

From Cultural Fortress to Civic Forum: Boundary Dissolution in the Contemporary Museum and the Case of Suzhou Museum

Zhe Zhou*

Bologna School of Art, Bologna 40137, Italy

**Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.*

Copyright: © 2026 Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is cited.

Abstract: This article examines boundary dissolution in the contemporary museum through the case of Suzhou Museum. It argues that the museum is no longer defined only by the protection and display of objects, but by its ability to negotiate relations among architecture, knowledge, urban mobility, digital mediation and public participation. Drawing on debates in museum studies and new museology, the article first explains how museum boundaries are produced by walls, doors, display cases, professional authority and inherited cultural hierarchies. It then analyses Suzhou Museum as a regional institution that has transformed limitation into strategy: I. M. Pei's architectural language softens spatial thresholds; the museum expands into an urban network of Wu-culture institutions and garden sites; digital tools assist wayfinding and visitor-flow management; and curatorial practice increasingly shifts from object-centered display toward contextual interpretation and public co-production. The article does not propose a museum without limits. Conservation, scholarship and spatial management remain necessary. Its central claim is that such limits become legitimate when they function as negotiated thresholds rather than instruments of exclusion. Suzhou Museum therefore offers a useful model for understanding how a museum can move from cultural fortress toward civic forum.

Keywords: Suzhou museum; Boundary dissolution; Museum architecture; New museology; Publicness; Digital mediation; Curatorship; Wu culture

Online publication: April 30, 2026

1. Introduction

Museums are commonly described as public institutions, yet their publicness has always been historically produced rather than naturally given. The modern museum developed from royal collections, aristocratic cabinets, colonial collecting, national classification and professional systems of knowledge^[1-3]. Its walls, doors, cases and labels organize not only objects but also access, behaviour and authority. Visitors may be permitted to enter the building while still being positioned as passive recipients of meanings defined by the

institution.

This tension has become central to contemporary museum studies. Current museums are expected to preserve fragile objects, maintain scholarly standards and manage increasing visitor numbers, while also becoming inclusive civic spaces and platforms of cultural democracy ^[4,5]. The issue is therefore not whether all boundaries should disappear. A museum without conservation protocols or interpretive responsibility would lose its public value. The more precise question is how boundaries can be transformed from mechanisms of exclusion into thresholds that support access, dialogue and shared interpretation.

This article explores that question through Suzhou Museum. However, the museum is often discussed in relation to I. M. Pei's translation of Suzhou garden aesthetics into contemporary architectural form, its significance extends beyond design ^[6,7]. Over the past two decades, the museum has become a cultural node that connects local heritage, urban tourism, digital services and participatory education. It therefore provides a productive case for analysing how a regional museum can move from a closed cultural container toward an open civic forum.

The argument is organized in five sections. After the introduction, Section 2 outlines the physical and epistemic boundaries inherited by modern museums. Section 3 examines Suzhou Museum through four dimensions: architectural openness, urban cultural networking, digital mediation and curatorial participation. Section 4 discusses the broader theoretical implications of the case. Section 5 concludes by arguing that the future of the museum lies not in the abolition of limits, but in the public negotiation of their meaning.

2. Museums, boundaries and the politics of access

The boundary of a museum is not only a line in space. It is produced by architectural form, display technology, professional language, institutional habit and social expectation ^[3,8]. A wall separates inside from outside, but a specialized label may also separate expert knowledge from everyday understanding. A display case protects an artefact, but it can also transform heritage into something visible yet untouchable. A monumental entrance invites admiration, but it may also produce hesitation among visitors who do not feel entitled to occupy such a space.

For this reason, access must be understood in a broad sense. It refers not only to admission, ticketing, or physical entry, but also to the ability to understand, question, feel, and participate. The traditional museum often granted physical access while preserving symbolic distance. Contemporary practice seeks to reduce this distance while retaining the responsibilities of preservation, documentation and research ^[4,5].

2.1. Physical boundaries: walls, doors and display cases

The physical boundary of the museum begins with architecture. Many canonical museums resemble semi-closed fortresses: walls define interior and exterior, staircases create ritual ascent, and gates regulate entry. Such spatial devices historically served collection, protection, and display, but they also communicated power. The Palace Museum in Beijing is a clear example. As the former Forbidden City, its walls, moat, axial order and hierarchical courtyards materialized imperial authority before the palace was converted into a public museum ^[9]. The British Museum offers a different genealogy, linking private collecting, parliamentary institutionalization, imperial circulation and universal classification ^[10]. Both cases show that museums inherit political and spatial codes even after they become public institutions.

Display cases form another physical boundary. They are indispensable when objects are fragile or sensitive to humidity, light, dust and touch. Yet the case also produces distance. It allows the visitor to see but not touch; it protects, but it can also sacralize. Recent work on display furniture shows that cases are not neutral containers, because they shape vision, movement and the perceived status of the object ^[11]. The problem is not the existence of cases, but their automatic and excessive use for materials that might support closer viewing, tactile learning or contextual demonstration.

2.2. Epistemic boundaries: authority, expertise and interpretation

The most persistent boundary is epistemic. Museums have long been spaces in which specific groups monopolize the right to classify, interpret and narrate culture. Bourdieu and Darbel's analysis of art museums shows how cultural institutions can reproduce social distinction even when formally open to everyone ^[8]. The visitor who lacks cultural capital may stand before an object without feeling that the object belongs to their own history or experience.

New museology responds to this problem by challenging the idea that the museum is a neutral storehouse of facts. It treats the museum as a social and political institution that mediates between objects, histories and publics ^[4,12]. In this framework, the curator is not only an authoritative narrator but also a mediator who creates conditions for learning, questioning and dialogue. Black similarly emphasizes the engaging museum as one that supports visitor involvement rather than passive reception ^[13]. Boundary dissolution therefore requires a redistribution of interpretive agency, not merely a redesign of space.

3. The Suzhou Museum as a case of boundary dissolution

Suzhou Museum is a useful case because its transformation is not a simple story of expansion. As a municipal museum, it once faced limitations in institutional rank, conservation conditions and access to high-value collections. The 2006 Regulations on the Administration of Museums recognized transfer as one way for museums to acquire and manage collections, a policy context that shaped the circulation of cultural objects within China ^[14]. Rather than defining itself only by rare objects, Suzhou Museum strengthened its focus on Wu culture, literati painting, local craft, garden memory and public education. Its development may therefore be understood as spiral rather than linear: each constraint generated a new form of positioning.

3.1. Architectural openness and the softening of spatial thresholds

I. M. Pei's design is central to this process because it reinterprets the threshold between museum and city. The museum is located beside major heritage sites such as the Humble Administrator's Garden and the Lion Grove Garden. Instead of producing a monumental object that dominates the old city, the design adopts white walls, dark roof lines, courtyards, water surfaces, framed views and garden-like transitions ^[15,16]. These elements soften the boundary between interior and exterior and translate the spatial rhythm of Suzhou gardens into a contemporary museum language.

The entrance and circulation system are especially important. Transparency, transitional courtyards, screens and corridors replace the heavy gate and closed wall as dominant spatial signs. The visitor is guided rather than intimidated. The building does not simply remove boundaries; it turns them into soft thresholds that organize movement while preserving visual continuity. In this sense, architectural openness is not only a matter of form. It is a reconfiguration of the visitor's psychological relation to the institution.

3.2. From museum building to urban cultural network

Boundary dissolution also occurs when the museum expands beyond the single building. Suzhou Museum increasingly functions as a node within a wider cultural network composed of the West Branch, the Museum of Wu Culture, garden sites and other local institutions. This network is not merely administrative. It enables the city to organize Wu culture through multiple sites, media and narratives. Permanent and temporary exhibitions on Wu painting, garden aesthetics and local craft show how regional identity can be constructed as an open field rather than a fixed collection category^[17,18].

The 2025 exhibition related to Changwuzhi is particularly suggestive because it connects museum display with garden space and literati life^[18]. By extending interpretation into classical gardens, the exhibition moves beyond the neutral white cube and situates objects within historical atmospheres of use, taste and social practice. The museum thus becomes less a container and more a cultural interface: objects, sites, visitors and urban memory produce meaning together.

3.3. Digital mediation and the redistribution of visitor flows

Suzhou's popularity also creates pressure. The museum and surrounding heritage district attract large visitor flows, while the historic centre has narrow streets and limited spatial capacity. Studies of tourism vitality in Suzhou Old City show the uneven distribution of visitors across time and space, especially around cultural attractions^[18]. In this context, digital mediation is not simply a fashionable addition to the museum experience. It becomes a practical instrument for access management.

Digital reservation systems, WeChat-based information, QR-code guidance, multilingual audio, interactive maps and indoor navigation help visitors plan routes and reduce unnecessary congestion. Research on the museum experience and visitor circulation has long shown that unclear orientation increases hesitation, backtracking and local crowding^[18,19]. By improving information access, digital systems can redistribute attention and movement. Their value lies not in technological spectacle but in the way they make the museum more legible, more accessible and more manageable.

3.4. Curatorial flexibility and public participation

The curatorial boundary concerns the relation between object and meaning. If the museum presents objects only as rare and untouchable things, it risks turning heritage into a silent warehouse. Benjamin's concept of aura is useful here: the uniqueness of the object matters, but museum interpretation must also reveal the historical and social relations that give the object continuing significance^[20]. In Suzhou Museum, this means that literati painting, craft, garden culture and everyday objects should not be treated only as aesthetic specimens. They should become mediators between past practices and present publics.

The museum's development plan for the Fourteenth Five-Year Plan explicitly emphasizes exhibition quality, diversified temporary exhibitions and the intelligent upgrading of display spaces^[16]. This supports a more flexible model of curation. Temporary exhibitions, craft workshops, educational programs and digital interpretation allow visitors to encounter Wu culture through making, listening, comparing and questioning. Public participation does not replace scholarship; rather, it extends scholarly interpretation into lived experience. The visitor is no longer only a viewer standing before objects, but a participant in the production of cultural meaning.

4. Discussion: From cultural fortress to civic forum

The case of Suzhou Museum suggests that boundary dissolution should be understood as a negotiated transformation rather than a simple act of opening. The cultural fortress is not overcome merely by removing doors or installing glass. It is overcome when architecture, interpretation, urban systems and curatorial practice work together to change the relation between institution and public.

This transformation has three implications. First, spatial openness must be connected to social accessibility. A transparent entrance matters only when visitors also feel able to understand and participate. Second, digital technology must be evaluated by its contribution to interpretation and access, not by novelty alone. Third, curatorial authority must become mediating authority. Expertise remains necessary, especially for conservation and historical accuracy, but its task is to create shared conditions for meaning rather than to close interpretation.

The Suzhou case also shows the limits of openness. Fragile manuscripts, paintings, textiles and lacquerware still require environmental control. Popular museums still need reservation systems and crowd management. Scholarly claims still require verification. The aim is therefore not an absolutely borderless museum. It is a museum in which boundaries are visible, explainable and adjustable. A threshold differs from a wall because it regulates passage while allowing relation.

5. Conclusion

This article has argued that Suzhou Museum offers a productive model for understanding the contemporary museum as a site of boundary dissolution. The museum's transformation is visible in its architecture, its integration with the urban cultural network, its use of digital mediation and its increasingly participatory curatorial practice. Together, these dimensions show how a museum can move from the logic of the cultural fortress toward that of the civic forum.

The significance of the case lies in its balance. Suzhou Museum does not abandon preservation, expertise, or institutional responsibility. Instead, it rearticulates them through openness, contextual interpretation and public participation. Its development is spiral: each return to tradition becomes a new act of translation, and each institutional limit becomes an opportunity to redefine the museum's role in the city. For museum studies, this suggests that the future of the museum is not the disappearance of boundaries, but their transformation into shared, interpretable and socially meaningful thresholds.

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Bennett T, 1995, *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*. Routledge, London.
- [2] Hooper-Greenhill E, 1992, *Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge*. Routledge, London.
- [3] Macdonald S, 2006, *A Companion to Museum Studies*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- [4] Vergo P, 1989, *The New Museology*. Reaktion Books, London.
- [5] International Council of Museums, 2022, *Museum Definition*. International Council of Museums, visited on

- January 25, 2026, <https://icom.museum/en/resources/standards-guidelines/museum-definition/>.
- [6] Suzhou Museum, n.d., About Suzhou Museum. Suzhou Museum, visited on February 5, 2026, <https://www.szmuseum.com/>.
- [7] Wiseman C, 1990, I. M. Pei: A Profile in American Architecture. H. N. Abrams, New York.
- [8] Bourdieu P, Darbel A, 1991, The Love of Art: European Art Museums and Their Public. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- [9] The Palace Museum, n.d., About the Palace Museum. The Palace Museum, visited on February 5, 2026, <https://en.dpm.org.cn/about/aboutus/>.
- [10] The British Museum, n.d., The British Museum Story: History. The British Museum, visited on January 2, 2026, <https://www.britishmuseum.org/about-us/british-museum-story/history>.
- [11] Johnson C, 2025, Making a Case for Cases: The Transformative Power of Display Furniture. Museum Management and Curatorship, visited on February 5, 2026, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19369816.2024.2445320>.
- [12] Desvallees A, Mairesse F, 2010, Key Concepts of Museology. Armand Colin / ICOM, Paris.
- [13] Black G, 2005, The Engaging Museum: Developing Museums for Visitor Involvement. Routledge, London.
- [14] Ministry of Culture of the People's Republic of China, 2006, Regulations on the Administration of Museums, Order No. 35. Government of the People's Republic of China, visited on February 5, 2026, https://www.gov.cn/gongbao/content/2006/content_457933.htm.
- [15] Suzhou Museum, 2021, Development Plan of Suzhou Museum for the Fourteenth Five-Year Plan, 2021–2025. Suzhou Museum, visited on February 5, 2026, <https://www.szmuseum.com/News/Details/125gh>.
- [16] Suzhou Museum, 2025, From the Humble Administrator's Garden to Changwuzhi. Suzhou Museum, visited on January 11, 2026, <https://www.szmuseum.com/Exhibition/TemporaryDetails/6c12bdb5-2eb8-4d87-864f-83c0fe8e38c6>.
- [17] Zhou M, Yang J, 2025, Geospatial Spatiotemporal Analysis of Tourism Facility Attractiveness and Tourism Vitality in Historic Districts: A Case Study of Suzhou Old City. Land, 14(5): 922.
- [18] Falk JH, Dierking LD, 2016, The Museum Experience Revisited. Routledge, London.
- [19] Bitgood S, 2006, An Analysis of Visitor Circulation: Movement Patterns and the General Value Principle. Curator: The Museum Journal, 49(4): 463–475.
- [20] Benjamin W, 2008, The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility, and Other Writings on Media. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Publisher's note

Bio-Byword Scientific Publishing remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.