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Abstract

The museum boom of the late twentieth century resulted in a growing emphasis on the role of the museum as an expressive iconic entity of a city. As a result less energy has been focused on architecture's role in mediating the past through its contents.

Aid in displaying and interpreting artifacts should remain the museum's primary design focus because it can provide a more complete understanding of the past. This investigation examines the role of artifacts in understanding the past through the observations of Lowenthal, Lynch and other authors. It analyzes successful museum precedents that facilitate this understanding through architectural space.

This information is then applied toward the development of a design case study for a carnival heritage museum in Kinsley, Kansas. This analysis is intended both to serve as a basis for developing a more contextually artifact-specific museum and to provide some insight into the nature of the carousel and traveling carnival in relation to the Midwest.
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Section 1  Introduction

The body of this document is divided into three sections. The first section, Mediating the Past Through Architecture, is an investigation into the nature of components of the past and how architectural design can mediate an understanding of the past. A series of museum and gallery case precedents are analyzed in subsequent subsections to support this premise. The summary provides general conclusions that are applicable in a wide array of situations.

The second section outlines project information, including client, site, and program. It also summarizes histories of the carousel and of Kinsley, Kansas, so that their roles in the creation and expansion of the travelling family carnival are understood from both a local and a more global historical context.

The third section, Design Parameters and Methodology reduces the general conclusions from the first section to a small set of guidelines meant to anchor theoretical positioning given the specificity of site and program to steer the development of the design project. This is followed by a description and images of the design development of the project. The final subsection reflects upon the design to characterize both goals accomplished and areas of potential further development of the project.
Section 2  Mediating the Past Through Architecture

2.1 Components of the Past

Knowing and understanding the past is a complex process because information from the past is interpreted through multiple mediums. In *The Past is a Foreign Country*, David Lowenthal reflects on the importance of the past, and the means information from the past emerges and is interpreted. Lowenthal summarizes that information from the past is interpreted through three means: Memory, History, and Relics.¹ (Thus forward in this document relics will be referred to as “artifacts.”²) Lowenthal outlines the properties of these interpretive vessels and how we as humans interact with them.

Memory, history, and artifacts portray the past in different ways. Each adds something to complete the whole picture, but not everything added leads to a clearer understanding of the past. A brief summary of the


²The term ‘relic’ connotes several qualities that are not implicit etymologically in the term ‘artifact.’ First, ‘relic’ can be defined as a body part or other physical remnant of a saint or martyr, inadvertently implying religious connotation. Second ‘relic’ can imply a sense of obsolescence. One aim of this document is to understand methods of augmenting artifacts, allowing their qualities to be interpreted in a contemporary setting, value as didactic tools rendering them far from obsolete.
properties and tendencies of memory, history, and artifacts will serve to clarify how each of these can be best suited to be complemented by architecture. Architecture which intends to mediate the past requires an understanding of these elements and their interaction; an investigation of that need is the objective of this thesis.

**Memory**

Memory allows people to know the past personally. Because memories require another medium (writing, drawing, speaking) in order to be translated and understood by others, their expressed essence retains interpretive information. This interpretive information can be either specific to an individual, or it can be the result of a collective interpretation of the past by many.

Lowenthal states, “We can seldom distinguish primary memories from secondary memories, remembering things from remembering remembering them.”3 The brain jumbles first-accounts of actual events with retold accounts so over time the two become part of the same story. Memories are the result of consensus of both personal and collective accounts and thus some bias is avoided through diversity of stories. Memory, through consensus of historical accounts leads to a better understanding of the past.

_________________________

3 Lowenthal, 196
Because memory is essentially the context by which people measure and relate the past, it is the best link that the past can provide to an individual. If something is a memory, it has been accepted by the brain and merged with a person’s current understanding of the past. Memory is constantly evolving as new information is added, but information is also lost. The past experienced through memory is not static, but ever changing.

**History**

History – written history, at least, is a slightly more static version of the past. It changes, but slowly, over time. History is not the past, it is a distilled version of the past by an author. Lowenthal notes history is “less than the past.”  

It is the author’s version of what occurred in the past based on their personal experience, physical investigation, and others’ accounts. In history, certain parts of the past are left out, others added, some even (intentionally or unintentionally) invented.

History cannot escape editorializing the past, but it also provides context. It can provide the scene, describe the setting in which the past occurred, thereby giving a person the extra context they need to understand the story. The drawback is that this context is filtered through

---

4 Lowenthal, 214
the lens of the historian and cannot reflect wholly an account of the past.

Lowenthal states, “…dissemination of historical knowledge through writing, and especially through print, sets the past firmly apart from the present.”5 A written historical account is understood as separate from present events. Because of this history needs the aid artifacts and memory to substantiate the past’s relation to the present.

**Artifacts**

An artifact’s main strength is that it exists, as Lowenthall states, “simultaneously in the past and in the present.”6 The artifact is both a product of a bygone time and a tangible thing that exists in the present. It is not an account of how the past was, or a memory of it; it is a piece of it. The diachronic nature of the artifact completes the way in which people understand the past. It can therefore create the strongest link from past to present, bringing relevance to an understanding of the past.

Artifacts are physical remnants of the past. If an artifact is just a remnant, not specifically created to explain something about the present to future generations, then it has no inherent editorial bias. This is the strength of artifacts. Having no editorial reference means that the beholder of the artifact is not subject to the preconceptions

---

5 Lowenthal, 232  
6 Lowenthal, 241
of an historical account. They may bring their own preconceptions through memory.

In the same stroke, however, if the beholder of artifacts has no knowledge or memory of the artifact, its nature or role in the past may be lost or misinterpreted. An artifact without context appears foreign. The beholder has no vantage point from which they can understand the artifact’s role in the past. The beholder must be given context in order to understand the artifact.

This thesis will categorize and examine the means and methods by which the container of artifacts (i.e. museum building) can provide context for the artifacts it contains. The first subsection will examine the container as artifact as a method of contextual supplementation. The second subsection will examine how the container can be re-interpreted through adaptive re-use to strengthen or re-connect the building contextually to its artifacts. The last subsection will examine methods of structuring the context through display and through narrative. It is by these means that a museum becomes more than just a blank palatte for the artifacts it contains; it facilitates an understanding of artifacts.

This paper does not distinguish the need to separate art galleries and museums in its investigation. Both serve to display artifacts. Because all artifacts age, new art from contemporary art galleries eventually
becomes the artifacts of museums, requiring context in order to be interpreted and as time continues on, the line is blurred.

2.2 Container As Artifact

Buildings can be utilitarian, housing inhabitants, everyday objects and activities, but they can also be arks, housing objects of importance so that future generations can understand some fragment of the past from which they came. As Lowenthal suggests, the past renders the present familiar and is integral to a sense of identity\textsuperscript{7}. Artifacts that retain tangible familiarity to current generations have an advantage over memories and history because they are unhindered by a singular narrative. The artifact can relate some insight about the life of a single person, an entire community, or both at once. The building that surrounds the artifact, however, and the context in which it is displayed can dramatically change its interpretation.

Museums house artifacts and provide the context for interpretation. The first order of involvement in providing context for the artifact is the building itself. The museum does not have to merely be a container of artifacts; the container itself can be an artifact. The building is the visitor's first contextual involvement or reference to the artifacts. If the museum building shares a

\textsuperscript{7} Lowenthal, 39-41
common history with the artifacts it contains, the context of the building is added to that of the artifacts, associations of site and place bring other memories and history to light and the frame of reference is expanded.

Historically significant buildings can have the effect of magnifying the emotive content of the museum experience. The following buildings were designed by architects who connected building historical context to the artifact collection, thus strengthening the connection of past to the present.

The first architect I will mention, Carlo Scarpa, provides several powerful examples of architecture adhering to this connection. Scarpa dealt with a diversity of architectural issues over his career, often several simultaneously. This is what makes his architecture intriguing, but its complexity creates difficulty in pinning down a singular unified strategy or stance. It is more beneficial, then, not to focus on characterizing all strategies, but to identify specific related strategies that Carlo used to enrich architectural space. This paper is not concerned with his (or other architects’) aesthetic and philosophies related solely to detailing. Its intent is to dissect and evaluate his methods of utilizing the architectural container to harmonize and enrich an understanding of display artifacts.
The Palazzo Abatellis (1400-1495) was originally a palace for Francesco de Abatellis, an important magistrate for Sicily and especially Palermo, Italy. During the mid 1500’s, Dominican monks occupied the building and added a chapel annex. Bombing during World War II caused considerable damage to the building. In 1953 Carlo Scarpa restored the building to house Sicily's medieval and modern art collections. The building itself had a history spanning the time between these two collections. As a diachronic artifact, the building exists as a bridge for understanding the past in relation to two dissimilar collections.

Scarpa also designed the Museo di Castelvecchio (Verona, Italy) to similar effect. Castelvecchio was constructed under the medieval rule of Lord Cangrande II della Scala as a fortification to a bridge crossing the Adige River. Under Napoleonic occupation a wing to the north was added on the castle. Castelvecchio was chosen to house a collection of Verona's sculpture and artwork, including the equestrian statue of Cangrande I della Scala, predecessor to the Cangrande. Placing the statue in Castelvecchio related the artifact back to an important place and time in Verona’s founding.

The Canova plaster cast gallery (Possagno, Italy.) was built next to Antonio Canova’s house, relating the work (artifacts) to the place. A museum visitor then has a
mental connection to the experience of place within Possagno.

The National Gallery site in London also contained a rich history, first being the royal mews, then royal stables, then finally site to house the national art collection of England. It is the “hinge on the route between London and Westminster.” Aside from being an important location in London, the changes in the site are emblematic of the changes in England’s political structure, transforming from absolute monarchy to constitutional monarchy. The national gallery site transformed one of private royal dominion, to public domain.

The above examples are of sites and buildings that have an accretive quality. Because of their role and positioning as diachronic artifacts of the past, they posses added associative value in relation to the artifacts they contain. Buildings can also be artifacts representative of a break or transition in historical context. These buildings contrast their surroundings but through reference to the past are emblematic of a move forward. They draw from a deeper felt sense of the past.

In Delirious New York Koolhaas describes Manhattanism as the oscillation between extremes. He

\[\text{2.2.3 National gallery building, showing sitelines to St. Martins}\]

refers to the needle and the globe as part of the need for Manhattan to search the outer limits of form\textsuperscript{9}. But it is here that the past is also referenced, primitive shapes being part of the collective memory.

The counteraction manifested itself many places in Manhattan. Frank Lloyd Wright’s sought to counteract the grid and the skyscraper, searching for another form. His new gallery referenced the past in order to gain validity. Carranza writes,

“For Wright, the stepped forms of skyscrapers had become stylistic, lacking relationship for their purpose... By inverting the ziggurat-based setback form in the Guggenheim, then, Wright critiques the forms used for skyscraper designs. Through inversion, Wright further avoids any formal references to that ancient ziggurat which has been portrayed as the persistent precedent of the modern skyscraper... the “optimistic ziggurat,” as Wright would call the museum – suggests an attempt to generate an alternative for the modern city based on that very same historical precedent and its transformation.”\textsuperscript{10}

Wright was reacting against the rectilinear skyscraper with a divergent form but at the same time, recalling an ancient form from the collective memory.

A similar method of referential treatment can be seen in the Bankside power station (1952) designed by
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Giles Gilbert Scott. The turbine hall was designed in a manner to call reference to Saint Peter's with a tripartite division. Also the height of the central chimney was designed to be near (but not over) the height of St. Peter's cathedral. The building was a statement at the time that design of industrial buildings did not have to be purely functional. Though an exaggerated metaphor, St Peters was a shrine to the old power of mysticism through religion where Bankside was a shrine to the new power of mysticism through technology and scientific progress.

Lowenthal discusses two types of validation by invoking the past. The first is to “restore lost or subverted values and institutions.”¹¹ The Guggenheim and Bankside create a dialectic of context through association. They use the past to validate a new position. The second validates to preserve. Buildings like Palazzo Abatellis and Castelvecchio gain historical context over time. It is this context that, if associated with the artifacts housed in the building, can reinforce a more complete sense of the past and through the container as dialectic artifact, a connection to the present.

Historical significance can have a number of scales. Not everyone visiting Canova sculpture gallery will know its history, but those who know, or even sense it, will have a greater sense of the past of the container and the

¹¹ Lowenthal, 41
connection to its contents. Buildings that have endured through time from the beginnings of a city or a culture often have a greater value to its inhabitants than to outsiders. This is because the local population is more familiar with their environment, and the effects of time over its artifacts. There is a stronger link of the artifact to the setting in which it was created or used, but at a local level. To provide context for an artifact that influences a more universal audience, more must be done than validation through association by the container.

2.3 Container as Found Object

Often buildings with a rich history, containers as artifacts, lose their functional ability over time because the original use for which the building was intended has changed or become superseded by a new use. The container as artifact, not necessarily losing historical associative value with local inhabitants, has lost the ability as a productive asset to its surroundings. Razing the building in this case is an option, but when the building is razed, so is the associative historical power of the container as artifact.

An alternate solution to razing the building is to encounter it as a found object within the fabric of the site. Its value is innate through strength of material and craftsmanship, but the use of it must be determined and the object altered in order to satisfy the needs of a new
use. Lynch refers to incremental adaptation\textsuperscript{12} as a method for retaining the important qualities of the container while altering it to continue its usefulness. He refers to the layering that occurs from this as “Temporal Collage.” He qualifies this, saying that,

A collage is no simple mix of old and new. It is the product of aesthetic judgement, the deliberate juxtaposition of seemingly disparate elements so that the form and meaning of each is amplified and yet a coherent whole is maintained.\textsuperscript{13}

The adaptation of buildings can increase an understanding of the past through contrasts such as the juxtaposition of which Lynch speaks. This, in turn can amplify not only the meaning of the building elements, but, if there is a maintained connection between the container and the artifacts it contains, the meaning of these artifacts is amplified as well.

An example of this meaning amplification can be found in the adapted buildings of Carlo Scarpa. In the Palazzo Abatellis, Scarpa alters the entry sequence into the building so that the visitor enters the courtyard on a central axis but turns and enters the building through an opening in the west courtyard wall. This sets the visitor up to immediately to transfer from the original medieval

\textsuperscript{13} Lynch, 173
building through to the later gothic chapel annex. By creating this entry sequence, the visitor is immediately confronted with the diachronic nature of the building. It also creates a different sequence for the visitor by obliquely encountering the symmetrical portions of the plan as they move through the building.

Here in the chapel, they are confronted by a series of gothic arches between which are groin vaults. The arches from the ground floor are high and maintain the architectural original purpose to inspire a certain awe with the viewer through the thinness of structure and seeming defiance of gravity by heavy masonry. The reconfigured circulation sequence eventually leads the visitor up to the second floor or mezzanine (modified by Scarpa) where the groin vaults create a very different sensation. Because of the elevation of the visitor, the groin vaults are close above, creating a catacomb-like quality. This sets up a different atmosphere in which to view the museum collection. Even though it technically the same space, the re-orientation of the visitor creates a different atmosphere in the beginning of the journey than near the end. This is important, especially when the artifacts of the museum are analyzed in relation to this sequence, which will be discussed in the next section.

In Castelvecchio, Scarpa again reconfigured the entry sequence. The original sequence was centrally
located off the courtyard on the Napoleonic (north) wing of the building. He moved the entry to the northeast corner of the courtyard so that progression through the Napoleonic wing would be a linear sequence. He blocked the original triple arched Gothic entry with two offset walls, created the *sacello* or “treasure chest” to draw the viewer toward the entry. The *sacello* essentially housed a series of artifacts where each artifact has a distinct relation to the whole, comprised of a series of built-up layers. This whole “box” then is the mediator between the gothic arch of the courtyard wall and the castle’s original semicircular arched opening within the wing. To create a signifier of the entry, he inserted a wall that bisects the original northeast opening and bends at a right angle as if to welcome the visitor.

Scarpa also created screening on the interior of the Napoleonic openings that appears as both a separate modern competition to and harmonization with some of the proportions of the windows. He also revealed the junction of the Napoleonic wing with the Castle through a series of offset layers allowing the viewer to see the build-up of the elements of the building as artifact over time.

Scarpa created these interventions with several intentions. The first was to create a sense of clarity between the castle, the Napoleonic addition, and the modern conversion into a museum. He does this in such a
way that none of the architecture from different chronological periods is completely obfuscated, allowing the visitor to sense the accretion of the building over time.

Second, in Scarpa’s own words he, “decided to adopt certain vertical values, to break up the unnatural symmetry: the Gothic... especially Venetian Gothic isn’t very symmetrical.”\textsuperscript{14} Scarpa saw his interventions as restoring the Napoleonic “unnatural symmetry” to a more Venetian sensibility. This can border on editorial bias, but the important distinction is that Scarpa does not remove the Napoleonic addition as a perceived mistake, but allows it to remain and be integrated with a modern aesthetic conception. The sense of the building’s continuity through time is maintained.

Third, and perhaps most important to this investigation, Scarpa changed the building in order for it to become a more responsive container for the artifacts that it housed. The interventions in the building directly benefitted the change in use to a museum and in providing a context for the artifacts.

Scarpa’s intervention to the Canova Plaster Cast Gallery was a more direct one. Rather than changing the

\textsuperscript{14} R. Nicholas Olsberg, Guido Guidi, and Centre canadien d’architecture, eds., \textit{Carlo Scarpa, Architect: Intervening with History. History, Craft, Invention} (Montreal, Quebec, Canada : New York : Canadian Centre For Architecture ; Monacelli Press, 1999) 70.
use and way the building was interpreted as in Palazzo Abatellis and Castelvecchio, the gallery was an addition to the original museum building. Here, the existing museum use required an addition in order to increase functional capacity by housing additional casts from the collection.

The building, as Scarpa designed it, manages to merge the old gallery with the new, while keeping them visually distinct. The building retains a connection to the existing city context by retaining a low profile of the tapered connecting piece from the new addition. This prevents the addition from dominating the existing building through scale.

The tapered section of the building cascades by lowering height as it extends down the length of the existing building partially in response to the context of the buildings next to it as they cascade. This allows the building to retain some of the characteristics of its context as an artifact, while still maintaining its own identity.

The intersection of the addition with the existing on the exterior abuts it directly. This allows the buildings to appear integrated on the exterior, but on the interior, their separation is pronounced. A series of concrete beams extend above the cornice line of the existing building appearing as if they rest upon it. The beams extend to an opposite wall, which extends down to an overhead beam supported by columns. The floor is pulled back from the
existing building and thus this pocket between existing and new is created. This space combined with the beam space overhead reads as a transitional space between the two volumes. Scarpa uses all these methods of modifying the container in support of providing a contextual space in which to view artifacts.

The Bankside Powerstation mentioned previously was converted into the Tate Modern Art Gallery by architects Herzog and DeMeuron. With this conversion, the found object (the power station) took a great deal of restoration and adaptation to become the art gallery, but the original configuration of the building was transformed to support the new function.

The turbine hall was retained as the grand open space for visitors. This allows a clear reading of the original spatial layout of the building, but transforms it. No longer housing gigantic machinery, the extreme dimensions of the space not only serve to create a sense of awe at the sense of scale – they also orient the visitor as they travel up various levels of the gallery spaces. The visitor can peer from the concourse and get a sense of orientation in the building. The central space is used as an orientational and referential space but retains the original character of the turbine hall.

Rather than change the character of the original exterior appearance of the building by piercing public
entries through the brick shell, Herzog and De Meuron created a giant ramp that extends underneath and into the original turbine hall. In addition to preserving the aesthetic qualities of the exterior, this move creates several other connections, which strengthen the building as artifact to its existing context. In addition to the connection through the axis to St. Peters (and previously mentioned similarities in height) the entry ramp creates a new circulation axis for the building that extends in line with the National Gallery on the other side of the Thames. The ramp itself creates a means for the ground floor of the building to be a full public pass-through, allowing the art gallery to interface with the existing city fabric as a means of connection, rather than just a destination. In this respect, the art gallery becomes more truly a public building.

Visitors to the museum can then go through admissions and information (located on the ground floor) and ascend up to a section of the original turbine platform that is the main floor for accessing gallery spaces. Herzog and De Meuron preserved some of the existing material and organization of the container as found object, while creating new elements that helped it function better as a public art museum.

England’s collection of artwork quickly outgrew the original National Gallery (designed in 1833 by William
Wilkins) but an addition was slow to appear with several architectural competitions failing due to lack of consensus. The Sainsbury addition, designed by Venturi-Scott Brown was able to, in the most important respects, complement the existing features of the National Gallery and Trafalgar Square.

Essentially, the building mirrors the façade of the original Wilkins building in both height and material, except that it is pulled away from the building. The building has both functional and aesthetic advantages.

By pulling the addition away from the building, more of the original façade remains, keeping more of the past of the historical artifact (Wilkins National Gallery) intact. The separation allows a path to cut through between the two buildings, keeping a public path accessible between Trafalgar Square and the Jubilee walk, an important walking trail in London. A connecting bridge between the Wilkins building and the Sainsbury addition
allows a transitional moment in progression between the two galleries. Because it is a bridge, the Jubilee walk passes under, remaining a completely outdoor path.

The aesthetic advantage gained by keeping two buildings distinctly separated is that the interior of the Sainsbury addition does not have to respond to the rigid formal criteria demanded by the nature of being a façade off of Trafalgar square as the front façade does.

The side where the building is pulled back is an exterior glazing wall. Directly next to the glazing wall is a grand stair that connects all the floors of the Sainsbury addition, from the café nearest Trafalgar square to the main gallery space on the fifth floor. This allows an easy understanding of the building layout in section. It is also a metaphor for the separation between the two buildings, as if they are literally pulled apart and a sectional view of the Sainsbury Gallery remains in view. The grand stair also references the past because it resembles Bernini’s Scala Regia in the Vatican. Inside the galleries, there is a resemblance to John Soane’s Dulwich Picture Gallery, a setting complimentary to the viewing of renaissance artifacts. In order to understand the display of Renaissance art, Venturi made visits to each of these sites.15 Formal similarities are immediately recognizable. Barker also notes other similarities:

___________________________

15 Amery, 72.
The arrangement of the sixteen galleries in three parallel sequences, with a vista down the centre, reveals the influence of the single most admired example of early gallery design in Britain, Dulwich Picture Gallery, as does the toplighting. Both the layout and the lighting are also reminiscent of a church. More specifically, the pale grey colour of the walls contrasting the dark grey stone used for the door and floor surrounds evokes a fifteenth-century Florentine church – appropriately so since many of the (mostly Italian) paintings hanging in the Sainsbury wing are altarpieces. Thus, the galleries allow for the undistracted contemplation expected in art museums whilst also conveying something of their original viewing conditions.\[16\]

Barker indicates that the elements such as material and light qualities of the Sainsbury gallery create a space concordant with its artifacts. The additional reference to both Dulwich Gallery and Church imagery submerges the artifacts into the depths of collective memory. Here, the viewer is confronted with a blend of symbolic spatial references contrasting the subjectivity of pre-enlightenment religious spaces and with the objectivity of post-enlightenment art gallery. This contextual multiplicity facilitates consideration of the artifacts’ original use and current interpretation in developing simultaneously.

While the formal structuring of the Sainsbury building as container has less direct connection to the artifacts than in Scarpa’s museums, a few important relationships between the artifacts are retained. First,
elevating the gallery to the fifth floor allows the Sainsbury gallery to extend directly over to the main gallery level of the Wilkins building. Second, this upper level allows natural light through skylights to penetrate to even the inner parts of the gallery so proper lighting for the paintings can be achieved. The relationship of the Sainsbury building as an artifact within the context and as part of a greater public space is also very crucial for setting the scene for viewing the paintings.

Another approach to the container as found object is to modify the container so that there is a direct connection between it and the objects it contains. Studio Works utilized this method when asked to re-design a façade for the Museum of Jurassic Technology17, (Culver City, California) essentially a curiosity museum holding a variety of materials and artifacts. The building already existed but required structural stabilizing against earthquakes due to the California building code.

Architects Robert Mangurian and Mary-Ann Ray approached the design with the sense that the existing building was one, “in which the contained is not controlled

17 The name of the museum itself is an intentional contradiction; technology, advanced by a species’ ability to make and use tools, did not exist in the Jurassic period. The name, an anachronism, purposefully initiates a divide between imaginative fantasy and rational thought providing an appropriate primer for viewing an eclectic blend of artifacts where illusion and science fiction occupy the same realm as historical artifacts.
The artifacts lacked a connection to the building and to the surroundings. They performed a charrette to determine possibilities for the façade that would help bridge this gap.

The most successful of these were able to tie the building, and relate or contrast its contents to the scale and context of its surroundings. The first of these was the “Building as Container: the Ark,” where the façade would be modified to represent a container, and through the qualities of the specific container, associate the outside of the building with that of its contents. The second was “Wall as Collector: John Soane in Culver City,” where the exterior building itself would become a surface for artifact display. Third was, “Inside out: Façade as Void of Space,” where the building would appear as if it was cut to display a section of the contents inside. Fourth was the “Micro/Macro” series, where small things would be blown up large and large things would appear normal size in order to relate the building to either its contents, or its contents to the scale of the surrounding buildings. Here, the building itself has less of an initial historical bond to its

---

artifacts, but instead the building becomes the transitional device between the artifacts and the public.

The container as found object is about adapting a building's use to connect the qualities of a history and past already imbedded in the building as artifact to the artifacts the building contains. Some instances, like Castelvecchio and Tate modern involve working intricately with the existing fabric to merge use, artifact, and container. At other times, in the case of Canova gallery or the Sainsbury addition, it is more important that the addition providing new use maintains or magnifies the importance of the site to the existing building and its contents. In other instances still, where the container is less of a prominent artifact than what it contains, such as the Museum of Jurassic technology, the building is merely the translator of the contents to the public eye. In any case the container as found object helps strengthen the context of the artifact at a middle scale. In order to create a more global or universal understanding of the artifacts, however, the architecture must integrate and support directly the artifacts on display.

2.4 Container of Artifacts

Content Specific Museum Architecture

To provide universal understanding about something, qualities that need no historical interpretation must be stressed. These are qualities inherent to the
artifact that can be ascertained through an architectural framework or point of reference. These qualities are not simply explained by providing an historical account of the artifact’s origins or properties, because, as discussed previously such historical accounts have an editorial bias that should be kept minimal. To supplement any necessary historical information required, the container should relate spatially to the artifact, highlighting or harmonizing with its more universal aspects, essential principles or fundamental properties.

A direct interface with the artifacts that reinforces an understanding of their past can be accomplished architecturally through two means. The first is through content specific museum architecture. Museums designed specifically for a collection can obtain a special relationship with the artifacts they house. Too often museums are neutral to collections, even in the case where the collection itself is relatively static. Precedent museums in this paper have been selected because they characterize the two previously discussed means for the container to interface with the artifact (container as artifact and container as found object). But they have also been selected because they provide a more direct relation to the specific artifacts they house. These containers spatially facilitate the interpretation of their specific content. Museum buildings whose architecture responds to the
artifacts they contain have the potential for a greater impact on the viewer and greater overall understanding of not only the purpose and role of the artifact in its time, but also, a greater potential for personal connection to the present through the diachronic nature of the artifact.

**Narrative sequence specific to artifacts**

The second means for architecture to enhance an understanding of artifacts is through narrative. The way a museum visitor moves through the exhibits has an influence over the interpretation of the artifacts. Spatial narrative can help link exhibits and imprint upon the mind a cohesive understanding of the relations between artifacts. Rather than being seen as a gathering of disparate objects, the collection is viewed as a whole and arranged so that a visitor can clearly piece together information. The precedents in this section also provide an architectural formation that in some manner is intended to create a narrative structure with which the viewer can experience the exhibits.

The commonality between all of Scarpa’s exhibition designs is the artifact’s persistent presence in Scarpa’s sketches and drawings. Scarpa exploits the potential of the architectural space in framing and contextualizing artifacts. He evidences an understanding not only of the specific qualities of each artifact, but of the contribution of each artifact to a grouping or collection.
One of the principal pieces displayed in the Palazzo Abatellis is the *Triumph of Death*. As previously discussed, Scarpa re-configures the sequence through the building so that the fresco is at the apse of the former chapel – the first terminal axis viewed upon entering the gallery. The fresco is at the end of a series of groin vaults, centrality and axiality adding emphasis to the work as a significant piece. The scale of the fresco, especially as framed by the existing gothic arches, situates the viewer in a subordinate or diminutive position and the oppressive, inescapable dominance of the figure of personified death on horseback is magnified.

The viewer then progresses through the gallery, where, from a new second floor walkway, the fresco is re-displayed. This time only a glimpse of it is partially visible from a distance, a signifier to inspect closer. The atmosphere of the second floor experience, previously described, creates this catacomb-like quality creating a different atmosphere than when on the ground floor.

When the viewer progresses closer to the edge of the second floor, the fresco can be seen obliquely from above. This perspective allows the viewer to reinterpret the fresco from a different vantage point. From this point, the work no longer towers over the viewer; it is the reverse. This second vantage allows the viewer to understand different aspects of the work.
emphasized the dramatic character of death above. The second neutralizes the effect of scale from the first vantage point, permitting the viewer to re-examine and interpret it with a certain removal or detachment from its original impact.

The importance of the *Triumph of Death* is also emphasized in the narrative journey through the building. It is first isolated and exalted by being located at the end of the first terminal axis. Then, by ending the narrative sequence with the same piece, the viewer is encouraged to first reinterpret the piece. This can consequently trigger reflections on the entire journey through the collection and any interconnections between artifacts that may be made.

In another room at the palazzo, dedicated to the works of Antonello de Messina, Scarpa uses a series of wood panels to reduce the room’s elongated dimensions. He sets Antonello’s principal piece, *Annunciation* at an angle, slightly off of the same axis between passages through the room. In this way, the painting is the focal point. It engages and urges viewers through the spatial narrative as it participates in a moment of pause to observe the painting, but at the same moment the view to the room beyond is visible, part of the continuous flow through the rooms. The diminutive *Annunciation* is also given special focus by the architecture. The placement on
an easel, Ranalli observes, allows it to, “acquire the status of a wall.”¹⁹ This provokes the viewer to pause and consider its importance as a work, not just in terms of size.

When Scarpa designed an addition to the existing Canova Plaster Cast Gallery, he not only considered the existing site and building context in his analysis; he also configured the addition specific to the sculpture by Antonio Canova that it would house. The addition is comprised of two main volumes – a rectangular solid (henceforth referred to for ease of reference as “the cube”) and a wedge-like volume (the wedge) that connects the solid and the existing museum.

The wedge narrows at the end opposite the entry. This end terminates with a glazing wall, beyond which a small reflecting pool extends, bounded by a wall extending at the same angle as the wedge. The view from the entry sets up the narrow end of the wedge as a focal point or terminus. The stepping of the wedged volume plus the angle of the wall creates a forced perspective, also emphasizing the end of the wedge as a focal point. It is here he places the statue of the Three Graces, one of Canova’s masterpieces and certainly a favorite of Scarpa’s.

¹⁹ Olsberg, Guidi, and Centre canadien d'architecture, 48
The journey down to this focal point in a sense enhances the final up-close viewing of this sculpture. A series of alternating sculptures are set before the viewer. The pieces are distributed and oriented so that the viewer has to stop on each level downward and turn to see each. In this way, the wedge volume gets segmented into four spaces. There is the constant reminder as the viewer translates across the centerline of the terminus of the space and the object it houses that creates an anticipation of the end.

To create this translation motion, Scarpa houses some of the smaller clay sculptures in rectangular glass vitrines. An important aspect of the vitrine is that, as a rectangular solid, it creates four distinct faces of
orientation in relation to the sculpture (front, back, left, and right) where the sculpture by itself does not necessarily have as distinct a division assigned to it. This forces the viewer to adjust so that they are oriented to what Scarpa deems front (approaching diagonally, the edge of the glass case would obscure view of the sculpture). The vitrine also gives more presence in the space to these small sculptures.

As discussed earlier, the tiered design of the wedge at the Canova Gallery creates four distinct viewing platforms. As the ceiling drops only once, the space when viewed as a whole can be read separately as two volumes. Scarpa is often most concerned with the initial view of the artifacts upon entering the space, or the unique circumstances the space can create when encountering them individually.

He also uses the division of space in conjunction with the artifact to call attention to the building as well as the reverse. This can be seen in the threshold between the cube and the wedge. There is a slight step up into the cube’s volume that designates this threshold. Here, a sculpture with a custom base straddles the threshold. The artifact calls attention to the division of architectural volume.

The edge of the cube is held off of the wedge by glazing so that the two read as independent. This southern
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Glazing creates a strong beam of sunlight that falls across the gallery floor, at first highlighting the joint between the two volumes. But as the line of the sunbeam is chased to the opposite wall, it falls upon relief sculpture on the old building’s wall. The architecture calls attention to the artifact.

Scarpa at times uses architecture to set up a specific zone or area in which to view artifacts. There is a chasm in the floor in front of the relief sculpture that at once delineates the separation of the old and new building (discussed previously) as well as creating a forced viewing distance for the relief sculpture.

In the sculpture gallery, the wedge and cube each have a sequence in which the viewer proceeds to a terminus, then backtracks in the opposite direction. In Castelvecchio, Scarpa reorganizes the viewer’s sequence through the building so that it is linear along each gallery floor. In the lower (sculpture) gallery, the sequence is located on the central axis of the original openings through the wing. The viewer reads individual sculptures but sees them arranged in the larger context of the rows of rooms—the sculptures are grouped partially as a continuous collection.

The viewer also learns about the artifacts in Castelvecchio through the placement of sculpture within the gallery. Scarpa even makes note of his intent to
articulate certain aspects of the artifacts to the viewer through placement and display:

If you enter the room having been told how to look at the shape, you’ll discover its particular qualities and you may want to look at it again. \[20\]

Scarpa positions the sculpture in one of the rooms so that the first impression of the visitor is the back of the sculpture. This is because Scarpa wants to call attention to the craftsmanship in sculpting the line of the robes and braids in the back of the sculpture. The base of the sculpture also sets a viewing distance from the sculpture and initiates a sequence. In this sequence, the viewer perceives the series of arched openings and sculpture grouped as part of a continuous collection, but the placement of the individual sculpture initiates a circuitous path within each room. Placement of the artifacts at different orientations to the viewer allows different aspects of each of the artifacts to be seen before the viewer moves to the next. Sculpture is also placed within the room according to the qualities of light Scarpa determined to be most fitting to each sculpture. Here, there is a certain editorial bias, but it is constructive in extracting particular qualities of the artifact.

In the upper (painting) gallery, Scarpa adds walls that force the viewer to pass through a narrow space between the new wall and the existing wall. Because of this a direct view through the passages does not include the artifacts. The paintings, within their individual rooms are elements in a continuous collection – they are grouped specific to the environment of the room.

As in the Palazzo Abatellis, there is a persistent element that is repeated. This sequence through the building can also provide singular or recurring re/contextualization of the object. When designing Castelvecchio, Carlos Scarpa systematically repositioned the Statue of Cangrande over time. His first placement had a singular viewing location, on a plinth in front of the building, only visible from the museum entrance. Later, he moved it so that glimpses of it could be seen from different locations, using the building as a lens for viewing it. In this manner, the building sequence and the interpretation of the artifact are intertwined. This is especially pertinent when the building itself shares a past with the object, either directly or indirectly.

When housing large-scale objects, such as Cangrande, the building and artifact share a close direct relationship. This is partially because the sizes of the building and artifact have a connection via similarity relative to the scale of the human. It is also because of
relative singularity. The large-scale artifact stands and is interpreted individually versus small artifacts that are usually viewed as part of a collection.

The large-scale artifact can be integral to the experience of the building, or the building can be used as a vehicle for understanding the artifact. The observer can move from building through the artifact to another area, where the artifact acts as a portal. The building can be the portal (or lens, as described above) where different aspects of the large-scale artifact are understood. The Air and Space museum uses floor levels to allow users to experience the scale and complexity of the Boeing 747 and Skylab.

Museum and gallery buildings can strive to be neutral backgrounds for artifacts, but in doing so they lose the opportunity to provide the artifact with some context to better understand it. They can be charged with materials, textures, sights and sounds that provide reinforcing context for the artifact. This does not have to be a direct one to one correspondence. Materials and textures often work suggestively upon the subconscious.

Neutral and charged spaces can also work in combination. The galleries of Tate Modern museum are essentially neutral white boxes, but the windows provide a recurring connection to the scale of the building as the viewer moves through the building. They also provide a
meter for the size of the room versus the comparative size of the artifact being displayed. This understanding works by fusing both short-term memory and observations of the present.

As mentioned previously, Tate Modern’s large turbine hall provides a space for orientation and reflection. Concourse stairs lead quickly up to various gallery levels, but if visitors are meandering from level to level, they can use the gallery stairs. These stairs wind up through the galleries at an irregular pace, slowing the narrative sequence, and creating spaces for contemplation as the visitor moves through the galleries. The stairs also pierce the galleries, their landings becoming observation decks from which the artifacts within the galleries can be viewed and reinterpreted from a new perspective.

Through their spatial relation to artifacts, buildings can control sequence and motion, allowing the artifacts to be understood a part of a narrative structure, or devoid of such a structure, where the spontaneous discovery is the intended result. An obvious example of structured narrative is the Guggenheim, where the continuous spiral gallery engages the viewer by moving them through an unbroken linear journey sequentially through the display pieces. Visitors would:

...Ascend via the elevator to the topmost tier and walk down the ramp to view the art around its periphery. They were to feel the natural condition of their bodies drawn by the force of gravity, so their
procession would be linear, if not determinate, along the galleries.”\textsuperscript{21}

Through the journey, the artifacts are to be considered part of a continuous sequence. Though they are part of this sequence, it is still subdivided by the structure of columns so that artifacts can be grouped together.

In design of the Guggenheim Wright also provides display spaces that attempt to break down some preconceived conventions of viewing and displaying paintings and artwork. Wright,

...Sought a new type of museum whose curved interior space would enhance visitors’ appreciation of the nonobjective modern paintings inside. Wright disliked the sequence of discrete rooms in most museums, where rectilinearly framed paintings were subservient to rectilinear interiors, whereas the paintings would be set freely in three-dimensional curvilinear space.”\textsuperscript{22}

Even though he was not designing for a specific collection, Wright still designed his building to coordinate with the general principles of the artifacts it would house.

Wright even devised the method for hanging and viewing these paintings to incorporate the sloped wall - Zuaznabar describes it as, “A free ambiance for free painting.”\textsuperscript{23} In it the painting is tilted so that natural light would wash down on them from windows above. The space also creates a set viewing distance from the artwork

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{21} Ammirati and Foreman, 47
\textsuperscript{22} Ammirati and Foreman, 46
\textsuperscript{23} Ammirati and Foreman, 104
\end{flushright}
(similar to the Canova Gallery) where the building regulates the manner in which the artifact is viewed.

An example of a less structured narrative is present in the Hirshhorn museum’s upper galleries, where the ovoid circulation hall is also a display hall, displaying sequential paintings and sculpture around the perimeter. This perimeter wall is broken by openings to individual categorically themed galleries, so that the viewer weaves between the two.

2.5 Summary/Conclusion

Sections 2.2 to 2.4 examined specific case studies to extrapolate architectural design operations that provided contextual reinforcement for artifact display and understanding. It is important at this point to review these analyses to understand similarities and methods of approach to design so that they can be applied to the thesis project.

The container as artifact can aid in the contextualization of its contents especially if there is a direct connection of the building to the collection’s history. This is probably most evident in Castelvecchio as the Cangrande sculpture is directly linked through lineage to the castle that houses it. When possible, direct linkage of the site to the artifacts can provide context at a local level, but it not the only role that the container as artifact plays. Preserving a significant building in some manner helps
maintain continuity (and potentially enrichment) of place. Tate Modern's unique modern design was valuable to the London landscape but the site location was advantageous because the building became a generator of interest and investment in the surrounding district. The container, while retaining its historical significance can also lend value to an area if there is enough interest in its contents. This opportunity should be seized if possible.

At the ‘container as found object’ level, differences in approach between precedent examples are dependent upon the significance of the building. If the existing building and site is very significant, care is taken so that alterations are compatible. In the Sainsbury wing, the building participates in the completion of Trafalgar square, however the side not contributing to the Trafalgar façade contrasts its surroundings, a transparent section opposite a massive masonry sidewall. Such contrasts serve to highlight qualities of the existing building as artifact. They also serve to differentiate old from new, which helps reducing ambiguity in understanding the building's passage through time.

Reducing ambiguity between the old and new elements can be seen quite easily in the Sainsbury addition and Canova gallery as both building forms step down to meet the existing buildings and do not dominate them. This reveal provides a buffer between old and new.
Actions such as this are required when the old part is determined historically significant and is to remain largely unchanged. Determining significance is an editorial action, but it is crucial in singling out and highlighting an artifact's unique qualities. Commonplace or less unique elements then are freed to be repurposed and provide a higher use value for the container. Unique elements when isolated will be more easily noticeable and this can lend to a greater understanding of the special qualities of the artifact. Repurposed or new elements should either benefit the building as artifact or the collection itself. For instance, the top level of Tate Modern allows the building to appear as a beacon to its surroundings, but also allows daylighting into the building, allowing natural light into some of the exhibit rooms.

As a container of artifacts, the building must be designed with an intention to how a viewer circulates and views the collection. Harmonization with the artifacts through scale, lighting, and material are all strategies for enriching the context of artifacts through architectural mediation. When this harmonization occurs in conjunction with a re-purposed element or building, an additional level of surprise (and possibly delight) is created as the viewer's semi-conscious thought contemplates the diachronic elements. For instance, the Capitoline Museum’s Centrale Montemartini in Rome
juxtaposes the sculptural qualities of ancient statues with the geometries and efficiencies of industrial equipment allowing the disparate forms to develop subconscious interrelations that they would not achieve if conceived and displayed separately. Harmonization can be direct (daylighting to enhance chiaroscuro on the sculptures at Canova gallery) or indirect via collective memory of the subconscious (the Sainsbury wing’s referential duality).

The spatial narrative sequence a visitor encounters can create linkages between artifacts, allowing a more complete understanding of the collection. It can also vary the amount of information a visitor encounters, so similarities and differences between grouped artifacts become more pronounced. It can provide moments of pause for contemplation or orientation. The narrative sequence can also position or translate the body to observe key elements of the artifacts. Repetition of view through portals, creation of viewing zones, or repositioning a viewer in relation to artifacts can provide valuable context for understanding them.

These are general guidelines, but they cannot be applied universally. They must be considered in conjunction with the specific container that is housing the collection as well as the collection itself. Once these criteria are understood, certain guidelines will become more applicable or create greater impact and resolve in
providing context for the artifacts. Section 4, Design Methodology will explain how these criteria are established based on the design project.
Section 3  Project Information

The above investigations and observations on the nature of the artifact-container relationship are in support of the development of a museum building to house artifacts for the client and program below.

3.1 Client and program

Kinsley, Kansas had been known as “Midway U.S.A.” due to its relatively central location in the United States. It gained the nickname because of a mock photo mimicking a Saturday Evening Post cover displaying a sign pointing New York 1561 miles east and San Francisco 1561 Miles west. Local residents later staged their own mock photo and dubbed Kinsley as the midway.

Kinsley’s location in the middle of the country and its association with the history of Midwest family carnivals has perpetuated this nickname. There is now a sign at a junction in the road at the west end of town that has the milages on it, as well as the “Midway U.S.A.” slogan as a welcome sign entering the city.

National Foundation for Carnival Heritage

The National Foundation for Carnival Heritage (NFCH) was originally formed in 1991. It was realized as part of an effort to revitalize Kinsley and to give it a
renewed sense of identity. A state funded community development grant helped start the foundation. $250,000 was raised in an effort to start the Museum for Carnival Heritage, originally located on the second floor of the Elher's building (discussed later.) Today the museum collection is located across the street and the NFCH board is looking to expand the scope of their museum and operations. The NFCH currently owns three buildings downtown.

NFCH’s official mission statement is “to acquire, display, and interpret the importance of the family-owned traveling carnival in the 20th Century, and to preserve and publically display artifacts that relate to carnivals for the education and enlightenment of the public.” Even though the travelling carnival no longer operates out of Kinsley the importance of the old travelling carnival to the modern Kinsley resident is still relevant and important. This is evident from the time, effort, and money raised by Kinsley residents to create the NFCH.

Aside from the NFCH’s mission statement, there is an unspoken goal, which is to energize and reinvigorate the city of Kinsley. The NFCH and the city want to create a new image for Kinsley as “USA’s Midway” and draw in tourism and money to the downtown business district. This district has suffered due to population loss and relocation. Part of the modern condition, where franchises
and global competitors starve smaller business districts, it would benefit from a unique atmosphere inspired by the curiosity and escapism embodied in the carnival. This then serves as an attractor for unique vendors and entrepreneurs that would serve to revitalize the downtown and fill some of the currently vacant storefronts. Though the primary focus of this thesis is not an exploration in small town revitalization, the museum is to be designed as a possible component in this process. NFCH would like to use the museum to generate a regional draw, as well as tap into the interests of carousel enthusiasts nation-wide.

The city of Kinsley will most likely never support the population it once experienced in its early history due to the increased mechanization of agriculture, but the farms and products produced here are crucial in providing food and support to a regional and national economy. The city deserves to be a vibrant and cherished resource by those who live there. It still serves as an important center for Edwards County and would benefit by a renewed interest in both its history and future.

Scope

The NFCH has a volunteer board headed by John Ploger. John stated, “Our growth is basically limited on funds, time, grants and energy. This is not to say that we are limited – it’s just a little difficult to say when this
growth will happen or how fast.”\textsuperscript{24} The board would not necessarily limit the extent of program scope, but the time taken to execute things is dependant on the abilities and persistence of the people organizing and running the museum. This means that design has to be sensitive to the fact that NFCH may not be able to implement every facet immediately- it may progress over time. The foundation is also working on a yearly event for the city called “carnival daze” that has various entertainment and carnival games available. This is perhaps an opportunity for the building to be engaging as a larger part of community events and celebrations, beginning with “carnival daze.”

NFCH provides largely a cultural and educational service to Kinsley residents through the collection and display of original artifacts from the travelling carnival. It is also a unique resource to those interested in carnival heritage. It shares information with other amusement based museums and organizations. According to Ploger the museum will be, “the only museum in the nation preserving those early days of the traveling carnival.”\textsuperscript{25}

When forming, the NFCH consulted with the Circus Museum in Baraboo, Wisconsin, which is the only dedicated circus museum in the US. The main organization concerned with preserving and cataloguing old carousels

\textsuperscript{24} John Ploger, e-mail correspondence, 10/1/2009.
\textsuperscript{25}
is the National Carousel Foundation. There are several carousel museums, each usually associated with a specific American manufacturer. There are many buildings displaying original or restored historic American Carousels, but they usually only house a single carousel. The carousel that the NFCH is looking to house is unique in that it is the only double-decker carousel in the United States. They would also like to potentially house more carousels in the future. The carousel is the primary driver for the museum’s expansion. It is also the largest and most prominent artifact the museum will house.

Because the nature of this architectural investigation is to engage the building as a container for artifacts, it is important to understand the nature and qualities of the artifact, in this case the carousel. The next section discusses the history and symbolism of the carousel as well as its role in the beginnings of Kinsley as many of the Kansas travelling carnivals' home bases.

3.2 Artifact: The Carousel

Though imagery of primitive carousel-like apparatuses can be found as early as 500 AD, the carousel had its roots as an equestrian game in 12th century Turkey. Fried describes, “Little clay balls filled with scented water were used by these horsemen and thrown to each other – the object was not to miss the catch. This game caught the attention of Italian and Spanish crusaders who brought it
back to Europe." 26 The appropriated title of this game of skill translated as garosello or carosella in Italian and Spanish, meaning "little war."

In 1662 Henry IV changed the nature of the game as the French carrousel became a grandiose horsemanship spectacle, incorporating many participants, games, and events. Among these was a Moorish game where the object was to lance a suspended ring while riding at full speed. Anne Dion Hinds writes, "Noblemen practiced so hard for the carrousel they overworked their horses. That compelled some clever inventor to devise a wheel-like contraption novice lancers could ride during practice." 27 From this point forward, the basic elements of the present day carousel would be defined: a wheel, a center pole, and a source of rotational power.

This notion of the rotation around a center pole is evidenced across cultures in different periods and locales. There is much symbolism imbued in these primary objects (axis mundi, cosmos, etc.) but this paper will focus on symbolism developed in the time the carousel was conceived. Most historically adjacent and relevant to the development of the carousel is the maypole. In several

Germanic nations in the 16th century, the tradition of the maypole evolved as a celebration of the beginning of Celtic summer. The center pole of a carousel, as seen in this 1766 French engraving depicts the center pole at the junction of the “four allegorical figures representing the seasons. In the foreground is Summer with a sheaf of wheat and Autumn with a garland of grape vine and wine cup.” The center pole divides these seasons and the two displayed are the most important in seasonal agrarian cultures – that of summer bounty and autumn harvest.

It is through these observations that the underlying symbolisms active at the formation of the carousel can be seen. The wheel and center pole are persistent primitive symbols that, along with agrarian symbolism, also recall one of man’s earliest inventions: the wheel and axle. When the wheel is vertical, it is a symbol of utility. Man can now move things linear distances using leverage around a moving axis. When the wheel is horizontal and the axle remains stationary, the wheel’s utility to move objects over a linear distance is removed. Now the wheel spins in place. It becomes purely decorative, purely celebratory. The carousel’s configuration not only has historic roots in French carrousel spectacles; it is a symbolic representation of the celebration of technology.

28 Fried, 19
The third element – the source of rotational power becomes the democratizing element of the carousel as it evolves. The carousel, originally a skill-building machine for French equestrians, survived as a source of pleasure and entertainment for nobility. Originally operated by manual or horsepower, the carousel was a source of enjoyment limited to those who could afford it. By the late 1800’s, the idea of the carousel had persisted to become ubiquitous throughout Europe. Steam power and flat belts had been tried with limited success, but its evolution took place at the hands of Fredrick Savage, a British man described as an Engineer and Agricultural Machinist. He created the center truck which essentially encapsulated all the necessary functions for the carousel within a mobile vehicle. With this invention, the carousel was given both mobility and increased capacity. More people could experience the spectacle and the spectacle could now come directly to the people. The center truck allowed a speed in demountability that made the carousel feasible as a travelling amusement feature.

Meanwhile, across the Atlantic, technological invention (steel, the elevator, new processes of manufacture) was drastically re-shaping New York City. In *Delirious New York* Koolhaas describes the dilemma of Manhattan residents at the turn of the twentieth century. Faced with the relentlessness of the urban grid people
strove to “counteract the enervations of urban civilization.” He continues, “A resort implies the presence, not too far away, of a reservoir of people existing under conditions that require them to escape occasionally to recover their equilibrium.”

Coney Island epitomized the duality of the amusement park in America. It was at once both an escape from the city – a human creation grown in complexity through advancements of technology; and the realization of fantasy through technological means – electric lighting, mechanical horses, and gravitational defiance. The equilibrium state people sought was both created and resolved through technology.

Amusement parks during the same period began to populate urban centers and as such, demand for carousels increased. European pioneers like Gustav Dentzel and Charles I.D. Looff brought the technology and craft of carousels to America. Soon manufacturing centers on the east coast were in full production – some producing up to one carousel per day by 1892.

**The Carousel in the Midwest**

The demand for this amusement was not only on the east coast; it also translated to the Midwest for different reasons. People were not escaping the relentlessness of the city, but that of the plains. Here too,

---

29 Koolhaas, 32-33
technology was beginning to alter the landscape as mechanized farm production increased. C.W. Parker realized the demand for amusement and began manufacturing carousels in Abilene, Kansas (later Leavenworth) for the Midwest audience and transport further west. Parker wanted a different image for his amusement and carnival companies, though. Parker’s publicist explains:

C. W. Parker is a man who, by untiring efforts, has rescued the carnival business from the gutter, where it had sunk when the hoochy-koochy and snake eating rage hit the country. There are none of these disgusting freaks and maids, whose twistings have made the streets of Cairo the tropical center of the universe to be found around the Parker shows.  

While the amusement of the carnival moved from East to Midwest, there was a desire for Parker and others to reclaim it, and make it wholesome. This desire will be re-encountered in relation to the history of the carnivals operating out of Kinsley.

Lowenthal states that artifacts (or relics as he terms them) “lend immediacy to exotic as well as domestic history.” There is something deep about the carousel that allows it to persist relatively unaltered to present day. Most carnival attractions need to become bigger, better, faster in order to keep up with the sensibilities of the

---

30 Fried, 87
31 Lowenthal, 246
public, but the carousel has stayed the same. A portion of this may be linked to a sense of nostalgia. The carousel is a memory that the older generation shares with the younger one. But it is also tied to a stronger sense of some need to move, but stay in the same place, to the earth's revolution, the sun crossing the sky, the cycles of seasons, birth, life, and death. These are the persistent notions imbedded within the carousel as artifact that architecture can reinforce, substantiate, or mediate.
Studies

The following diagrams represent different properties of the carousel, inherent in its construction, design, and function. Drawn after observing a time-lapse video of a carousel’s erection, they were created as an alternate method of understanding the carousel as an artifact. They are general principals applying more to portable carousels, such as that obtained by NFCH, but all principles do not apply necessarily to all carousels.

As discussed earlier, the center truck was crucial to creating the mobility of the carousel as a travelling carnival attraction. Another crucial aspect is the manner in which the structure of the carousel is formed so that the entire carousel platform and canopy are supported by the center pole. This allows the carousel to be erected and dismantled quickly and adds to its ease of portability. In the era of the steam carousel, the function of the center pole would also perform as the exhaust chimney.

The organization of the carousel is such that the outside platform and the panel housing the motor and gearing rotate, but the interior is actually static. From the exterior there is no perception of this because all the external pieces appear to move.
The panels housing the gears and the canopy are often oriented so that they are perpendicular to the viewer’s field of vision. One reason this may occur is to catch the viewer’s attention as they pass the carousel. Many of the general construction characteristics of the carousel or other carnival items are geared toward attracting customers through visual overload. Carnival horses are also carved so that the outer row has the greatest amount of visual detail because they have the greatest potential for attracting customers visually.

Repetition of pattern on carousels serves two purposes. It allows certain aspects of the carousel to be mass-produced as panels, and fit onto the circular shape. This repetition of pattern also helps accentuate the motion of the carousel.

The vertical motion of the horses combined with the rotational motion of the carousel creates a sinusoidal motion for the rider. The combination of two separate motions appropriates more accurately that of the cantering horse than either separately.
The carousel displays a dual nature, being comprised on one hand of machine-made, mass produced items such as the framework for the canopy, the platform and many of the connecting pieces for the horses. On the other hand, however, many of the components are hand crafted and one-of-a-kind. Medallions, panels, and the horses themselves are often hand-carved. Depending on the specific horse, the body and legs may be mass produced, but the head is still hand carved so that the horse retains a unique character to the rider.

The assembly of the carousel is done so that each joint is covered over with a finish panel so that on the final product, no fasteners, etc. can be seen.

Lighting on the carousel often runs along the structural members of the carousel, but sometimes, the structure is just used as a framework for a design, or pattern with the lights.
3.3 *Kinsley, Kansas – City Profile*

**Early Kinsley**

Understanding Kinsley and the eventual role the carousel and (ultimately) the carnival had in its history, it is important to have a brief historical background in order to grasp the context that made it possible. In the early 1900’s industrialized technology spread through the Midwest first in the form of steam locomotive transportation. The railroad was crucial to Kinsley, as J.A. Walker explains:

Without rivers to afford natural facilities for transportation, the railroad had been the necessary preliminary to settlement as applying to the whole sub-humid West. That fact has been rather generally recognized by historians, but an equally important one not clearly understood is that so small a population and so little property could not have maintained either the settlement itself or a local government had it not been for the railroad.\(^{32}\) (J. A. Walker's Early History of Edwards County, Pg 267)

The history of Kinsley begins with the Atchison, Topeka, Santa Fe Railroad (ATSF). The ATSF was a railway that intended to stretch from Topeka to Santa Fe. Because of the sparse population of Kansas, the ATSF promoted settlement by applying the ticket price out toward the cost to inspect and buy the land. As such the

ATSF was able to build a customer base as it expanded. In 1872 the ATSF extended its line to the location now occupied by the city of Kinsley. The city of Kinsley was originally populated by the “Chicago Workingmen’s Colony”\(^{33}\) and similarly likeminded people who sought to make a living at agricultural production. The train not only provided the people to live on the land. Its speed and capability to cover great distances brought the crops produced to more densely populated city centers.

The ATSF rail line was the lifeline for bringing people and supplies into the city and also for exporting agricultural products. It ran diagonally through Kinsley, from Larned (east) to Dodge City (west). The rail depot was near the head of Sixth Street (the main commercial street of Kinsley). The city was laid out in a north-south grid pattern.

**Kinsley, 1910**

Kinsley was and still is the county seat of Edwards County. Edwards County had been steadily increasing in population until about 1910 and so had Kinsley's population. Following this period, however, Edward County's population begins to decline, while Kinsley's continues to increase. Improved farming techniques and equipment past this point had the effect of decreasing the

\(^{33}\) Walker and Malin, 260.
population per acre in agricultural areas. Agricultural fields dominated the landscape and at the same time, less and less people were required to maintain them. People wanted entertainment as an escape from the vacuum left in the wake of modernization of farming techniques in the agricultural Midwest.

The Travelling Family Carnival in Kinsley, KS

In Kinsley, one man recognized a growing demand to fulfill people’s desires to escape into fantasy. Charles Brodbeck visited a festival in Hutchinson, Kansas, where he saw, “People would ride a horse or buggy and then pay a nickel to ride a wooden horse in a circle. So he traded some land and some cattle for that carousel.”34 (KTWU interview 7/20/2004) This was the beginning of the traveling carnival in Kinsley, Kansas, and home base to a total of 6 travelling family carnival shows that operated for a good part of the twentieth century.

Kinsley proved to be a good location as a base for the travelling carnival. Although it is not the extreme epicenter of Kansas, the centrality of the city made it a good dispersion point for the travelling carnival. From this point, caravans of vehicles and equipment could transport

34 Jim Kelly (Producer), Narrative including excerpts from Fred Burgess, Buford Brodbeck, and John Ploger, 2004).
the entertainment of fantasy and escapism to towns and cities across Kansas.

The carnivals operating out of Kinsley were all family-run, branching off of the family of Charles Brodbeck. Brodbeck and Sons, Brodbeck Brothers, Brodbeck-Schrader Carnivals and Midwest Strate shows all stemmed from the same family carnival tradition. In addition, as shows grew larger, the number of people it took to run them grew, with up to 150 people accompanying a show.35 The Brodbeck-Shrader Carnival was at one point during the 1950’s the third largest travelling amusement operation in the United States.

Another aspect that helped keep the carnivals based in Kinsley running in the mid and later years was the George Fox machine shop. It serviced farm equipment but also tackled the servicing of carnival rides and equipment as the carnival repaired its machinery over the winter.

Kinsley was located at the chiasm of lines of the ATSF railroad. This allowed larger shows in the early days of the travelling carnival to be transported by train north, south, east, or west. Many shows were also accommodated through smaller wagon (and later truck) caravans as well. Small towns like Kinsley would be

35 "One Ferris Wheel Launched Kinsley Men's Carnival," Great Bend Tribune 1957, .
transformed as the carnival became the destination. Jim Fisher describes the transformation,

Remember? On a hot summer night, one end of a prairie town would literally come ablaze with light. That glow would illuminate unimagined sights... The carnival became part of small-town America’s mythology. For a brief moment, a whistle stop, a tank town, a wide place in the road was transformed. For a night a Ferris wheel, freaks and cotton candy replaced the unrelieved sameness of rural America. 36

What Jim was remembering was not only the carnival, but its transformation of the “sameness” as an event.

The travelling carnival legacy ended in the early 1980’s when the last of the carnival outfits operating out of Kinsley closed its doors. It did this chiefly because of rising insurance costs, competition from larger amusement conglomerates, and new media that allowed people to escape into a world of fantasy in some sense without leaving their homes.

**Kinsley 2009**

Kinsley today is still a rural community with much of its economic base intertwined with the agricultural industry. Many other aspects of the city, however, have changed.

---

The ATSF railroad has since merged with the Burlington Northern railroad to become the BNSF railroad. There is no longer a railroad depot so passengers and goods no longer stop here via rail.

True mechanization and industrialization has changed the agriculture industry drastically, ever since 1950 when the number of gas tractors on farms exceeded the number of horses and mules for the first time. Farmers have had to farm more land to make the same amount of money. Many have sold out to larger farm operations completely. This has effected Kinsley and many farm communities across the Midwest. Edwards County population and Kinsley's population have dwindled. This puts a sort of stress on the town because although the farms are necessary for agricultural production in the U.S., depopulation has changed the dynamic in which the towns can operate and create a sense of community.

Route 50 (formed 1926) was the next lifeline to Kinsley, running east-west from the Atlantic (Ocean City, Maryland) to the Pacific (Sacramento, California). It runs roughly midway north-south as it crosses the U.S. which gained it the nickname, “America's Backbone.” It was a major transcontinental highway in its day. Route 56 (formed 1957) comes into the city from the north, paralleling the railroad and serving as a diagonal highway across Kansas.
Both Route 50 and 56 were superseded when the interstate highway system succeeded them in 1972. Thus, much of the traffic and commerce that once visited the town just because it was on a major railroad line or major highway artery has vanished. While the ability to redirect traffic or commerce in the original sense has disappeared, new potential is evident. Route 50 has gained some importance today as a coast-to-coast “off the beaten path” tourist route. It is in this respect that a curiosity attraction such as the Museum for Carnival Heritage makes sense as an attractor to the city.

3.4 Site

While the NFCH owns three buildings in downtown Kinsley, the “Ehler’s building” (one of the three) has the most potential as a site for the museum.

History and Importance

First and foremost, as discussed earlier, the building as artifact is the outer, global level for establishing a context for its collection. While the Ehler’s building does not have a direct connection to the carnivals, or a recorded role in the carnival’s history, it has operated as one of the anchor buildings in much of Kinsley’s history.

W.H. Ehlers came from Larned to work in Kinsley at the first general goods store (Marshall and Bidwell) in
Kinsley. He then eventually became partner in the business and bought the other interests in the firm. He built the Ehlers building in 1910 on the corner of Marsh and East Sixth Street. Sixth street by this time had become the town’s main street. It terminated at the location where trade and shipment of agricultural products occurred and was just north of the train station. Early downtown Kinsley was comprised of the first two blocks east of the train tracks on Sixth Street. The street that divided these two blocks was Marsh Ave. Since the Ehler’s building was located off of the intersection of Marsh and East Sixth, it was essentially located at the heart of downtown Kinsley.

The building was Kinsley’s first “modern department store.”37 It sold all the general goods the town would need and housed the Farmers and Merchants’ State bank in its southeast corner. This corner was deemed the “best corner” of the building by the Kinsley Mercury because it had street real estate on two sides. The original store was two open floors separated by a back mezzanine balcony floor, the east half of which was originally a women’s parlor.

The store was operated by Earl Ehlers and his descendents for three generations, before it closed (in 1964) and re-opened as Fox’s department store (owned by

37 Ed Carlson, "(Untitled) Subject - Kinsley Downtown Building Profiles," *Kinsley Mercury* 1911,
Tom and Mary Fox.) the same year. The building was later “modernized” with a plastic storefront extending from the first floor to the top of the building. A drop ceiling was added to the lower level, lowering fifteen foot ceilings to eight foot ceilings. Fox’s closed in 1987 and was donated to the school district. The NFCH bought the building for $5000 and used a tourism grant of $51,000 and raised $250,000 before opening. The museum later moved to 111 and 113 East Sixth street in order to remain ADA compliant. Currently, a NCFH office and “Twice is Nice” charity resale shop occupy the first floor. NCFH uses the second floor to store some of its carnival artifact collection.

The Ehlers building has strong potential as a museum for several reasons. First, it has potential over a new building on a clean site because the building as artifact already has associative value in the town with the residents. Long after Ehlers department store closed, the building is still known as the Ehler’s building, showing that the building has at least some lasting value in the collective memory. The city manager identified it as an “anchor” building in the community38.

While it most likely does not contain the unique characteristics buildings need to gain National Register status, the building itself has local resonance, and this

resonance is important for the building as artifact to provide context for that which it contains. The building’s particular resonance is one that is compatible with re-use. When questioned, residents agreed that they would like to see the building remain but that more drastic alterations to achieve a compatible use were not out of the question. The building is not seen by the residents as a pristine object only to be preserved, but rather as an integral part of the city that is more valuable when it is operating and contributing, even if in an altered form.

The Ehler’s building has certain characteristics that could be better utilized. The original “bank corner” of the building could potentially house a use compatible with the museum and the city. The mezzanine would obtain a much different quality if it is incorporated into the museum design and if the drop ceiling is removed. Much of the old character of the building is hidden by the “modernization” improvements of Fox’s, but the original attributes still exist and are in good condition.

The building also has the advantage of location. As discussed above, the building sits in the heart of Kinsley's downtown, small as it is. It is located off of the main street and because the street is one way, there is a definite pattern of approach to the site. Because of the generous width of the roads in Kinsley, there is actually diagonal
parking on both sides of East Sixth and Marsh Street, so parking for the museum is plentiful.

The building east of Ehler’s was most recently Farmer’s insurance. It has a very small footprint and none of the associative value to the community as does Ehler’s. Adjacent to that building, and key to the Ehler’s site working for the museum is a vacant lot. The lot is large enough to house the double decker Heyn carousel.
3.4.1 Ehler's and neighboring building histories.
3.5 Building Program

The carnival heritage museum has the unique advantage of being an institution that displays artifacts for the general public, but also is representative of history unique to an area. Some museums and galleries curate artifacts so that they can be viewed in a single place, but the place they are viewed is not necessarily connected to their place of origin. Many of the artifacts at the carnival heritage museum have been donated by the people of Kinsley, or are related directly to the Kinsley travelling carnivals. In this sense then, the museum houses not only a collection, but also a permanent tie to a memory of place.

The client has indicated several programmatic spaces directly related to museum operations; from this information, support and complimentary spaces were developed in order to complete the building program. The program was developed as classification of activities and functions that would occur in the museum, and later those activities were assigned square footages and room criteria.
Classification of Activities and Functions

All the following are strictly activities, not necessarily correlating to space requirements.

Accessing the Site
- Automobile Parking
- Bus Parking – North
- Bus Turn-around

Patron oriented activities

Exterior activities
- Finding the museum
- Participating in museum special events

Greeting/Orientation
- Remove Jackets, scrape boots, etc.
- Request Information
- Waiting
- Seating

Museum Experience
- View Carnival Hall of fame
- Learn about Kansas Carnivals
  Learn about carnival amusement rides
- Learn about the Carousel
- Learn about Kinsley built carousel
- Ride the double decker Carousel
- Standing in Line>Loading Carousel
- Observation
- Learn about carnival music/players of the early 1900s
- Listen to audio from the era
- Learn about Carnival display/advertisement
- Observe restoration in progress or view artifacts undergoing restoration
- Screen video of carnival family interviews and early carnival footage
- Watch re-enactment/interactive show
- Eat carnival food
- Interpreter guided tours
- Participate in workshops

Research
- Research carnival history
- Research carnival genealogy
- Read and understand materials
Hygiene
- Bathroom activities

External (to main function) activities
- Children’s educational tours
- Children’s reading
- Small public group meetings
- fundraisers

Museum Operational Functions

Operate admissions
- greet patrons
- Donation recording
- Print/copy receipts
- Hand out information
- Operate telephone
- Schedule group visits
- Coordinate special events
- Manage public room schedule
- Lead interpreter guided tours
- Organize workshops
- Set up/ break down workshop materials

Operate rides/games
- sell tickets
- operate carousel
- demonstrate old game strategy/ techniques

Administrative/Coordination
- Staff meetings
- Board meetings
- Promotion
- Financial tabulation
- Order supplies
- Correspond through mail, phone, e-mail, fax

Staff operation
- take a break/lunch

Food Service
- prepare “carnival food”
- serve carnival food
- clean food containers/machines
- clean patron eating spaces
- package gift orders

Special Events
  Fundraising events
- catering
- entertaining
- minimal food preparation (heating/warming items, some cold storage)
  Re-enactment Performance
- rehearsal
- prep/dressing
- store props
  Group tour
- training
  Research Related
- Research requests
- Store/catalog/archive materials
  Restoration
- Cleaning carnival related items
- Repainting/touch-up
- Light fabrication and assembly (welding etc. done offsite)
- Demonstration
  Maintenance/service
- Store janitorial/maintenance supplies
- Store equipment
- Heat/cool/provide utilities for museum
- Load/unload new artifacts and displays
Section 4  Design Parameters and Methodology

4.1 Design Guidelines

In applying ideas learned from precedents I must also consider the nature of the project and differences between it and the precedents discussed in this document. For instance, variants of techniques used by Sarpa arise between Canova and Castelvecchio because the buildings have different significance and the nature of modifications necessary to adapt them is unique. Because of this I have developed some design guidelines that reflect an understanding of the character the building in its surroundings.

1. Create a visual magnet at street level.
2. Reinforce a sense of escapism/willing suspension of disbelief generated by the early carnival.
3. Exploit addition to create tension/contrast between old and new.
4. Maintain architecture as a diachronic artifact with a clear expression of the passage of time.
5. Use artifact arrangement to augment architectural goals while telling the story of the early carnival and of the town.

The intent of these guidelines to apply an appropriate level of care to the significant characteristics of the building, while allowing flexibility for adaptation to strengthen the container’s relation to its content. The arrangement of the images to follow is intended to relate a sense of the method and process involved with
establishing the design of the Carnival Heritage Museum. Some early images have been reduced intentionally so that they can be grouped and seen as distinct phases in the design progression.
4.2 Design Development

Initial Studies

Design development began with a series of analyses focusing on the relationship between the 1900 Heyn carousel that is to be part of the collection, Ehler’s building, and the addition to Ehler’s that will house the carousel. This began with a series of studies examining the consequences and potential of locating the carousel in different relationships with Ehler’s building in both plan and section.
It also included a survey of existing carousel building and pavilion precedents to perceive similarities in design strategy and relationships. Two contemporary pavilions (Geeloong Waterfront Pavilion and Mitchell Park pavilion) were analyzed because they involved strategies that could be modified or applied to the project. Geelong provided an example where the circular geometry of the carousel intersected with the rectangular layout of the building. Mitchell Park provided an example of a pavilion that opened to create a more outdoor space. Many other precedents opened, but not with the level of porosity exemplified by Mitchell Park.

**Building Analysis**

The Ehler’s building was analyzed as an artifact both for qualities that can support the design guidelines and for strategies to enhance it in service of them. The building itself is a masonry load-bearing building. Most of it operates with small lintels above openings to distribute load, but the south (front) elevation of the building has a large storefront display on the southeast corner that does not operate in this manner. Instead a large hidden lintel carries the load to either side of this façade and a small steel column supports the middle. This portion of the
façade is a mixture of older masonry techniques and modern steel construction, much as the early carnival included both aspects of handcraft and technological innovation. A site model was developed to visualize design impacts. The small vacant building to the east of the Ehler’s building would be removed so that more open space is available for the carousel addition. A series of massing models then explore uniting the existing building to the addition using this opening as nexus.
4.2.8 1:50 Building massing iterations.
One of the first observations was that the primary approach was from the east because Sixth St. (Kinsley downtown’s main street) runs one way, east to west and delivers traffic from routes 50 and 56 from Niles Avenue (route 183). Also, observed vehicular and pedestrian traffic is greatest along Sixth St. secondary approaches to the building are from Marsh Ave. coming from the north or south. Guideline 1, create a visual magnet at street level was selected because the Ehler’s building by itself does not stand out, being located amongst other early twentieth century buildings. The new portion of the building, in addition to being a visual magnet should also create a tension between old and new. Several 1:50 study models were created to explore ways in which the addition interacted with the existing Ehlers building. The earlier survey of pavillions along with personal experience and some scale drawings indicated that the carousel would have to utilize the entirety of the vacant lot next to Ehlers in order to provide enough clearance around the carousel, both for viewing and general gathering space. The models exhibit this and also exhibit some general characteristics of how the new building attaches to the existing, or how the existing building is modified to accommodate space for the carousel and moving between the two spaces.
4.2.11 1:50 models exploring visual impact and relationship of existing building to new.
4.2.12 1:50 models exploring visual impact and relationship of existing building to new.
Experimentation then proceeded to a larger 1/16” = 1’-0” scale where progression through the building and carousel spaces could be examined. The first iteration derived certain formal aspects from the first 1:50 model. The second derived formal aspects from the third and fourth 1:50 models. Each of the 1/16” models had some common design elements. The entry in each case was through the original Ehlers building, but a portion of the second floor is pulled back to the first structural bay, allowing for a larger central space and also creating a focal point. Both models have a rear mezzanine space that is expanded and actually bridges the old and new portions of the building. This is meant as a subconscious reference to the old mezzanine of Ehlers, but it also is a plan organizer, pushing all the non-artifact display spaces (offices, mechanical rooms, auditorium, etc.) to the back of the building. Each model has an intended progression from artifacts on the first floor dealing with the history of the town to the mezzanine, providing both a space for contemplation and housing various advertising artifacts. From the mezzanine up to the second floor, the viewer crosses from new to old building diagonally, contrasting the grid structure of the building (guideline 3) in a similar manner to the way the railroad cuts through the grid of Kinsley.
These models introduced the idea of the party wall as the main wall for displaying larger sculptural artifacts (carvings, etc.) It is also isolated because it is the largest conveyor of the history of the building; showing the remnant of the connecting building as well as a remnant of current renovations. Old portions of the building are kept separate from the new.

The carousel remains in relatively the same location in the two models – on the first floor near the façade in the area of highest visual impact. Central location in the space is necessary for operation and viewing/gathering.

The new building roof in each model also appears to peel back from the original building, reinforcing a sense of escapism/suspension of disbelief (guideline 2). Also, a portion of the façade (colored blue in models) is relocated; the double height interior is linked to the formal entry. Another element reinforcing this sense of escapism is the diagonal journey from mezzanine to the second floor. Travelling through the building, above and between old and new heightens a sense of the juncture between the two buildings and ‘suspects’ the viewer in a moment of reflection. The height also allows a different perspective on the carousel, so the craft of upper elements of the carousel can be viewed.
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Design then progressed to a slightly larger scale so that details and connections could be formulated. A model at 1/8” = 1’-0” shows progression of the design. Here, the diagonal element modeled as a bridge on the 1/16” model is hypothesized to be of a similar construction to that of a roller coaster, both recalling imagery of the suspension of dis-belief and accomplishing the goal of covering a large span with relatively little support. The single center rail of the bridge also allows it to touch lightly where it hits the existing building. The bridge widens near the carousel to become a viewing deck.

In addition to the bridge, the rear portion of the new addition was considered, as an element in the narrative through exhibits. The auditorium/workshop configuration were designed so that the workshop can be viewed from above as restoration to carnival artifacts becomes part of the museum’s scope. The auditorium and elevator are considered and integrated in a possible method of circulating through the building.
4.2.19 1/8" model of bridge/viewing platform (above), 1"=1'-0" model of bridge segment, shown in plan (right) and bridge decking removed to show underlying bridge structure (upper right).
Though the west and south faces of the Ehler's building are altered (in part to create a visual magnet from street level), the east elevation remains relatively unaltered. This elevation is to receive a graphic or possibly even lighting installation that is applied to (or stripped from) the building face and should serve to highlight an element of the carnival, Kinsley, or the Ehler’s building. Below are some test graphics produced to gauge the scale and treatment for this face.
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