is the debut of the official discourse considering the collections of the Palace Museum as “national treasures.” The reply indicates that the collection of the Palace Museum is not only the public asset belonging to the nation but also an essential element for the sustainability of the nation-state. During the war, those relics were symbolized as the nation suffering for survival.

ii. Exhibiting China: The Chinese Art Treasures Exhibition in the United States

In June 1946 the Chinese Civil War began. In 1948 the combat between the Kuomintang (the Nationalist Party, 國民黨) and the Chinese Communist Party (CCP, 中國共產黨) armies took an adverse turn. The Central Government of the ROC which led by Kuomintang decided to transport the collections of the Palace Museum to Taiwan, again, on a top priority over the retreat of the military and officials (Wang, 2004). After shipped to Taiwan, to ensure the safety of the Museum’s collections, these artifacts were temporarily stored in the mountain of Wufeng, Taichung County.

After retreating to Taiwan, with military and economic assistance from the U.S., the Kuomintang government had established the “quasi-Leninist authoritarian regime,” which is a one-party dictatorship led by Chiang Kai-shek (Cheng, 1989: 471-480). Although the Chinese Civil War was suspended with the involvement of the US, in the Cold War framework, the civil war did not end for the both parties. As historian Lin Guoxian points out, the Kuomintang government was seeking for opportunities to fight back, so it rule in Taiwan in the 1950s was a “quasi war-time system.” (2004, 76) Based on military logic during the civil war, “*Fan gong da lu*” (to retake mainland China, 反攻大陸) became a basic political doctrine and an ultimate goal for the nation. As a result, the collections of the Palace Museum was reinterpreted by the Kuomintang government and was endowed with more political meanings than when they were in Beijing. Beyond Anderson’s theory, the museum came to function as an apparatus not only for imaging its dominion in the domestic level but also for demonstrating its legitimacy to others on the international scale. The Kuomintang government constructed a kind of expanding nationalism, which called for international recognition and contest with its rival.

Because of the defeat in the civil war, the Republic of China led by the Kuomintang government lost the main territories of China, and only controlled Taiwan Island and its surroundings. Based on the military forces, the territorial jurisdiction, the size of the population or other material condition, it was difficult for the Kuomintang to claim to be the legitimate government of “China.” Also, after the second Taiwan Strait crisis in 1958, under pressure from the US, the Kuomintang was forced to give

up its ambition to retake mainland China by military means. Although the Kuomintang did not change its ultimate goal, the principle means shifted from military to political ones (Chang, 2010: 41-42).

In the context of the civil war, the Palace Museum turned into a strong weapon for the Kuomintang to strike the communists and to claim its political legitimacy in China. In May 1961, the Joint Management Office, which was in charge of managing the museum's collections was invited to organize a major exhibition on the theme of "Chinese Art Treasures" in the United States. The Chinese Art Treasures exhibition circulated in Washington, New York, Boston, Chicago and San Francisco in the United States for a year.

When discussing the meaning of exhibition, Yu Jun-zhi, a cultural critic who participated in organizing the exhibition wrote:

Our nation is facing a crisis that has never happened in the past. Shen zhou (the old name for China, 神州) was fallen; the homeland was crumbled to pieces. Only understanding the true spirit of Chinese nation through the historical relics from our ancestors can save this crisis.What the totalitarian communist have done is far away from the spirit of "Tian-ren-he-yi" (the unity of heaven and men). They have humiliated our nation and our ancestors! As Sir Percival David said, the great masterpieces of Chinese art can only be bred in the land of freedom and civilization, and will never exist under the gray sky of totalitarianism! (1961:4-5)

Yu Jun-zhi's statement shows the political purpose of the exhibition. Instead of a simple cultural exchange, Yu Jun-zhi saw the exhibition as the only solution for the unprecedented national crisis. By emphasizing the connection between cultural legacy and political succession, he denied the legitimacy of the CCP in China and indicated that the Kuomintang government which possess the relics and antiquities from the ancestors was orthodox successors. Furthermore, Ye Gong-chao, the minister of foreign affairs who negotiated with the U.S. said when asked about the Chinese Art Treasures exhibition:

The president [Chiang Kai-shek] and I are looking forward to achieving this plan.....By this exhibition, we will show that not the Communists but we [the Nationalists] are the guardians of the great Chinese cultural heritages (quoted in Nojima, 2012: 158).

What Ye Gong-chao said corroborated Yu Jun-zhi's view

and made the official purpose of this exhibition clearer. The Kuomintang called itself as the protector of Chinese culture and considered the CCP as a destroyer. This statement actually inherited from the idea of nation-state since 1912 which considers the cultures relics imply or even equate the nation and its legitimacy. By holding an exhibition in the territory of its supporter, the Kuomintang tried to demonstrate to other countries not only the ownership of cultural relics but also the political legitimacy that those relics symbolized.

Imaging China on the Kuomintang's behalf, the exhibits were selected deliberately. One characteristic of those objects is "systematic." The Committee of Chinese Art Treasures Exhibition chose 253 masterpieces, including famous paintings, calligraphy works, bronze relics, porcelains, jade artifacts, curios, and so on (Central Daily News, 31 Jan.1991). The paintings accounted for the largest proportion. There were 112 traditional Chinese paintings on the exhibiting list. Besides the portability of objects, the reason why the painting was the majority of this exhibition was that paintings could display the Chinese history in a systemic context. The committee explicitly indicated that the collections of *wenrenhua* (literati painting, 文人畫) from the Palace Museum were so abundant that they can be displayed to show the longevity and continuity of Chinese art history (Chuang, 1961: 9).

Another feature of the exhibits is "orthodox." As the member of the exhibition committee, Tan Danjiong, pointed out, the porcelains selected for the were "completely orthodox", which means those porcelains were all from *yu yao* (imperial kilns, 御窯) or *guan yao* (official kilns, 官窯) and none of them from *ming yao* (folk kiln, 民窯). These were the collections which represent "the true spirit of our Chinese culture." (Central Daily News, 1 Feb.1991) As the Hooper-Greenhill suggests, those in power create a new truth and reason by reorganizing and reclassifying the collections in the exhibition. While the relics of the Palace Museum origin from the imperial collections, they were chosen and arranged to make a "systematic" and "orthodox" China visible and to support the claim that the Kuomintang was only legitimate government in China.

iii. Building up the Nationalist China: The Rebirth of the National Palace Museum in Taiwan

Inspired by the success of the exhibition tour in the U.S., the Kuomintang government, with the financial support from the U.S., made a decision to move the collections of the Palace Museum from remote mountain area to its temporary capital, Taipei. In 1965 the construction of the National Palace Museum in the Taipei suburb of Waishuanxi was completed. After sixteen years sealed in the mountain, those displaced collections of the Palace Museum finally were settled down and displayed in public again.

The “rebirth” of the National Palace Museum in Taipei has special meanings not only for the Kuomintang government but also for the Chinese nation that they have created since 1911. Although sharing many similarities with the old palace museum in Beijing, the new museum was endowed with different political meanings from the old one. To demonstrate the continuous legitimacy of the ROC, the architecture design of the new museum was in northern Chinese imperial style and referred to the Forbidden City. As Huang Bao-yu (黃寶瑜), the designer of the building, talked about the designing idea of the main hall: “When the sunshine enters the hall, it will create a 45-degree shadow. It will remind visitors of the *Wumen* (Meridian Gate, 午門, the main gate of the Forbidden City) in Peiping.” (Huang, 1966) The building of the new museum showed the Kuomintang’s ambition to summon the spirit of Chinese nation from the old palace and to claim the Chinese orthodoxy in Taiwan. The symbol of the old building called for the connection with the starting point of the Chinese nation and represented the expansion of the ROC.

However, the Kuomintang added extra elements to the “rebirth” of the Palace Museum in the Taipei. Compared with the image of the Forbidden City, the new museum was equipped with much more symbols of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the founding father of the ROC. The inauguration ceremony was held on November 12th which was the centenary of Dr. Sun Yat-sen’s birthday. Even the name of this new museum site was christened the “Chung-Shan Museum”(中山博物院) by the President Chiang Kai-shek in honor of Dr. Sun Yat-sen’s (Chung-Shan is the most popular of his Chinese first names).

In memory of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, there were many facilities

relating to Dr. Sun Yat-sen added in the Chung-Shan Museum. A bronze statue of Sun Yat-sen was placed in the great hall of the second floor. Then in 1967 the extension project phase 1 completed a paifang (memorial archway gate, 牌坊) which was identical with the Bo’ai archway gate in the Sun Yat-sen Mausoleum in Nanjing (Song, 2013:113-114). With the hundreds of stairs up to the museum, the spectator seemed to walk through pilgrimage road of the Sun Yat-sen Mausoleum.

The name and design put the new museum in a vague position and caused confusion both to visitors and the original faculty members. As Na Chih-liang, a senior member of the National Palace Museum, pointed out, due to the naming by Chiang Kai-shek, the National Palace Museum changed “from a homeowner to a tenant” (1993:223). However, those symbol of Sun Yat-sen, in fact, reflected the transition of the Kuomintang’s discourse of the Palace Museum and the Chinese Nation that the museum represented. Following the strategy of the exhibition tour in the U.S., the Kuomintang had elaborated the discourses of the museum to display its legitimacy and strike the CCP.

One main discourse is about orthodoxy. By combining the image of Dr. Sun Yat-sen with the National Palace Museum, the Kuomintang constructed a new discourse of Chinese nationalism which emphasized the relation between the cultural orthodoxy and political legitimacy. According to Chiang Kai-shek, Dr. Sun Yat-sen, who established the ROC is the true heir of Chinese sages, inheriting from Yao, Shun, Yu, Tang Wang, Yi Yin, Wang Ji, Wen Wang, Wu Wang to Zhou Gong, and he entrusted the ROC to the Kuomintang (1954: 150). Therefore, to construct a linear orthodoxy in China and undergird its legitimacy in China, the commemoration of Dr. Sun Yat-sen become a crucial element in the National Palace Museum.

The other discourse is about the moral dimension of the Chinese nation. The Kuomintang accused the communist’s propositions, such as historical materialism and class struggle and proletarian internationalism, of destroying the Chinese traditional ethics and virtue (Hsiau, 1991: 92). In 1966, the Cultural Revolution movement broke out and called to destroy the *si jiu* (Four Old, 四舊) which were Old Customs, Old Culture, Old Habits, and Old Ideas. The anti-communist war turned into a combat of culture and morality. As a result, when talking about Chinese culture, the Kuomintang emphasized specific moral

values. For example, *siwei bade* (Four Anchors and Eight Virtues, 四維八德)¹ became a characteristic of the Chinese nation. What is more, Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles [People's nationalism, People's Democracy, People's Livelihood] was regarded as the core of Chinese culture.

In addition to the architecture symbols, the Kuomintang's discourse and new imagination of Chinese nation were demonstrated in the exhibition of the National Palace Museum. As the director of the National Palace Museum, Chiang Fu-tung said:

An abstract concept is easily forgotten and ignored, so we need the visible objects or artifacts to testify. The ten thousands of historical relics in the National Palace Museum are the best witnesses and evidence (Chiang, 1977:52-53).

In January 1967 the National Palace Museum hold the "Exhibition of Chinese orthodoxy", exhibiting *li dai sheng xian hua xiang* (the portraits of sages in Chinese history, 歷代聖賢畫像), *ling yan ge er shi si gong chen xiang* (the Lingyan Pavilion's portraits of 24 loyal officials, 凌煙閣二十四功臣像), *er shi si xiao tu* (24 filial piety, 二十四孝圖) and other collections which represented Chinese orthodoxy and the traditional virtues. The organizer of the exhibition especially pointed out that those relics were displayed on the principle of Dr. Sun Yat-seng's theory (Central Daily News, 1 Jan.1967). By underscoring of the moral dimension of the Chinese nation, the Kuomintang criticized and repudiated the legitimacy of the CCP. Besides, in the exhibition, the manuscript of Chiang Kai-shek was consciously juxtaposed with Dr. Sun Yat-seng's work which was displayed after the portraits of Chinese sages (Central Daily News, 27 Jan.1967). The linear orthodoxy in China which Chiang Kai-shek claimed were clearly presented in the exhibition as real as an undeniable truth.

In the context of anti-communist, the Kuomintang built up a specific nationalism while reconstructing the Palace Museum in Taiwan. The discourse of Chinese nation has added the element of a great person and moral doctrines to demonstrate culture orthodoxy and political legitimacy of the Kuomintang. The relics of the National Palace Museum became more like "nationalist's treasures" than "national treasures."

Conclusion

This paper analyzes the development of the National Palace Museum. From the establishing in Beijing, relocating around the mainland, and finally reconstructing in Taipei, the National Palace Museum represents different political meanings in different periods and demonstrates the transition of the Chinese nation. Following the step of European nation-states, the museum was established as an apparatus for creating the imagination that unifies the different ethnic groups into one "nation." Through museumization, the relics from imperial collections became "national treasures" symbolizing the new nation.

As Anderson suggests, by arranging the exhibits in particular order, the museum assists nations to imagine their dominion and to elaborate the legitimacy of their ancestry. However, he and other scholars above primarily focus on the internal construction of a nation. This case study of the National Palace Museum indicates that the museum can also function as an apparatus for demonstrating nations to other countries. The image of a nation is shaped not only by the domestic rulers but by the international rivals. In the context of anti-communist, the Kuomintang shows the external function of the museum on the exhibition tour in the U.S. By exhibiting the "systematic" and "orthodox" collections, the Kuomintang claim the legitimacy in China to its alliance.

Furthermore, the "rebirth" of the National Palace Museum in Taipei elaborates the transition of the Chinese nation. On the one hand, the new museum emphasizes the linkage with the old palace museum in Beijing to demonstrate the continuity of the ROC. On the other hand, the new museum was endowed with more political meaning in the context of the Kuomintang's rule in Taiwan. In contrast to the old museum in Beijing, the National Palace Museum has added new elements. The symbols of Dr. Sun Yat-sen was coded in the museum to demonstrate the cultural orthodoxy and political legitimacy, and the moral doctrines of the Kuomintang was displayed in the exhibition to undermine the legitimacy of the CCP. By the display in National Palace Museum, the Kuomintang in 1960s created a "nationalist" image of the Chinese nation and an expanding nationalism.

¹ *Siwei* are propriety(禮), righteousness(義), a sense of honor(廉), and a sense of shame(恥); *bade* are loyalty(忠), filial piety(孝), benevolence(仁), love(愛), faithfulness(信), justice(義), peace(和) and harmony(平).

References

- 1) Anderson, Benedict (1991) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London; New York: Verso Books.
- 2) Bennett, Tony (1995) *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*. London; New York: Routledge.
- 3) Chang, Su-ya (2010) The Second Taiwan Strait Crisis and “Return to the Mainland” Propaganda [Chinese]. *Bulletin of the Institute of Modern History*. Taipei: Academia Sinica.
- 4) Cheng, Tun-jen (1989) Democratizing the quasi-Leninist regime in Taiwan. *World Politics* 41(4): 471-499.
- 5) Chiang, Fu-tsung (1977) Gu gong bo wu yuan yu zhong hua wen hua fu xing yun dong [*The National Palace Museum and the Chinese Cultural Renaissance Movement*]. Taipei: Taiwan Commercial Press.
- 6) Chiang, Kai-shek (1954) Zong tong jin nian lai guan yu jiao yu wen hua de xun shi. Taipei: Taiwan Provincial Education Department.
- 7) Chuang, Shang-yan (1961) Fu mei zhan lan ming hua zhi zhen xuan ji qi yi yi [*The Selecting Process of Renowned Paintings for the U.S. Exhibition and Its Meaning*] Zhongguo gu yi shu pin fu Mei zhan lan zhuan kan. Taipei: Wen xing za zhi she, pp. 9-11.
- 8) Duncan, Carol, & Wallach, Alan (1980) The universal survey museum. *Art History* 3(4): 448-469.
- 9) Gellner, Ernest (1983) *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- 10) Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean (1992) *Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge*. London; New York: Routledge.
- 11) Hsiao, A-chin (1991) *The Cultural and Moral Discourses of the Kuomintang Regime(1934-1991): An Analysis of Sociology of Knowledge* [Chinese]. Taipei: National Taiwan University.
- 12) Huang, Bao-yu (1966) zhong shan bo wu yuan zhi jian zhu [*The Architecture of the Chung-Shan Museum*]. *National Palace Museum Quarterly* 1(1): 69-78.
- 13) Kaplan, Flora (2011) Making and Remaking National Identities. In S. Macdonald (Ed.), *A Companion to Museum Studies*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 152-169.
- 14) Knell, Simon (2011) National Museums and the National Imagination. In Knell, Simon e. al (Ed.), *National Museums: New Studies from around the World*. New York: Routledge, pp. 3-28.
- 15) Lin, Guoxian (2004) Zhan hou tai wan tong zhi ti zhi de zai si kao: Wei quan ti zhi de li lun yu shi yong [*Rethink the Ruling System in Post-war Taiwan: Theories and Applications of Authoritarian Regime*]. *Formosan Study* (13): 45-88.
- 16) Na Chih-liang (1993) Dian shou gu gong guo bao qi shi nian [*Seventy Years in the National Palace Museum*]. Taipei: Taiwan Commercial Press.
- 17) Na Chih-liang (1957) Gu gong bo wu yuan san shi nian zhi jing guo [*Thirty-Year History of the National Palace Museum*]. Taipei: Taiwan Commercial Press.
- 18) Na Chih-liang (1966) Gu gong si shi nian [*Forty-Year History of the National Palace Museum*]. Taipei: Taiwan Commercial Press.
- 19) National Palace Museum (1995) Gu gong qi shi nian xing shuang [*Seventy-Year History of the National Palace Museum*]. Taipei: Taiwan Commercial Press.
- 20) Nojima, Tsuyoshi (2012). *The Separation and Reunion of the Two Palace Museums* [Chinese]. Taipei: Linking Publishing.
- 21) Song, Zhao-lin (Ed.) (2013) Gu gong yuan shi liu zhen [*The History of the National Palace Museum*]. Taipei: National Palace Museum.
- 22) Wang, Horng-Luen (2004) National Culture and Its Discontents: The Politics of Heritage and Language in Taiwan, 1949-2003. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 46(4): 768-815.
- 23) Yu, Junzhi. 1961. Wen hua jiao liu yu tian ren he yi: Lun zhong guo gu yi shu pin fu mei zhan lan de shi dai yi yi [Cultural Exchange and “Tian-ren-he-yi”: On the meanings of the Chinese Art Exhibition Tour in United State]. Zhongguo gu yi shu pin fu Mei zhan lan zhuan kan. Taipei: Wen xing za zhi she, pp. 4-5.