Abstract: Founded in 1872, the Budapest Museum of Ethnography is an institution that is simultaneously national and international in scope, focusing on phenomena both historical, and contemporary. The museum boasts a collection of national ethnographic material of outstanding value, as well as collections of ceramics, textiles, and clothing that are among the largest of their type on the continent. Though the significance of the museum’s various social and scientific pursuits is beyond dispute, the institution has never operated within a facility constructed with its essential functionality and particular needs and requirements in mind. Currently underway, however, is a project that will put into place the conditions required for effecting the very necessary relocation of the museum to the Budapest City Park. Planning and preparatory work on the project were begun more than three years ago, in parallel with the development of the concept for the new facility. The present study summarizes the most important elements of that concept and discusses the specifics of the winning design.
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Recent times have seen considerable dialogue regarding the changing role of museums, a conversation that has not been limited to professional circles. As far as the general public is concerned, it may be said that opinions thus far have been guided more by prejudice, than by logical evaluation. One idea that has gained increasing acceptance is that, from the standpoint of their function as public services, such institutions constitute living sources of societal knowledge, and should therefore react openly to contemporary phenomena. Related to this is the concept of problem sensitivity, which it is said must be made to exert a fundamental influence on museum activities. Indeed, it is held as evident in both domestic and foreign professional forums that a museum’s mission must be continually adapted to reflect the prevailing social, economic, and scientific framework, and the signs involved in this carefully read (Rentzhog 2007).

In the more fortunate cases, museum activities function together as an interdependent system. In Hungary, as elsewhere, the word “museum” offers a guarantee of authenticity and intellectual credibility in the way an institution conducts its mission, and because
reliability is part of a museum’s image, every role undertaken is given careful attention. Museum exhibitions, for their part, are the fundamental tools by which modern systems of knowledge are re-ordered and embedded into socio-political worldviews (Kôreff 2003:10). In the age of virtual worlds, the individuality and distinctiveness that help a museum accomplish its various objectives reside in the institution’s real-world nature: the museum is a safe, physical environment in which real people meet, spend time together, and have real-world conversations (Kômecsi 2010:171). Still, given the disintegration of classic frameworks of interpretation, narratives that used to provide credible answers no longer do so. In the 21st century, the key pillars upon which museum activities must rest are credibility and authenticity anchored in rigorous professional standards, coupled with the relevance of questions addressed (Kômecsi 2010:102). Consistent, rigorous professional activity that is both problem-sensitive, and capable of reacting to current events must be permitted to flourish, regardless of the principles by which institutional strategy is set (Kêmecsi 2013a: 126–127). Scientific studies into the conditions at modern museums show that in general, while public funding for museums has decreased, visitor expectations continue to grow, a situation that has prompted many museums to pursue new activities in order to increase revenues, expand visitor attractions, draw attention to new developments, and underscore institutional individuality. Clearly, it is a process that impedes museums in assuming their role as places of true scientific advancement. Recent times have seen new methods added to conventional ones, and the findings as they relate to documented lifestyle changes must be compared to those found with other social sciences (Nôgô Bôngô 2014:119–219).

The Budapest Museum of Ethnography is simultaneously a national and universal, historical and contemporary institution, which – founded in 1872 – houses within a single, unified framework ethnographic/ethnological material encompassing not only ethnic Magyars and other groups living in Hungary, but also European and even non-European peoples. The museum’s collections number over 250,000 artefacts, one quarter of which are international in nature. The institution also operates one of the discipline’s largest archives, home to several million pages of archive material, more than 400,000 images, and a substantial body of audio material and film. The Museum of Ethnography Library, too, boasts material to rival that of any institution in Europe. Of the museum’s traditional national ethnographic holdings, its international-standard ceramics, textiles, and clothing collections are the largest of their type on the continent. And while this information makes clear the social and scientific significance of the institution’s activities, still, the museum has never occupied a building constructed with its particular functions and needs in mind. Though it is not the place of this study to provide a detailed summary of the history of the institution, such histories have already been written and are readily available elsewhere (Fejôs 2000, Grânaszûtôi et al. 2012).

Guiding the relocation of the institution, which currently operates from a building opposite the Hungarian Parliament on Kossuth square in Budapest, are the current concept devised for the development of the Budapest City Park and a number of government decrees that have been passed toward its funding and implementation.¹ In fact, one of the key elements of the project, deemed to be of considerable importance not only culturally,
but also from the standpoint of tourism, is that conditions be put into place that permit
the creation of a new location for the Museum of Ethnography within the City Park
development. Preparations for the move have been underway for over three years now,
in parallel with ongoing work on the concept itself. Steps completed successfully to
date include a relocation design competition, by which the location for the museum’s
new building was established, and – coming to a close at the time this study was written
– adjudication of submissions to an international invitation-only call for proposals
pertaining to the design of the new museum building (JELINEK 2015; KOVÁCS 2015), the
winner of which was Napur Architect Kft. At the same time, significant advancement has
also been made on the design of the complex to be constructed in Szabolcs street, whose
purpose is to provide a modern facility for the institution’s storage and restoration needs.2
In the sections below, I will strive to give a succinct summary of both the individual
elements of the concept for the new Museum of Ethnography, and of what has been
expressed so far regarding the building’s actual construction.

One of the first and fundamental tasks in developing a concept for the new museum
was to compose an institutional mission statement. Having reviewed both the scant
number of existing domestic examples, and the international situation, the museum’s
scientific staff worked together to conceive, draft, and accept a formal declaration of the
museum’s mission:

As one of the earliest ethnographic museums in Europe, the Museum of Ethnography has been
collecting, archiving, preserving, researching, and transmitting the traditional and modern
cultural artefacts of Hungarian, European, and world communities since 1872. The museum is
a collection of objects, images, textual material, audio recordings, and thoughts that serves as
a rich and multi-faceted resource for learning about the world. As a social history museum, the
Museum of Ethnography is a place to reflect on, study, and exhibit the manifestations of material
culture past and present, as well as of various social phenomena. It is also the determining
Hungarian institution in – and primary museological laboratory for – the fields of ethnography,
European ethnology, and cultural anthropology. Given its excellent collections and the amassed
knowledge it represents, the museum may be viewed as a point of departure for both other
sciences, and the arts, in comprehending, accepting, and respecting cultural memory, cultural
diversity, and changing identities. The concordance of knowledge and experience creates an
opportunity to give expression to community and individual interpretations and relationships.3

As a social science museum, the Museum of Ethnography is concerned primarily
with everyday life and the movements of society, areas of inquiry that apply equally
to past and present, seeking to incorporate its knowledge and experiences into the
museum’s presentational apparatus with a view to its commitment to society. Museums
are storehouses of temporality, places where historical traditions are both amassed, and
projected into the future. They are the archives both of the human past, and of what is to
come. If the two are not connected, that is, if a museum remains nothing more than an
assemblage of archives and projections, then it loses its ties to life and becomes a cultural

2 SÁSVÁRI – VASÁROS 2014. Project implementation has begun with the commencement of underground
construction work.
mausoleum, rather than a tool for communication. It is the task of museums to connect living culture and present practice to cultural heritage – and to do so in numerous areas of human experience (CASTELLS 2012: 37–38). The modern museum is not a museum of unique truth, but one of complex, multifaceted collections, a forum for alternatives and for the posing of questions. Indeed, one of the principal messages conveyed by modern museum architecture is that of the museum as a modern cultural context, or place of gathering (GYÖRGY 2003:20, 122). It is a message the winning architectural design for the Museum of Ethnography’s new building successfully conveys in accordance with the expectations the institution itself has expressed.

The new Museum of Ethnography hopes to put its rich and various collections to good use, while taking an approach that is in line with modern international trends, while also employing the latest in museographic techniques. The new institution builds emphatically on cooperation with the public, as well as on the principles of openness, social responsibility, and sustainability. The same principles are represented by the layout requirements imposed on the design process – requirements based largely on experiences with the current state of affairs. Indeed, the move represents not merely a relocation, but rather an all-encompassing overhaul – a complete re-thinking, as it were – of the existing institution. The new Museum of Ethnography must transcend its current limits and disengage itself from the inauspicious compromises associated with its current operating conditions.

The concept reflected in the design of the new, modern museum building has been substantially shaped by international trends and experience. Until now, work regarding the relationship between museum and building, or museum and architecture, was limited for the most part to international preliminary studies. In the past two decades, too, several international architectural journals have issued special edition publications dealing specifically with museum architecture. In recent years, prompted by a growing interest on the part of the Hungarian public, even some domestic studies have touched upon the subject, though not by any measure exhaustively. In indication of this tendency, the textbooks used in architectural classes at Hungarian universities, unlike those of former times, now include a separate chapter on this area of the discipline (CsÁGOLY 2004). It is crucial, therefore, that the questions and answers we now express with regard to the Museum of Ethnography be composed in the knowledge of both the international professional literature and of concrete institutions, actors, agents, and concepts, and that this knowledge be applied rigorously.

Historically speaking, by the 20th century, museums had become overt means of indoctrination by states that, as backing organizations, found institutions with public collections to be excellent channels for the promotion of contemporary state programs (ÉBLI 2005:49). Part of the reason for this was that museums function as communications protocols, intermediating between various identities, and connecting science and knowledge to various temporalities. Museums can additionally serve as links between the global and local dimensions of identity, space, and society (CASTELLS 2012:41–42). Architecture, for its part, is perhaps the most conspicuous – if somewhat inconsistent – element in this success story. Museum collections and buildings regularly redefine
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Each other. The museum world clearly benefits both from competition, and from the lack of an overarching architectural trend in the sector. It is also clear, however, that the “secularized temples” of former times have today become destinations for cultural tourism – not in small part for the recent renaissance in museum architecture.

What often goes unstressed in various analyses are the problems surrounding museum funding and building operation, even if it is always harder to cover the costs of operations than it is to fund large construction projects; and intensive museum expansion – booms in the industry – frequently spawn architectural wonders built with funds from state or private coffers whose day-to-day operating costs are a considerably less attractive financial target for potential donors. The prestige associated with helping to operate an institution is not equal to that of a contribution toward construction. And ultimately, what draws in the visitor – whether compelled or inspired to consumption – is the exhibition or attraction. Also neglected by treatises on various star specimens of museum architecture is an evaluation of institutional functionality, despite a focus within the professional literature on the two sides of museum operation – the visitor side and the institutional side – and on a healthy relationship between them as one of the secrets to a museum building’s long-term success. The visitor side comprises the reception, visitor service, and exhibition zones, the institutional side areas dedicated to administration, research, artefact restoration, storage, and maintenance. Also, the operating trends currently seen as successful place museum shops and hospitality industry (e.g. food service) areas in a position of fundamental importance (Kémecsi 2010:171).

The principles and trends described succinctly above are precisely those by which the conceptual design process for the Museum of Ethnography’s new building was begun and now proceeds. Based on previous plans and preliminary surveys, the institution’s total floor space requirement amounts to nearly 29,000 square meters. Currently accepted international museum architectural standards generally allot 40% of this space for the storage of artefacts, another 40% for exhibitions and visitor service spaces, and 20% for work rooms, building services, and building engineering functions. This basic distribution has, in the Museum of Ethnography’s particular case, been somewhat modified to suit the architectural concept of splitting the institution between a storage complex (to be located in Szabolcs street) and separate museum building (to be constructed in the City Park), as some (if not all) points of infrastructure must clearly be installed in both the buildings in question (Kémecsi 2013b:2). Of course, placement of the collections that serve as the institution’s fundamental credentials is a matter of extremely high priority. A reordering of museum storerooms will take place in parallel with the moving process, and the current system of grouping by place of collection/geographic association will be replaced by a system based partially on artefact size and material. The design of new, state-of-the-art storage systems will be conducted with a view to the optimal use of space, adherence to safety regulations, and artefact conservation requirements. Of decisive importance from the standpoint of the institution’s future is that the design of the new storage facility takes foreseeable collection expansion into account (Sasvári – Vasáros 2014:34–45). Certainly, a modern institution constructed with 21st century needs in mind can operate using a storage system that separates articles according to material, as with digital inventory management systems, it is no longer necessary to keep artefacts of a single museal/geographic/thematic type, but different materials, physically together. In this way, research may be safely conducted using digital information on
artefacts, while the artefacts themselves are stored under circumstances that are ideal from the standpoint of conservation.

Every museum has its own individual profile and offers its own unique, incomparable encounter with objects of the past, an “object competency” that if used to advantage, can help an institution to do its part in broadening the historical and cultural knowledge of modern humanity. In its work in coming years, the Museum of Ethnography, too, wishes to focus on the transmission of scientific knowledge in all its stratified complexity. Though every discipline needs, of course, to redefine its objectives from time to time, and to rejuvenate the methods and approaches it employs, European ethnography must continue to view the diachronic approach (that which regards the present as a temporal plane that slides quickly into the past) as a strength worth preserving. Thus, just as we urge that methodical study of the present be strengthened, we cannot forget that contemporary events are part of a historical process. In analyzing and interpreting material, the diachronic approach will continue to be of decisive importance, and archives everywhere, including those of the Museum of Ethnography, will offer ethnographers an inexhaustible source of material for decades to come (Paládi-Kovács 2005:5).

Another development of recent years has been a quickening of the pace of analyses of the processes that shape museum collections, while the methodology applied to collection interpretation, too, has received new weight. This has occurred despite a perceptible international “trend” toward radical debate of the system of relationships between museums and their collections, and even the postulation of a place for museums with no collections at all. Some have even suggested (for the time being only outside Hungary) that museums today renounce the “conventional” formula of permanent and temporary exhibitions, to be replaced by a building designed by a star architect – a distinctive, even exhibition-free structure housing a fashionable restaurant in lieu of artefacts and displays (Kléálárág 2010:169). What is envisioned is a process leading from buildings constructed to preserve artefacts to buildings that may be regarded as artefacts themselves.

Clearly, the past few years have constituted a turning point in the realization of the prevailing museum paradigm. According to the principles espoused by “New Collecting,” museums should amass not artefacts, but interactions, taking part in the community of cultural heritage as equal partners and serving as platforms where individuals and groups collect their own heritage (Meijer – Van Mensch 2012:123–126). In this model, museums cooperate with audiences as co-curators through what the discourse on new heritage refers to as co-creation and shared curatorial practice. As such processes reach fruition, the focus of contemporary museology moves from actual collecting to collection development. The history of museums is a history of institutionalization. The change in attitude toward the system of collection – the recognition of the utilitarian value of collections and in relation to it, of the mission of the institution – has been a century-long process. Now, in the 21st century, a new model for museum operation has begun to spread, a model involving processes and procedures whose key words are participation and co-creation (Meijer – Van Mensch 2012:97). Yet collections are of fundamental importance to museums. Sir David Wilson, former director of the British Museum, summarizes his own decisive opinion in the following terms: “A museum which does not collect is a dead museum” (Keene 1999:25).

Begun as a result of cultural political decisions, the process that precedes the relocation of the Museum of Ethnography clearly comes with – among other things
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the opportunity of instituting a number of structural changes. Given the institution’s commitment to a collection-centric design, an integral part of this must consist in the refinement and concrete expression of an institutional collection strategy.

The highly complex collections of the Museum of Ethnography require similarly complex and specialized conservation efforts. The varied properties of the different materials involved require that the planned new site feature a separate, specialized restoration facility (KEMECSEI 2013a:32). The two most important, extraordinarily complex professional tasks the new center must accomplish are the state-of-the-art, secure storage of the museum’s collections, including such collection management and inventory record-keeping as this entails, and the conservation – or to use the more commonplace, generalized term, the restoration – of a set of artefacts with a uniquely complex set of attributes. Ethnographic collections by nature require special storage and restoration techniques. Of critical importance for a 21st century project of this type is that the complex be operated appropriately and sustainably, that ecological and energy management considerations be addressed, and that a maximum level of security be ensured. Artefact environmental conditions, too, may be brought into line with building engineering solutions that regulate humidity and temperature and indeed, this should be seen as a particular design challenge (KEMECSEI 2013a:32).

In terms of content and methodology, development of the outward appearance and grounds of the new City Park building rests on the twin pillars of the museum’s holdings and its scientific and social mission. As a social science museum, the Museum of Ethnography is concerned primarily with everyday life and the movements of society, incorporating its experience and knowledge of these – with regard to both past, and present – into its presentational apparatus, with emphasis on its social commitment. Thus, the new building cannot reflect early museum metaphors that presented culture as an enclosed, hierarchalised, segregated world. The new Museum of Ethnography is a gathering place in which public and private, the globally known and the locally valued, the general and the special/individual all find a place. An institution constructed with such a concept in mind attracts and captivates visitors using the architectural means of openness and transparency. The ideal building opts for a mode of speech and language of form that gives priority to the changing, moving world, while also offering a solid frame of reference for thinking that leads to understanding – for a space that is specially crafted and architecturally structured for these purposes.

With a total of 31,000 square meters in floor space, the new building in the City Park offers the Museum of Ethnography the opportunity of introducing previously unworkable presentational solutions and visitor-friendly functions. Playing a key role in the new museum are high-visibility, study-access storerooms that are physically linked to visitor areas, whose creation is justified not only by conservation considerations, but also, given the exceptional, international-standard quality of the museum’s collections, by the conspicuously improved access they will provide. The Viewable Storage Area that functions as part of the permanent exhibition serves to highlight both how broadly the collection can be interpreted, and how it connects to the various aspects of culture (lifestyle, utility, ornamentation, style, everyday vs. festival, etc.) with which the museum is concerned.

Essential to the layout of the future museum building is that it not be constructed to house a single permanent exhibition; rather, the designers should think in terms of changeable, mobile spaces as determined by the museum’s mission. One particularly
important criterion in the design of the new building is improved viewability of the institution’s exceptionally valuable holdings, a goal achieved through expanded exhibition space. In addition to its conventional exhibitions, the Museum of Ethnography will be able to expand the offerings of the museum quarter of the park through the organization of living culture events. Given its international orientation, the museum may even serve as a node for performances by foreign acts visiting Hungary, who may in turn function as mediators of global cultural diversity for Hungarian audiences. For this reason, space must be made within the museum for a high-tech performance and concert hall, a feature that may well prove one of the major attractive forces the institution has to offer.

Ensuring that the museum fulfils its role as a center for scientific study are both a new library, and a number of auxiliary areas to be employed in the service of conferences and research. Also integral to the institution’s state-of-the-art operations are various means of comprehensive, open, indirect access, such as are represented by the range of publications, reproduction artefacts, and products available in the museum shop. Important visitor activities will include museum education workshops, courses of instruction, and other learning opportunities, with visitor activities of all types supported at a fundamental level through consumer services and other comforts. Given the Museum of Ethnography’s status as a hub of ethnographic study, researchers – who form a special subgroup of the museum’s visitors – regularly seek out the museum both for its collections (artefacts and documents), and its library. The museum’s Ethnology Archive is the largest archive on folk culture in the country, whose collections and various catalogues may be accessed by anyone possessing the proper research permit. Access to collection holdings within research areas is fast and direct in a manner comparable to library use.

The Museum of Ethnography is committed to providing its youngest visitors with lasting experiences in the form of programs that expressly address their interests, held in an appropriately inspiring environment, in this case, a special “Children’s Museum”.5 In terms of content, this museum will focus on taking an ethnographic approach to culture (and in particular children’s culture) past and present through presentations of topics of both Hungarian and international scope. Children’s exhibitions will permit the exploration of various systems of relationships and will inspire comparison, resulting in the identification of parallels and differences.

The building’s modern, visitor-friendly spaces and varied functionality will aid the museum in fulfilling its true mission as a social institution. In addition to the hope and expectation of an expanded visitorship, the project will promote the development of a denser network of societal connections and, at the same time, of an institution that is more deeply socially embedded. By nature, the Museum of Ethnography – alone among Hungarian ethnography museums – boasts not local, but societal character and context. Accordingly, the planned development project will be of decisive import in terms of its repositioning.

5 Serving as inspiration for the interior design and program offerings of this novel institution – unprecedented in Hungary – are the Please Touch Museum (Philadelphia, USA), winner of the 2013 Children’s Museum Award, the Kindermuseum (Vienna, Austria), the Tropenmuseum Junior (Amsterdam, the Netherlands), and the Joods Historisch Kindermuseum (Amsterdam, the Netherlands).
The strongest element of the Museum of Ethnography’s identity is its historical heritage – its collections. The museum’s mission is to carry on that heritage, an activity that will, in and of itself, create an opportunity of discussing its particular subject matter – that of culture and society, together with all the day-to-day and popular phenomena they entail – comprehensively and with a nod to those on the international stage. It is capable of offering its audiences in a manner that is simultaneously modern, open to the present, generally comprehensible, and interactive, producing a discursive relationship not only with those audiences, but also with other institutions operating in the same space. Thus, the new Museum of Ethnography is the interpretation of a complex thought in building form, capable of showing cultures engaged in dynamic dialogue. Currently in the design phase, the new building will enable the museum to move past conventional categories and to present – via a comprehensive permanent/semi-permanent/temporary exhibition – the diversity of human culture; to juxtapose the material cultures of traditional societies with the universe of modern customs and material contexts of today. The museum’s collection of artefacts is not only a Hungarian national treasure, but an asset of international import. Thus, the new building design will be expected to give maximum consideration to artefact safety and security and to provide optimal conditions for artefact display, storage, and handling. The Museum of Ethnography is an institution founded on 19th century principles, one that views its traditions with pride, but that at the same time seeks both to meet the challenges presented here and now, in the 21st century, and to study, and promote public engagement with, the society of today. As it is planned, the new building will not archaize, but keep perfectly in step with its own age, reflecting the institution’s progressive mode of thought. At the same time, the building’s outward appearance and interior design will allude to the museum’s traditional subject matter and guiding principles, expressing the conclusions this brings to bear in the language of – and using the tools afforded by – contemporary society in a carefully thought out, yet easily comprehensible fashion, communicated through contemporary architecture.

For the Museum of Ethnography, as it opens its doors on this new space, one of the most important roles it has to play is that of carrying heritage on into the future, complemented by the expression of new research and exhibition themes and perspectives. The act of thinking within the historical context in modern times is rendered complete through the understanding and exhibition of contemporary global processes. In this way, the new Museum of Ethnography, building upon what it has achieved to date and then taking those successes a step further, will add to the Hungarian network of museal institutions a new type of museum in which ethnographic museology becomes both a sensitive contact zone, and a hub of intercultural activity.
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