Markian Prokopovych

Governing Taste: Fin-de-siècle Cracow, its Museums and the Urban Elite in the Shaping of the Modern Metropolis

(Accepted Manuscript)

Tony Bennett famously put museums of art 'at the centre of cities… as embodiments, both material and symbolic, of a power to "show and tell" which, in being deployed in a newly constituted open and public space, sought rhetorically to incorporate the people within the processes of the state'.[1] Bennett analysed how through the 'exhibitionary complex' – a set of specific architectural and exhibition practices aiming to regulate the public, its attendance and behaviour – museums became part the modern state's 'soft' approach in promoting its own version of art and culture which, effectively combined with 'hard' disciplinary and schooling institutions, contributed to the creation of governable populations. He emphasised the role of new architecture and modern spectacle, and the experience of seeing and being seen, through which museums and exhibition grounds integrated the population, as audience and as consumers, into the workings and ideologies of the nation state. Echoing the work of Carol Duncan and others, Bennett offered the Louvre as an ultimate archetype of such public museum institution.[2] Though the term 'governmentality' was not used, just as with Bennett's approach in general he offered an example of how the Louvre could be understood as part of top-down government policies to produce new dedicated citizens.

Paradigmatic as the Louvre may seem, its example is rather exceptional in its sheer centrality to France's political project and the almost unilateral control of the central political authority over its functioning. What was the role and power of smaller cities in the making of their museums apart from being mere locations or functioning as an extension of the central power? What were the limits of the 'exhibitionary complex' in places outside Bennett's largely Franco-Anglo-American-Australian analysis, especially in places where nation and state were not even in the *process* of becoming synonymous and where architecture and spectacle were employed, first of all, to glorify the empire? Did the involvement of municipal authorities and local elites there facilitate, or challenge, the successful workings of museums on the local populations? Were all museums in one city effective to the same measure and what evidence could be brought in to

support the claim that the population was actually becoming more disciplined as a *result* of visiting the museum?

Concerned with these questions, this study looks closely at the agendas and aspirations of those involved in Cracow's museums that went beyond the imperial and the national project, and at governance practices that involved a larger scope of actors.[3] It argues that the applicability of Bennett's theory to museums in smaller but culturally important European cities that were not imperial capitals at the time, such as Cracow in the Habsburg Empire, needs to be reassessed. It follows a strain of critical revision of the 'exhibitionary complex' that explores the discrepancy, highlighted by Bennett, between museums' aims at homogenising the population by making themselves accessible to all citizens in theory, and the way they functioned to segregate the 'civilised' elite from the masses in practice.[4] As part of this criticism, Sharon Macdonald suggested, for example, that museums are capable of communicating 'other kinds of identities than the national, homogeneous and bounded', and that they functioned as 'contact zones… rather than quite as publicly disciplining or penitential as some of those working in them might have intended'.[5]

Furthermore, this study continues the trend of an array of recent urban historical studies that have employed the concept of governance to the sphere of symbolic politics and the use of culture in governing urban populations.[6] It relies on the research conducted in Cracow archives and libraries and is also informed by a number of excellent studies in the history of Cracow and its culture in the nineteenth and early twentieth century.[7] Rather than a demonstration of Foucauldian governmentality – the central state's efforts to discipline its population and integrate it into its preferred vision of culture, history and good taste – Cracow's museums serve as examples of a different type of governance that resulted from the negotiation between the municipal authorities and the larger circles of educated and privileged urban elites, and the need to function in an imperial setting and in competition with other cities over cultural pre-eminence in the region. 'Negotiated' is a principal term in this respect as, in contrast to Bennett's notion of central authority's power to convince its populations to adopt specific vision of history, in Cracow the governance of museums was instituted predominantly on the local level, even if also

under the watchful eye of the imperial centre. Furthermore, it transcended the institutional boundaries of municipal government and included other urban institutions.

In the following, 'governance' is understood as a set of more decentralised, complex and diffused forms of administrative regulation and policy, produced and executed, first of all, at the municipal level but in close discussion with some of the external circles in the urban elite. I argue that the functioning of public museums owed more to the agendas of municipal elites than to their wish to manage national or even local citizenship. It was in pursuit of these agendas that they aimed to project specific visions of authority onto local civic culture and the creation of meanings, and the role of municipal employees was central in the shaping of this process. These visions incorporated elements of the central imperial state's ideology as well as the local nation, and they were communicated through the establishment of institutions that celebrated a complex, negotiated version of history through their display of visual culture and the rituals that surrounded them. At the same time, there were serious limitations to the effectiveness of this sort of taste governance. Only some of Cracow's museums were shaped according to a specific municipal vision; furthermore, they were popular only with a segment of the public.

The Habsburg Empire and the 'Exhibitionary Complex'

In attempting to apply Bennett's approach to nineteenth-century Habsburg Central Europe, the historian is faced with a number of caveats. First of all, Europe of the time was as much a continent of modernising empires as it was of nation states, and the multi-ethnic Habsburg Empire was home to a number of nascent nationalisms that had their own view of art and culture that often contrasted with the official Viennese vision. A fairly coherent Habsburg state ideology through which the population was to be made governable certainly existed, but to speak about it without taking these nationalisms into account would be misleading. Secondly – and this is important in order not to fall into the trap of national history that routinely equated the foundation and functioning of museums with the national project – national allegiance and loyalty to an imperial state, as scholars of nationalism as well as Habsburg historians would readily agree, were not necessarily mutually exclusive.[8] In nineteenth-century Central Europe, it was possible, for example, to be a patriotic Pole and a loyal Habsburg subject and combine these two allegiances with a number of other, equally important identities.[9] People who stood at the

foundation of national collections and museums had agendas that went beyond the national project while, at the same time, larger sections of the public remained essentially indifferent to these initiatives.

Furthermore, many nineteenth-century 'national' museums emerged out of earlier aristocratic collecting initiatives of a much clearer regional and local character, and continued to tread a fine line between all these different allegiances at the century's close. And finally, cities were not just mere locations for the emerging 'exhibitionary complex' in the museums but were home to a multiplicity of local agencies and interests: the official position of the municipality; the agendas of private collectors (aristocratic and not); the increasingly professionalised art academy, university and heritage protection circles; and the attitudes of diverse urban publics. The active support of Cracow City Council was essential for the institutionalisation of several local initiatives as museums, and the belief in the central role of the museum as a nation-building institution consolidated divergent views of the nation among the local elite.[10] Yet the city representatives rarely achieved their goals unilaterally or without debate, and often required the support and approval of other influential groups to foster them.

One of Bennett's important concerns is that the 'exhibitionary complex' involved specific arrangements and policies aimed to convince the working classes to behave in a specific, 'civilised' way. He provides ample examples of the elite and the middle classes fears of the lower classes' rowdy behaviour in the museum. While this certainly serves the purposes of the argument of how the population was (self-) governed and disciplined through public museums, it does presuppose the existence of those fears. The Habsburg Empire had a very different context. This was a society strictly regulated by protocol, in which power and status was closely linked to behaviour and appearances, in which the industrial revolution proceeded largely outside the main cultural centres in the eastern provinces such as Galicia, and in which the museum age coincided with that of nationalism. In this situation, trying to teach good manners to the working classes – in the museum or elsewhere – would have been largely pointless because that would have meant preaching to the converted. As Nathaniel D. Wood points out, Cracow's citizens 'were obsessed with status and respectability, from the ubiquitous honorifics among the educated or social elite and the presence of servants in petty bourgeois homes to the black bowler hats… on the heads of

manual laborers'.[11] In this, Cracow was representative of many other Habsburg cities. Museum directors and curators therefore had concerns other than the inappropriate behaviour or the potential amount of alcohol consumed by the uneducated in the museum. Rather than aiming to teach their populations proper manners and good taste, they rather declared their wish to recruit them, with reservations, into their respective nations. This, however, was a difficult task to pursue in an imperial context, and it required a lot of calculation and ingenuity.

Habsburg Cracow and its early museums

A number of events in Cracow's nineteenth-century history contributed to an idiosyncratic perception of the role of the city in the region of Central and Eastern Europe and the nature of museum initiatives there. Historically a medieval royal seat, Cracow became part of the Austrian province of Galicia following the Partitions of Poland in the late eighteenth century, received a free city status at the Congress of Vienna in 1815, and was finally incorporated into Austria after the unsuccessful uprising in 1846.[12] After this incorporation, the city found itself in a situation where state authority was effectively divided between the institutions of imperial government: the office of Galician Governor based in the administrative capital of the province Lemberg (Lwów/Lviv) and the Austrian army that occupied some of its Cracow's valuable historic buildings; and a small and weakened municipal administration in the Town Hall. Cracow not only had to declare its (often wholehearted) loyalty to the Habsburgs, but also to accept that many decisions concerning its present and future would be decided in Vienna or Lemberg. Significantly smaller Cracow was in competition with Lemberg as a location for modern Polish institutions of culture.[13] While the presence of a large Austrian military garrison on the Wawel Hill, the site of medieval power and glory, was perceived as oppressive in Cracow, Austrian rule was more liberal than the forms of governance Poles faced in the Prussian and Russian partitions.[14]

The transformation of the Habsburg Empire into a constitutional monarchy in the late 1860s resulted in the increased autonomy of Galicia. This transformation had fundamental consequences for the nature, size and funding of municipal governments. Mayors and city councils were now elected and their tasks and responsibilities stretched over larger areas of local affairs, while the size and funding of municipal governments significantly increased. It was these

new city councils, which functioned on the principle of self-government and relative autonomy from provincial and central state institutions, that were chiefly responsible for the liberal 'reform era' in municipal politics of Central European cities and towns.[15] This newly acquired authority provided a chance for Stańczyks, Cracow's ruling conservative political party loyal to Austria, to transform Cracow, which was granted self-government in 1866, into their vision of the city as the national capital of all Poles. Stańczyks founded institutions of science and art, erected monuments, and staged celebrations to achieve this goal; the Great Fire of 1850, which had destroyed a large part of the historic city centre, provided a further impetus and sanction for municipal intervention.[16] Cracow municipal government also actively engaged the local elites, which consisted largely of prominent aristocrats, the gentry (*szlachta*), university professors and other academics, literati and a very few industrialists, in the organisation of imperial celebrations and other initiatives that, similar to national celebrations, reached large crowds and fostered imperial loyalty among Cracovians.[17] To paraphrase Wood, Cracow was not only turning into the 'Polish Mecca' but also into the 'little Vienna on the Vistula', and the role of the municipality was central in this transformation.[18] The sheer complexity of overlapping imperial, national and local agendas compromised the effectiveness of the overarching historical or aesthetic narrative in Cracow's museums, and turned them conveniently into vehicles for specific, often divergent, messages delivered to a specific public at a specific point of time.

Largely in parallel with these developments, Cracow's new circular promenade around the historic centre, its broad boulevards, and its modern apartment houses, made it into a decidedly modern city with metropolitan aspirations. The 'reform era' was notable, however, not only for the improvements of the city centre and the emergence of a bourgeois consumer culture. It was also the era that eventually culminated in the incorporation of the outlying worker districts and the creation of 'greater Cracow' by the early twentieth century. As Wood convincingly demonstrates, the mass of these new Cracovians thought of themselves as metropolitan and European first and only second as Polish, as they engaged with the city's somewhat subdued and conservative official culture and its vibrant consumer antipode. At the time when the museum initiatives were taking shape this was, however, only a prospect: before the largest worker district of Podgórze (until 1915 an independent town) was incorporated, there was no sizeable

worker population to speak of.[19] This is a matter of some importance when the exact composition of the museum public and the elites' views on how to govern it is analysed.

Even before municipal reform, in the times when collecting initiatives were shaped by an antiquarian movement dominated by wealthy aristocrats, municipal employees were central to these initiatives. A significant overlap between the representatives of the municipality, the university, the aristocracy and middle-class collectors, and the initiatives of public art institutions, was due to the fact that in a city as small as Cracow many initiatives were undertaken by a group of intricately connected public enthusiasts.[20] This is another classic example of governance where the boundaries between the (local) state and civil society were permeable and blurred.[21] Though of different status and social position, many of these enthusiasts shared the experience of the revolutionary events of 1848 (and, if often indirectly, of the Polish January uprising in Russia in 1863), the subsequent émigré experience in the West, and the return to a relatively more tolerant Austrian partition in the 1860s. Many also were prominent Stańczyks.[22] Cracow's municipal employees, university faculty and aristocratic patrons were not only connected via common membership in local associations such as Cracow Scientific Society, but also met in church and shared family links as well. This characteristic overlap of institutional authorities and jurisdictions and the negotiated nature of governing museum initiatives remained a defining feature of Cracow after the introduction of municipal self-government in 1866. However, the three most important public museums in the city that emerged in the late nineteenth century – the National Museum, the Czartoryski Museum and the Museum of Technology and Industry – were each an example of a different overlap of authorities and a different negotiated solution.

The National Museum

'In Cracow, stones speak about Cracow and Poland; in Cracow, Poland dreams about its past and yearns towards its future… To preserve national monuments, to multiply cultural resources, to link the past and the future: this is the task for all of us. The National Museum fulfils a large part of it… This synthesis is its title of merit and glory, this is its goal'.[23] Thus the Society of Lovers of History and Monuments of Cracow addressed the directorship of the National Museum in 1909, on the occasion of its 25th anniversary and the year when concrete plans could finally be

made to move some of the museum's collections to the Wawel Hill, vacated by the Austrian army. This quotation is significant in several respects. It serves, firstly, as an indication that an institution that emerged and functioned due to municipal governance of its affairs was successful in convincing at least segments of the Cracovian public of its national significance that, in their view, transcended imperial borders for a stateless Polish nation. Secondly, it emphasises the centrality of Cracow for the national narrative. Thirdly, it highlights the symbolic significance of a historic location, the glorious Wawel Hill that, in view of the article's authors, functioned as a source of emotional attachment for 'the entire country'.[24] This sort of formulation not only challenges Bennett's argument about the significance of new architecture for the 'exhibitionary complex', but also obscures the fact that the history of the museum's creation displayed a much more complex symbolism and was associated with a very different location and public.

Whereas the National Museum serves as a rather extraordinary case of full municipal endorsement from the very inception of the idea of establishing such a museum in the city, its creation was also a matter of continuous negotiation with the very urban elites that created it.[25] While the first suggestions to establish such institution were voiced among the Cracovian public already in the late 1860s, the idea received a major impetus from the speech of Mayor Józef Dietl at the City Council on 5 January 1871, in which he argued for the establishment of the national museum within the general programme of the 'improvement' of the city of Cracow. As part of the latter effort in particular, Dietl suggested the restoration of the iconic yet dilapidating Cloth Hall (*Sukiennice*) on the Market Square, at the very centre of the historic city, as the future location of the institution.[26] At that point of time, just a few years into the era of Constitutionalism, this could have hardly been understood as a realistic suggestion. Rather, it was representative of many individual initiatives suggested for public discussion at the time, such as the adapting of the buildings of the Wawel Castle, which at that time was in the possession of the Austrian military, for the purposes of such a museum. Dietl's suggestion demonstrated not only the central importance of official city representatives in the shaping of the future museum, but also their growing awareness that prominent historic buildings could serve as an ideal background for the symbolic representation of municipal power, especially in locations of historic visual display such as a gallery or a museum. The municipal government at the time

of reform was clearly becoming aware of the possibility of gaining legitimacy from leading the public debate and encouraging public engagement.

The beautifully renovated building opened on 3 October 1879 with a ceremony dedicated to the fiftieth anniversary of writer Józef Ignacy Kraszewski.[27] At the ceremony the overall message to the public, reported by the press and to become deeply ingrained in local memory, was that Cracow was becoming a national capital.[28] During the ceremony in honour of Kraszewski in the Cloth Hall, one of the participants, the painter Henryk Siemiradzki donated his enormous painting 'Nero's Torches' (1876) to the city of Cracow. This painting, which spoke the visual language of officially sanctioned historicism and laid foundations for the art collection of the future museum, depicted a scene from early Christian martyrdom but made subtle allusions to the contemporary fate of the Polish nation. Stylistically it was in good taste for the time, but like the political views of Kraszewski himself, the painting's thinly disguised political message went a few steps too far ahead of what the conservative city elites wished. Uncomfortable as Stańczyks were with such explicit statements of popular nationalism, they realised, especially in the light of further donations that helped to lay foundations to the art collection of the museum, that endorsing the new institution was central to their political flourishing. In that vein, not only were they overly cautious in their refusal to specify what the 'national' in the museum's name actually entailed, but also in the Stańczyk-sponsored publications about the museum, such as the memorial book of the Kraszewski Jubilee, they made sure to convince the public that even a word 'demonstration' was not appropriate to describe the Kraszewski jubilee celebration.[29]

By locating the National Museum in the Cloth Hall, the gentlemen in the City Council and Cracovian educated circles aimed to convince the local population as well as the city visitors of the status of the city not only as a historical monument, but also of the cultural progress of all Poles, which was made possible, they stressed, by benevolent Habsburg rule. For example, French politician Georges Clemenceau was impressed by the National Museum during his visit to Cracow in 1898 and repeated this narrative in his memoirs. While his overall report is not entirely positive, he noted a sharp contrast between the noisy trade on the Market Square and the museum exposition: 'The National Museum, which contains many revolutionary memories, displays a surprising contrast of the bloody dramas of the past and the present peace of mind…

Now by a strange revenge of fate the Polish gentry rule Austria… The sceptre of [Habsburg Emperor] Francis Joseph is mild.'[30] The same message was repeated over and over again, and the significance of location at the very heart of the city in an important historic building was never lost on contemporaries.[31]

Cracow's municipal government was aware that, in order to ensure that the museum corresponded to the desired vision, its functioning and management needed to be taken under control. The City Council's resolution from 7 October 1879 to establish the National Museum 'as a property of the Cracow community for the benefit of the whole nation' is illustrative of this very awareness.[32] However, far from a straightforward and consensual act as it is presented in national historiography today, the National Museum was actually created 'in an atmosphere of dissent, debate and strong opposition'.[33] In this context, it was important not only to ascertain that the project was within the municipal jurisdiction, but also to provide representation to other urban groups that historically collaborated with the municipal government in previous museum initiatives. Hence the committee that oversaw the creation of the museum and its subsequent functioning consisted of twelve members – half from the City Council, and another half from leading Stańczyk politicians at various levels of government, trusted university professors and professional art historians and archaeologists. Art historian Władysław Łuszczkiewicz, who was appointed director and remained in office until his death in 1900, also belonged to this small circle.[34]

The museum legitimised its activities with the public through the publication of its yearly reports, as well as through the organisation of exhibitions of general interest which incorporated artefacts from other collections and celebrated the empire as much as the Polish nation.[35] For example, a massive exhibition in 1883 was dedicated to the 1683 Relief of Vienna and celebrated the legacy of King Jan Sobieski III. Carefully and cleverly blending issues of loyalty and nationality, the exhibition presented Sobieski as the main hero of the Vienna siege that could both be interpreted as a historic evidence of Polish loyalty to the Habsburgs and as a sign of Polish greatness as a nation.[36] Some of the artefacts from the exhibition, such as the Ottoman tent alleged to have come from the siege, became central to the permanent display at the Cloth Hall in the subsequent years. Together with notable paintings by Siemiradzki, Jan Matejko and others, to

whom special place was dedicated in the permanent exposition, the notable artefacts from the Sobieski exhibition therefore entered Polish national historiographies written from a *Cracovian* perspective. In effect, during the making of the National Museum, and at least partially due to the municipal effort, Cracow's specific historical and artistic heritage found its way to becoming a prominent narrative in the national discourse.[37] At the same time, the museum never lost sight of the imperial dimension and made sure that each of its initiatives were blessed into life by the Vienna Court, and that every government dignitary visiting the city visited the museum to further legitimise its activity.

To an extent it can be argued that the museum was successful in reaching out and motivating its target audience. It quickly became popular outside Galicia, in other partitions and among the émigré community, in particular in France. It also attracted and engaged a great number of local benefactors in an attempt to appeal to both local patriotism and the greater nation. The calls to support the museum, initiated by the director and the overseeing committee, were replicated multiple times in the local, provincial and foreign press. For example, the journalist of Stańczyk official newspaper *Czas*, whose article was reprinted elsewhere, argued that the 'poor' city of Cracow was fulfilling its duties in this respect, and it was now 'the duty of the entire nation to ensure that it becomes what it should become, namely, a national (museum)'.[38] Nevertheless, the amount of donated funds – as opposed to artworks and artefacts – remained miserably small in comparison with the yearly contribution of the municipal government. The National Museum's curator, Maciej Szukiewich, remarked ironically in 1909 that although the Municipal Council's resolution obligated 'the maintenance of the… museum by the funds of the municipality and the entire nation', 'that hoped-for… help from the nation remained mostly mere rhetoric without the real basis of fact'.[39]

Open to the public from 1883, the museum established a free entry one Sunday per month, allowed free entry to all village school groups in 1892, and on special occasions, such as the centennial of the Kościuszko Insurrection in 1894, was free for everyone. On such days crowds of Cracovians were reported visiting the museum. According to the approximate calculation by Szukiewicz the number of visitors doubled between 1889 and 1898 to exceed 10,000 persons per year, whereas it quadrupled by 1908 to over 49,000 persons – a significant number for a city of

approximately 90,000 inhabitants.[40] It is significant that there neither seems to have been a concern for the visits of the lower classes, nor was a single event of inappropriate behaviour ever recorded. Rather, museum administration was actually more upset with the low number of artists and academics among the visitors, who they argued could have used the collection for research as well as inspiration.[41]

Despite ambitious aims to reach out to the broader public beyond Cracow and across the borders of partitioned Poland, however, the museum struggled in particular to engage the suburban population. In fact, during the times of Luszczkiewicz directorship the museum did not even concern itself with recording systematically the numbers of visitors. In the official published report from 1891 it was openly stated that the city public did not 'enter the museum rooms eagerly', and attributed the overall increase in the visitors' numbers to guests from outside Cracow and from abroad.[42] While peasants increasingly visited the museum in greater numbers, it was only in 1909, as reported by the Cracow cheap and popular illustrated weekly *Nowości Illustrowane*, which targeted mostly the suburban population, that the suburban inhabitants were made aware of its prominence on the occasion of its 25th anniversary. At that point, however, the link with the suburbs had been secured: not only had *Nowości Illustrowane* emulated word-for-word a phrase popular in educated circles about the function of the museum as a depository of historic artefacts, mirroring the national genius and serve as a pattern for future generations.[43] In a simple, accessible language it also reported on the splendour of the collection in the Cloth Hall and the jubilee ceremony that confirmed for its readership the museum's vision of Polish history.[44] It is perhaps ironic that it was at about the same time, during the discussion on how and what the National Museum should exhibit in the Wawel Hill, that the Louvre was mentioned in the local press as the model for emulation.[45] As far as the 'exhibitionary complex' is concerned, then, it acquired a rather different dynamic at the Cracovian National Museum from Bennett's paradigmatic example. The governing of tastes and behaviour of the public was effective with some of the Cracovian elite and the sympathetic circles elsewhere, and the broader public seems to have been persuaded about the Stańczyk project and its vision of the place of Polish national culture within the empire. However, it took almost three decades from the museum's foundation for its directorship to actually reach out to the city's suburban audience.

The Czartoryski Museum

Whereas the National Museum was embraced by municipal government from its very inception, other Cracow museums were governed in diverse and more complex ways and to different degrees. The foundation of the Czartoryski Museum, based on a private collection of great cultural significance, was a result of the decision of Count Władysław Czartoryski, a prominent member of the Polish émigré community in Paris and a representative of one of the most important aristocratic families in the partitioned country, to move his collection from Paris to Cracow. The collection included fine arts, historic military artefacts, and a library. After the failure of the 1830 Polish uprising in Russia, in which Czartoryski participated along with practically every Polish aristocrat of significance, his estate was confiscated and the collection found its way to the Hotel Lambert in Paris, also in the ownership of the Czartoryskis, which was to become the centre of the Polish émigré activity in France.[46] By the second half of the nineteenth century the collection was of an immense symbolic value as a remnant of the historic legacy from the partitioned Poland that was under threat, as an aristocratic collection and something that was closely associated with the goings-on in the Hotel Lambert.

The decision to move the collection from Paris to Cracow was also a matter of profound significance and the outcome of complex negotiations between Czartoryski and the Cracow municipality. In these negotiations both parties attempted to secure measures of control over the new institution to their mutual benefit. The signing of an ownership agreement on the lease of several properties in the city centre on 13 November 1874 marked a symbolic union between the Stańczyk elites in the Town Hall and the Polish émigré community.[47] Such a union was essential at that point for Stańczyks' political legitimacy as the party that came to power due to the rapprochement with Vienna. Once again the location in an important historic building was significant. Cracow's former armoury, the fully restored and renovated Arsenal Miejski, was the core of the future museum, but it also came to include several neighbouring buildings and structures such as the Florian Gate, a remaining section of the fortification walls along the new circular promenade, and an adjacent building. The symbolic implication was not lost on contemporaries: the museum was housed in the buildings associated with Cracow's medieval power and municipal autonomy.[48] In the course of the next decades, the construction of the new building of the Academy of Fine Arts across from the Florian Gate, sponsored by the

municipality, would create an important cultural cluster by bringing several cultural institutions into the vicinity of each other.

The Czartoryski Museum was a deeply aristocratic institution for the privileged class.[49] Despite its public status on paper, and although free entry on two weekdays was made a requirement in the agreement between the museum and the municipality, it was a shared opinion among the Cracovian public that the museum 'did not… obtain the character of a public institution available for everyone easily and at every time'.[50] Unlike the National Museum, it did not publish reports on its activity and rarely appealed to the public in the press. Furthermore, the pronounced aristocratic nature of the collection meant that it was often unavailable for viewing even for its target public, which apart from honorable foreign visitors included Cracow's aristocratic philanthropists, the academic elite, other local luminaries, and municipal employees.[51] The museum's exhibition, which displayed various family memorabilia alongside artworks from the Czartoryski collection, as well as the events that it organised for its public, remained firmly within the earlier traditions of the antiquarian movement.

Nevertheless, the museum's existence in Cracow not only helped to redefine the city as a historic capital of all Poles and stressed the historic role of Polish aristocracy in nurturing culture, but also corresponded well with the Stańczyks' conservative political programme. The negotiations could not have been easy for Cracow's municipal government, as Czartoryski, popular with some of the local circles as well as abroad, had a lot of leverage based on his aristocratic title. The outcome, however, was fundamentally to the city's advantage. On the one hand, while publicly demonstrating good will by relieving Czartoryski from property tax or lowering it significantly on another occasion, and eventually offering him the honorary citizenship of the City of Cracow, the municipality made sure to impose a measure of control over the future museum.[52] On the other hand, precisely those members of the university faculty, who sat on the City Council and frequented the museum for research purposes, secured Czartoryski's engagement with larger urban initiatives. For example, he was included in organisation committees and other academic and public initiatives and was expected to contribute to them financially or in kind.

While of no immediate importance or concern to the museum, such measures further strengthened the city administration's reputation as a legitimate government presiding over cultural affairs and capable not only of incorporating prominent benefactors into municipal activities but of making Polish culture flourish under the Habsburgs. As a consequence, the museum was firmly on the route of a visit by an important foreign guest or a state functionary. For example, Czartoryski was invited to the organisation committee of the Emperor Francis Joseph's visit to Cracow in 1880, and the visit to the museum was given a prominent place in the programme and widely celebrated in the press.[53] The programme was entirely planned and controlled by the Stańczyks, and included only those groups and institutions that were beneficial to their agenda.[54] The example of the Czartoryski Museum demonstrates that as long as the agendas of the Town Hall, the aristocratic lobby, the university leadership and the émigré community were partially congruent, the municipal programmes were much more open to a daily engagement with a private institution - as long as the key elements of the city's control over its affairs were secured. Catering for an exclusive public and contributing to the image of Cracow as a reliquary of historic aristocratic culture, something that could be legitimately presented both to the local elite and the imperial centre, the Czartoryski Museum was also quickly incorporated into the municipal commemorative practices that further legitimised Stańczyks' grip over municipal affairs. Whether and to what degree its collection shaped the views and tastes of the broader public was a matter of secondary importance.

The Museum of Technology and Industry

In contrast to the National Museum, which was a municipal affair that engaged many among the Cracovian elite and the émigré community, and Czartoryski Museum which was governed much more in negotiation with its private benefactor, Cracow's first public museum was at the outset a deeply individual affair incorporated into municipal governance at a much later date. The Museum of Technology and Industry came into existence in 1868, practically simultaneous with the dawn of the Constitutional era and the establishment of Galician autonomy. Its emergence was largely due to the efforts of Adrian Baraniecki, a well-travelled and passionate collector particularly impressed by the works of John Ruskin and Henry Cole.[55] The collection of industrial art and design, acquired by Baraniecki during his travels and to a large degree from the Great Exhibition in 1851, was donated to the city of Cracow on the condition that it would make

the foundation of the industrial museum, be maintained by the city and remain in Cracow permanently.[56] The first exhibition was arranged in and sanctioned by the Town Hall for just that purpose. Baraniecki saw the exhibition and the future museum as vehicles to transform local crafts following the examples of modern industrial design in the West, and thus contributed significantly towards the transformation of Cracow into a modern city in which such crafts would be a point of local pride.

Modelled on the South Kensington Museum in London, the museum also aimed to function as a centre of learning and to foster the development of local crafts, and successfully targeted a broad urban public.[57] Entrance tickets were kept deliberately low to allow entry for the local middle and lower middle class. Through its permanent and temporary exhibitions and its workshops in local crafts, the museum attempted to establish Cracow as a place of modern arts and crafts and applied design. At the outset, it was attempted to forge connections between the 'gentlemen's club' of the local elite and the broader public: the lectures that the museum initiated featured local luminaries as well as politicians, and even celebrities such as Kraszewski and audiences, up to 200 people on some occasions, consisting of academics, craftsmen, soldiers, clerks, 'boys… barely ten years of age… a stray priest and even… a Jew from the Kazimierz District'.[58] At that point of time, this was clearly a very different public from the one present at the events of the antiquarian movement, the Czartoryski Museum or even the National Museum. Like the Higher School for Women, founded by Baraniecki the same year as the museum and until 1894 the only institution of higher education in Cracow where women could enroll, the museum published annual reports.[59] While not on the map of an average Habsburg dignitary or a typical patriotic tourist, the museum attracted visitors from Cracow and beyond who were particularly interested in sciences, applied arts and industrial design, including internationally renowned scientists as well as larger student groups.[60]

Despite Baraniecki's affinity to and good understanding with Dietl, and despite the loud assurances of support on behalf of the municipal government, at least in its early years the museum was left to develop on its own, largely devoid of municipal funding or other assistance.[61] Rather than serving as an example of sensible negotiated governance involving the municipal administration, the founder and the group of enthusiasts around its collections, crafts

school and public lectures, the Museum of Technology and Industry remained, until the turn of the twentieth century, a civic and mostly voluntary initiative. Successful with the broader public and promoting an image of Cracow as a modern city, it found itself having to negotiate with a municipal administration dominated by the supporters of the antiquarian movement, an aristocratic ethos and Stańczyks' keen desire to maintain an ambiguity between Cracow's grand national aspirations and its imperial loyalty. A good illustration of how the newly created municipal ritual omitted the museum was the procession during Emperor Francis Joseph's tour to Galicia in 1880, when it was simply not included.[62] The location of the museum, in the cramped rooms of the former Franciscan Cloister, not only precluded any possibility of the 'exhibitionary complex' to take effect but remained hugely inadequate for the museum's everyday functioning.

Only after Baraniecki's death in 1891, and the institution's incorporation into the National Museum, would the situation improve. With the decision to include the museum in municipal governance and expenditure, and the appointment of architect Tadeusz Stryjeński as director, the plans for the design and construction of the new building were finally drawn. The magnificent building, completed in 1914 in a prestigious location on Smoleńsk Street, is one of the most remarkable Art Nouveau edifices in the city. By then, however, the museum had lost much of its institutional independence.[63] The Museum of Technology and Industry thus serves not only as an example of how the publicly declared commitment of the municipality to foster local industries and industrial design in the early years of municipal reform contrasted with what they were willing to contribute in reality to an essentially civic institution. It also demonstrates that, as municipal reform proceeded to include more aspects of public life in the early twentieth century, municipal government became increasingly aware of institutions that had hitherto functioned outside its vision. Essentially, it took under its control a museum that in the public mind was strongly associated with modern, metropolitan Cracow in order to boast its own new public image only at a time when this institution was no longer capable to pursue its own symbolic agenda.

Conclusion

Of the three Cracow museums discussed in this study, the National Museum came the closest to Bennett's idea of an institution that, through its capacity to 'show and tell' its own version of

history and good taste, forged links with the broader public and contributed to its incorporation into the processes of the Habsburg state and the concrete agendas of Cracovian conservative elites. Yet its capacity to reach out to large segments of this public was handicapped by precisely the kind of negotiated governance that only involved actors within the municipal administration and the urban elites. The Museum of Technology and Industry was certainly the most successful in engaging the broader public, but it did so as a civic institution, whose incorporation into municipal government well past the times of its glory only accentuated further the discrepancy of how the latter viewed the role and reputation of Cracow as a historic city. Those Cracow museums that were incorporated into the larger sphere of municipal governance, such as the Czartoryski Museum and the National Museum, were originally created by and *for* the small elite, and the resulting message had to reconcile regional and local identities, aristocratic and antiquarian values with the interests of the municipality, the purposes of the national project and the imperial ritual.

This suggests problems with the applicability of Bennett's approach to smaller European cities such as Cracow, whose cultural importance within the region went far beyond their administrative function. In the complex political climate of late Austria-Hungary, the efficiency of the imperial centre in delivering its own vision of history to its diverse inhabitants was counterbalanced by national projects, which themselves attempted to 'show and tell' and thereby integrate and regulate their specific populations through celebrations, commemorations and prearranged display in museums. As this study demonstrates, however, the local agendas of the municipal government representatives and the circles of the urban elite were decisive in the shaping of local tastes and histories and their incorporation into the slowly developing national projects. The involvement of municipal authorities and local elites facilitated some museums but put obstacles in the functioning of others. Through negotiation and bargaining the Stańczyks created institutions that integrated Cracow's antiquarian, aristocratic legacy into a larger national historical narrative. As a consequence, the 'nation' was articulated in the National Museum rather in the manner of Heimat museums in the German lands, privileging local histories in the overall narrative; in the Czartoryski Museum, it was interpreted as a pre-modern nation of the aristocratic elite; and in the Museum of Technology and Industry, the only institution to actually incorporate 'the masses' at the outset, it was not the primary focus of articulation at all.[64]

Producing governable populations was not among the Cracow municipal government's priorities when they founded, managed and controlled museums in the city. The institutions they created or supported did, however, succeed to 'show and tell' their vision of local, imperial and national histories as well as a good way to govern, and contributed to the formation of specific identities among the inhabitants of Cracow and beyond. Architecture and spectacle played an important role but new architecture was a rarity, and spectacle was much more effective on the street during imperial and national celebrations. The museums' difficulty in reaching out to a broader spectrum of the local population, however, sets further limits to the efficiency of the 'exhibitionary complex' in this specific urban context – an aspect worth exploring further in other cities of the Habsburg Monarchy and beyond. However, in contrast to museums based on transnational concepts and truly concerned with the nurturing of the local public and expertise, such as the Museum of Technology and Industry, the museums endorsed into the systems of municipal governance proved more durable and survived until today. Works of art and other artefacts that were instrumentalised in the process subsequently became canonical within the local Cracovian and Polish national narratives and effectively shaped aesthetic tastes in those susceptible to listening to such narratives for the decades to come.

---

[1] Tony Bennett, 'The exhibitionary complex', *New Formations,* 4:1 (1988), 99; also see idem, *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics* (London, 1995).
[2] Carol Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums* (London, 1995), 32; Daniel J. Sherman, *Worthy Monuments: Art-Museums and the Politics of Culture in Nineteenth-Century France* (Cambridge, 1989); Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum*, 6.
[3] For a comparative analysis of museums of fine and applied arts in the Habsburg Empire, see Matthew Rampley, Markian Prokopovych and Nóra Veszprémi, *An Empire on Display: The Art Galleries and Museums of Austria-Hungary* (University Park, Pennsylvania, forthcoming) and idem, *Liberalism, Nationalism and Design Reform in the Habsburg Empire: Museums of Design, Industry and the Applied Arts* (Abington, forthcoming).
[4] Bennett, *Birth of the Museum*, 28.
[5] Sharon J. Macdonald, 'Museums, national, postnational and transcultural identities', *Museum and Society,* 1:1 (2003), 10.
[6] Simon Gunn, *The Public Culture of the Victorian Middle-Class: Ritual and Authority in the English Industrial City, 1840-1874* (Manchester, 2000); Patrick Joyce, 'Maps, blood and city: the governance of the social in nineteenth-century Britain' in Patrick Joyce (ed.), *The Social in Question. New Bearings in History and the Social Sciences* (London, 2002); Louise Miskell, *Meeting Places: Scientific Congresses and Urban Identity in Victorian Britain* (London, 2016); Charlotte Wildman, *Urban Redevelopment and Modernity in Liverpool and Manchester, 1918-1939* (London, 2016); Tom Hulme, '"A nation of town criers": civic publicity and historical pageantry in

inter-war Britain', *Urban History,* 44:2 (2017); Tom Hulme, 'Urban governance and civic responsibility: interwar council housing in Buxton', *Midland History*, 35:2 (2010); Sarah Bassnett, 'Picturing filth and disorder: photography and urban governance in Toronto', *History of Photography,* 28:2 (2004); Ben Roberts, 'Entertaining the community: the evolution of civic ritual and public celebration, 1860-1953', *Urban History,* 44:3 (2017). For a good overview of approaches also see R. J. Morris, 'Governance: two centuries of urban growth' in R. J. Morris and R. H. Trainor (eds), *Urban Governance: Britain and Beyond since 1750* (Aldershot, 2000).

[7] On Cracow in Habsburg Galicia, see Nathaniel D. Wood, *Becoming Metropolitan: Urban Selfhood and the Making of Modern Cracow* (DeKalb, IL, 2010); Nathaniel D. Wood, 'The "Polish Mecca", the "Little Vienna on the Vistula" or "Big-City Cracow"? Imagining Cracow before the Great War', *Urban History,* 40:2 (2013); Daniel L. Unowsky, *The Pomp and Politics of Patriotism: Imperial Celebrations in Habsburg Austria, 1848-1916* (West Lafayette, IN, 2000); Patrice M. Dabrowski, *Commemorations and the Shaping of Modern Poland* (Bloomington, 2004); Keely Stauter-Halsted, *The Nation in the Village: The Genesis of Peasant National Identity in Austrian Poland, 1848-1914* (Ithaca, NY, 2001); Jacek Purchla, *Krakau unter österreichischer Herrschaft 1846-1918. Faktoren seiner Entwicklung* (Vienna, Cologne and Weimar, 1993); Jacek Purchla, *Jak powstał nowoczesny Kraków* (Cracow, 1990); Wojciech Balus, *Krakau zwischen Traditionen und Wegen in die Moderne: Zur Geschichte der Architektur und der öffentlichen Grünanlagen im 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 2003). On Cracow museums see Markian Prokopovych, 'The city and the museum: Cracow's collections and their public reception in the long nineteenth century', *Austrian History Yearbook* 2018, forthcoming; Maud Guichard-Marneur, 'Drafting futures: the birth of the museum institution in Cracow, 1868-1939', *Centropa,* 12:2 (2012); B. Krzaczyńska (ed.), *Zapomniane muzeum. Adrian Baraniecki i Muzeum Techniczno-Przemysłowe 1868-1950*, Exhibition catalogue (Cracow, 2013); Franciszek Stolot *et al*, (eds), *Narodziny Muzeum. Ważniejsze daty w stuletnich dziejach Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie* (Cracow, 1979); Janusz Nowak, 'Władze gminy miasta Krakowa wobec Muzeum Książąt Czartoryskich 1874-1939', *Krakowski rocznik archiwalny,* 7 (Cracow, 2001); Janusz Pezda (ed.), *Władysław Czartoryski, wystawa w stulecie śmierci* (Cracow, 1994).

[8] Pieter M. Judson, *The Habsburg Empire: A New History* (Cambridge, 2016).

[9] See, for example, Jeremy King, 'The nationalization of East Central Europe: ethnicism, ethnicity, and beyond' in Maria Bucur and Nancy M. Wingfield (eds), *Staging the Past: The Politics of Commemoration in Habsburg Central Europe, 1848 to the Present* (West La Fayette, IN, 2001); Pieter M. Judson, *Guardians of the Nation: Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria* (Cambridge, 2006); James E. Bjork, *Neither German nor Pole: Catholicism and National Indifference in a Central European Borderland* (Ann Arbor, MI, 2008); Tara Zahra, *Kidnapped Souls: National Indifference and the Battle for Children in the Bohemian Lands, 1900-1948* (Ithaca, NY, 2008). For a longer discussion of the relevance of this scholarship to the study of museums see Prokopovych, 'The city and the museum'.

[10] Guichard-Marneur, 'Drafting futures'.

[11] Wood, *Becoming Metropolitan,* 49.

[12] For a good historical summary, see Wood, 'The "Polish Mecca"'.

[13] For more on Lemberg, see Markian Prokopovych, *Habsburg Lemberg: Architecture, Public Space and Politics in the Galician Capital, 1772-1914* (West Lafayette, IN, 2008).

[14] See Purchla, *Krakau unter österreichischer Herrschaft*; idem, *Jak powstał nowoczesny Kraków*; Balus, *Krakau zwischen Traditionen*.

[15] For Cracow see Purchla, *Krakau unter österreichischer Herrschaft*; idem, *Jak powstał nowoczesny Kraków.* On the context of urbanisation and municipal reform in larger Habsburg cities, see Susan Zimmermann and Gerhard Melinz, eds., *Wien, Prag, Budapest: Blütezeit der Habsburgermetropolen. Urbanisierung, Kommunalpolitik, gesellschaftliche Konflikte, 1867–1918* (Vienna, 1996); Malcolm Gee, Tim Kirk and Jill Steward (eds.), *The City in Central Europe: Culture and Society in Central Europe since 1800* (Aldershot, 1999).

[16] See Dabrowski, *Commemorations*; Guichard-Marneur, 'Drafting futures'.

[17] Unowsky, *Pomp and Politics of Patriotism*.

[18] Wood, *Becoming Metropolitan;* Dabrowski, *Commemorations*; Stauter-Halsted, *The Nation in the Village*.

[19] On the incorporation of Podgórze, see Wood, *Becoming Metropolitan*, 119-24.

[20] In 1851, Cracow had a population of over 40,000, whereas it doubled between 1890 and 1910 from over 70,000 to around 150,000.

[21] Morris, 'Governance: two centuries of urban growth', 1.

[22] For more on specific names and functions see Prokopovych, 'The city and the museum'.

[23] S. Krzyżanowki and K. Bąkowski, 'Adres do Muzeum narodowego. Towarzystwo miłośników historji i zabytków Krakowa', *Kuryer Lwowski*, 20 October 1909, 8.
[24] Krzyżanowki and Bąkowski, 'Adres do Muzeum narodowego', 8.
[25] Prokopovych, 'The city and the museum'; also see Stolot, *Narodziny Muzeum*.
[26] Stolot, *Narodziny Muzeum*, 9-10.
[27] Dabrowski, *Commemorations*, 25-48; Guichard-Marneur, 'Drafting futures', 119-20.
[28] W.L. Anczyc *et al* (eds), *Księga pamiątkowa jubileuszu J. I. Kraszewskiego 1879 roku* (Cracow, 1881), 22.
[29] Anczyc, et all, ed., *Księga pamiątkowa*, 2.
[30] George Clemeneau, 'Galizische Eindrücke (Schluß)', *Die Neuzeit*, 26 August 1898, 352.
[31] See, for example, Maciej Szukiewicz, *Dzieje Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie* (Cracow, 1909), 21, 77-79; Odrowąż, 'Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie (Z powodu ćwierćwiekowego jubileuszu instytucji)', *Kuryer Lwowski*, 19 October 1909, 1 and 3.
[32] *Uchwała Rady miasta Krakowa o utworzeniu Muzeum Narodowego w Sukiennicach jako własnośći Gminy m. Krakowa na pożytek całego narodu* (Stolot, *Narodziny Muzeum*, 12).
[33] Guichard-Marneur, 'Drafting futures', 120-1.
[34] See Prokopovych, 'The city and the museum'.
[35] *Sprawozdania Muzeum Nadorowego* 1887-1898 (Cracow, 1888-99).
[36] See Dabrowski, *Commemorations*, 48-74 and 51-53.
[37] Stolot, *Narodziny Muzeum*, 18-21; Prokopovych, 'The city and the museum'.
[38] 'W sprawie muzeum narodowego', *Kuryer Lwowski*, 15 May 1887, 4.
[39] Szukiewicz, *Dzieje Muzeum Narodowego*, 36.
[40] Szukiewicz, *Dzieje Muzeum Narodowego*, 70-1.
[41] *Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie. Sprawozdanie Zarządu za rok 1893* (Cracow, 1894), 10.
[42] *Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie. Sprawozdanie Zarządu za rok 1890* (Cracow, 1891), 10.
[43] Szukiewicz, *Dzieje Muzeum Narodowego*, 14.
[44] 'Jubileusz Muzeum Narodowego,' *Nowości Illustrowane*, 23 October 1909, 15-16; see also Prokopovych, 'The city and the museum.'
[45] Ludomir Benedyktowicz, 'Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie', *Kuryer Lwowski*, 18 May 1913, 2.
[46] Janusz Nowak, 'Władze gminy miasta Krakowa wobec Muzeum Książąt Czartoryskich 1874-1939', *Krakowski rocznik archiwalny,* 7 (2001).
[47] Purchla, *Krakau*, 57. See also J. Pezda (ed.), *Władysław Czartoryski, wystawa w stulecie śmierci* (Cracow, 1994); Prokopovych, 'The city and the museum'.
[48] M. Szukiewicz, *Dzieje Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie* (Cracow, 1909), 19-20.
[49] Guichard-Marneur, 'Drafting futures', 117-18.
[50] Szukiewicz, *Dzieje Muzeum Narodowego*, 20.
[51] Prokopovych, 'The city and the museum'.
[52] Prokopovych, 'The city and the museum'.
[53] Nowak, 'Władze gminy', 96-9; Prokopovych, 'The city and the museum'.
[54] Unowski, *The Pomp and Politics*, 61-4.
[55] See Krzaczyńska, *Zapomniane muzeum*; Piotr Hapanowicz, 'Adrian Baraniecki – prekursor polskiego muzealnictwa przemysłowego', *Muzealnictwo,* 57 (2016); Piotr Hapanowicz, 'Działalność Muzeum Techniczno-Przemysłowego w Krakowie i jego likwidacja w latach 1949–1950', *Zarządzanie w Kulturze,* 8 (2007); Prokopovych, 'The city and the museum'.
[56] Krzaczyńska, *Zapomniane muzeum*, 16-17.
[57] Stolot, *Narodziny Muzeum*, 8; Krzaczyńska, *Zapomniane museum*, 16-7; Guichard-Marneur, 'Drafting futures', 116.
[58]Krzaczyńska, *Zapomniane museum*, 16-17; Prokopovych, 'The city and the museum'.
[59] J. Rotter, *Sprawozdania o rozwoju Muzeum techniczno-przemysłowego* (Cracow, 1897 and 1899); Stanislaw Batko, ed., *Miejskie Muzeum techniczno-przemysłowe i Krajowy Instytut popierania rękodzieł i przemysłu. Musee municipal technico-industriel et Institut du Pays pour l'encouragement des metiers et des industries* (Cracow, 1912); Stanislaw Till, *Powstanie Muzeum Przemysłowego i Krajowego Instytutu Popierania Rękodzieł i Przemysłu w Krakowie. Przeszłość, stan obecny, ogólne sprawozdanie za 1911 do 1913. Szkic planu na* przyszłość (Cracow, 1914); *Sprawozdanie Dyrekcyi Miejskiego Muzeum Techniczno-Przemysłowego, Krajowego Instytutu Popierania*

Rękodzieł i Przemysłu w Krakowie (Cracow, 1909-1915); Józef Rostafiński, *Historia Kursów Wyższych dla Kobiet im. A. Baranieckiego oraz Sprawozdanie Dyrekcji za rok szkolny 1899/1900 istnienia kursów XXXII* (Cracow, 1900)
[60] Further see Prokopovych, 'The city and the museum'.
[61] Krzaczyńska, *Zapomniane museum*, 29-33.
[62] Prokopovych, 'The city and the museum'.
[63] Prokopovych, 'The city and the museum'.
[64] See Celia *Applegate, A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat* (Berkeley, 1990); Alon Confino, *The Nation as a Local Metaphor: Württemberg, Imperial Germany, and National Memory, 1871-1918* (Chapel Hill, 1997).