Public Humanities (2026), 2, e165, 1–10
doi:10.1017/pub.2026.10266

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS PUBLIC HUMANITIES

ARTICLE

The Microhistorical Museum

Pin-Hua Chou

History, University of California Los Angeles, USA
Email: chou.pinhua@gmail.com

(Received 13 May 2026 UTC; revised 14 August 2026 UTC; accepted 15 August 2026 UTC)

Abstract

This article uses microhistory as a theoretical framework to examine the Nguyễn Văn Huyên Museum in Lai Xá village, Hanoi, as both a curatorial project and an epistemological intervention. Established by Nguyễn Văn Huyên's son, the museum recovers the life and career of Nguyễn Văn Huyên (1905–1975), the first Vietnamese doctoral of letters at the Sorbonne, the first Vietnamese scholar employed by the EFEO as a researcher, and the Minister of Education of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam for twenty-nine years. Drawing on Carlo Ginzburg's concept of the "exceptional normal" and "clues," Clifford Geertz's thick description, and Natalie Zemon Davis's attention to the texture of lived experience, the article argues that the museum operates as a microhistorical text in three ways: it restores Nguyễn Văn Huyên's pre-1945 intellectual career from the double erasure of colonial surveillance and postcolonial nationalist historiography; it reads French colonial administrative documents as evidence of an epistemology that treated Vietnamese scholarly agency as inherently threatening; and it demonstrates that private family museums can accomplish what state institutions are structurally prohibited from doing, telling stories that complicate and supplement the national narrative. Intimate scale, the museum insists, is not a limitation on historical understanding but its most productive condition.

Keywords: colonial knowledge production; microhistory; Nguyễn Văn Huyên; private museums; Vietnamese history

"The history of the country begins from each individual," reads the guiding motto of the Nguyễn Văn Huyên Museum in Lai Xá village on the outskirts of Hanoi. By insisting that national history is best approached through the particular, through a single life, a single family, a single courtyard, the museum stakes a claim that both Carlo Ginzburg and its curator would recognize as microhistorical. That the museum's founders arrived at this orientation partly through a visit to the Anne Frank Museum in Amsterdam is itself revealing: they understood, intuitively and comparatively, that intimate scale enlarges rather than diminishes historical significance, that the particular is where meaning becomes fully visible.

This article examines the complicated career of a Vietnamese official named Nguyễn Văn Huyên (1905–1975). Born into an elite northern family, Nguyễn Văn Huyên studied at the Sorbonne and became, by the 1930s, one of the most respected young intellectuals in French Indochina—the first Indochinese Doctor of Literature graduate of the Sorbonne and the first Vietnamese scholar employed by the École française d'Extrême-Orient (EFEO) as a

© The Author(s), 2026. Published by Cambridge University Press. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. 15 Nov 2026 at 21:25:12, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use.

researcher with a permanent position.[1] After 1945, when Vietnamese Communist leaders sought to give their new government a moderate, noncommunist face, Hồ Chí Minh made Nguyễn Văn Huyên Minister of Education, a post he held for twenty-nine unbroken years. To outside appearances, Nguyễn Văn Huyên had an outstanding career as a powerful official of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (DRV).[2] On closer examination, as this article argues, the story is more complicated, and it is the family museum devoted to him in Lai Xá village, established by his son Nguyễn Văn Huy, that makes this complexity visible. The museum occupies approximately 200 sq m across four floors and houses nearly 400 documents and artifacts spanning from the late 19th century to the late 20th. The argument of this article is threefold. First, the museum operates as a microhistorical text, reducing the scale of historical observation precisely in order to make visible what macro-level narratives systematically conceal. Second, the museum performs an act of archival recovery, restoring to public legibility a pre-1945 intellectual career that was shaped and constrained by French colonial surveillance, and then, after 1945, largely dismissed by the politics of Vietnam's Communist Party. Third, the museum's objects and documents function as what Ginzburg calls "clues": material traces through which social structures, power relations, and the texture of individual agency can be reconstructed from the bottom-up.[3]

1. The exceptional normal: Microhistory as museum method

Microhistory, as theorized by Carlo Ginzburg and his colleagues beginning in the 1970s, is not simply the study of small things. It is a methodology: that by drastically reducing the scale of historical observation, we gain access to dimensions of social reality, relationships, meanings, power dynamics, that remain invisible at the macro level. In *The Cheese and the Worms* (1976), Ginzburg demonstrated that the mental world of a 16th-century Friulian miller named Menocchio, reconstructed through Inquisition records, could illuminate the popular culture and theological heterodoxy of an entire era.[4] Ginzburg was drawn to what he would later theorize as the "exceptional normal"—the anomalous case that, precisely because it generated extensive documentation through conflict and surveillance, exposes the normative structures it deviates from. Microhistorians study deviants, eccentrics, and marginal figures for a precise methodological reason: such figures leave denser archival traces than those who move silently within the norm.

Nguyễn Văn Huyên is, in this sense, an exemplary microhistorical subject. He was exceptional in ways that generated records, the first Annamite to receive a doctorat dès lettres (Doctor of Literature) from the Sorbonne, the first Vietnamese person to hold a permanent position as an EFEO researcher, later Hồ Chí Minh's minister navigating the impossible demands of postcolonial state-building, and those records, as we shall see, include the documents of surveillance that colonial administrations produce precisely when they are uncertain about how to categorize a subject.[5] At the same time, his trajectory was structurally representative of an entire generation of Franco-educated Vietnamese intellectuals

[1] The École française d'Extrême-Orient (EFEO) is a French research institution founded in 1900 (building on an archaeological mission started a couple years earlier), originally headquartered in Saigon and then moved to Hanoi in 1902. Its founding mission was to study the languages, history, archaeology, and religions of "Farther Asia"—Indochina above all but also China, Japan, India, and beyond.

[2] Democratic Republic of Vietnam was founded by Hồ Chí Minh in 1945, led by communists, and known as North Vietnam.

[3] Ginzburg 2013.

[4] Ginzburg 1980.

[5] In French, "Annamite" translates into "Vietnamese" or "Of Annam."

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. 15 Nov 2026 at 21:25:12, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use.

who occupied what Homi Bhabha would call the "colonial third space": educated in the language and methods of the metropole, professionally dependent on colonial institutions, politically indeterminate, and ultimately caught between competing demands when the moment of revolution arrived.[6] To read his life carefully, with the archival density the museum makes possible, is to read the history of that generation.

This microhistorical sensibility converges with Clifford Geertz's concept of "thick description," introduced in his 1973 essay *The Interpretation of Cultures*.[7] Geertz argued that cultural analysis requires richly layered accounts of social action, accounts that move from the surface observation of behavior to the embedded webs of significance that make behavior meaningful. The museum translates this imperative into curatorial practice: it will not tell you simply that Nguyễn Văn Huyên was an important minister; it will show you his wife's dinner plates, his rejected Communist Party application, and the fruit trees his descendants replanted in the courtyard—the same trees his wife, Vi Kim Ngọc, had known at the hometown the land reform made it hard for her to return to. The thick description is achieved through objects.

The museum reads its French colonial documents against the grain, recovering the uncontrolled voices that erupt through official discourse; this article does the same with the documents displayed on the second floor.

2. Constraint, erasure, and the politics of the private

To understand why a private family museum was necessary to tell this story, one must understand the silences that surrounded Nguyễn Văn Huyên's name in both the colonial and postcolonial periods.

The first phase was one of constraint rather than erasure. As an EFEO researcher, Nguyễn Văn Huyên published extensively in French on Vietnamese ethnology, oral literature, and folk religion throughout the 1930s. These works constituted a significant intellectual contribution, and they did so within the institutional framework of French colonial knowledge production, using French methodological conventions, and appearing in EFEO's *Bulletin* and related publications. After 1945, when Nguyễn Văn Huyên joined the Việt Minh and became Minister of Education for the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, this body of work in French effectively ceased to circulate within Vietnam, for decades. He himself stopped conducting ethnological research and devoted himself entirely to education policy, now writing exclusively in Vietnamese. His pre-1945 scholarship did not disappear, but it became inaccessible to Vietnamese readers without French literacy and, more importantly, politically ambiguous in a context where association with French colonial institutions required careful management.

The second, and more consequential erasure was the work of Vietnam's Communist Party rather than that of the nation as such. During the period of decolonization and the consolidation of the DRV's official narrative, the Party subjected the intellectual contributions of those who had worked within French colonial institutions, even figures who had subsequently joined the revolution, to retrospective silencing. To discuss Nguyễn Văn Huyên's work at EFEO was, implicitly, to discuss French Indochina and the complex

[6] Bhabha and Rutherford 2006.
[7] Geertz 1973.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. 15 Nov 2026 at 21:25:12, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use.

accommodations that Vietnamese intellectuals had made with colonial power. National museums followed a "set template": a triumphal narrative of resistance, liberation, and socialist construction that had limited space for the ambivalent careers of colonial-era scholars.

State museums in Vietnam typically present a similar structural narrative. The Vietnam National Museum of History in Hanoi is representative: its content divides Vietnamese history into two parts, the first spanning prehistory to the end of the Nguyễn dynasty (1945) and the second running from the mid-19th century to the present day. Beyond this chronological division, both parts are organized around themes of struggle and resistance, with section titles such as "Struggles to Gain Independence, 1st–10th Centuries AD," "The Struggles for Independence of the Vietnamese People (1858–1945)," "The Resistance Against French Colonialism," and "The Resistance Against American Imperialism, Liberation of the South and Unification of the Country." The same structure recurs at other national museums, including the Ho Chi Minh City Museum of History and even the National Museum of Fine Arts. Because these narratives center on events, warfare, and conflict, it is difficult to find any individual in them beyond political or military leaders.

The result was a figure who was highly visible in one dimension, the Minister of Education, the loyal colleague of Hồ Chí Minh, and nearly invisible in another: the ethnologist, the Sorbonne-trained Doctor of Literature, the man who had spent years researching Vietnamese folk culture through French scholarly frameworks. The museum was built to close that gap. The decision to build a private rather than state museum was therefore not merely pragmatic. It was epistemological. A private museum is not bound, as state museums are, by the Communist Party's official narrative, and this freedom is precisely what enables a fuller account. When Nguyễn Văn Huy visited the Anne Frank Museum, he recognized in its methodology something more than sentiment: the capacity of individual biography, told through objects and domestic space, to illuminate historical processes that official histories treat at a level of abstraction that renders individual experience invisible.[8]

3. Surveillance, archives, and the controlled production of knowledge

Among the second-floor displays, it is the bureaucratic documents that arrest attention: internal memos of the French colonial administration recording, in the careful prose of officialdom, the surveillance of a young Vietnamese scholar. Displaying them in a family museum makes a point: these are the records of power, and they belong in a story about knowledge, access, and the politics of the archive.

The documents in question concern Nguyễn Văn Huyên's 1929 request to consult archives at the French Ministry of Colonies. Nguyễn Văn Huyên requested access to documents relating to Franco–Indochinese relations from 1800 to 1880 for the preparation of his doctoral thesis. The request was unremarkable in form. What followed was extraordinary.

Before granting or denying access, the Ministry of Colonies consulted the Ministry of Marine and, crucially, the Service of Control and Assistance of Indigenous Workers, an institution whose very name announces a surveillance function. The inquiry was: what were Nguyễn Văn Huyên's political affiliations? Was he safe to grant access to colonial records? The response from the Service was telling: no negative political information about Nguyễn Văn

[8] Personal interview with Nguyễn Văn Huy and Nguyễn Vũ Hoàng on August 31, 2024.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. 15 Nov 2026 at 21:25:12, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use.

Huyên could be found, he had studied at the Faculty of Letters in Montpellier without incident, but this absence of evidence was not treated as grounds for approval. Instead, a final memorandum concluded that access should be refused on the grounds that "certain pieces could be interpreted in a tendentious manner" and that the communication of historical documentation posed risks to "French colonization."

The logic is worth dwelling on. The colonial administration was not refusing a dangerous radical. It was refusing a graduate student in good standing, with no political record, whose only transgression was wanting to research the history of the country from which he came. The refusal was preemptive, a declaration that Vietnamese scholars, by virtue of being Vietnamese, might read colonial archives against French interests, regardless of their actual intentions. Access to historical knowledge about Indochina was, the documents make clear, a privilege to be withheld from those most directly implicated in that history.

The restraint is deliberate. The documents speak loudly enough without editorial amplification. What they reveal is a colonial system that treated interpretive freedom itself as the danger, the uncontrollable possibility that a Vietnamese scholar might read colonial history on his own terms.

There is a deep irony embedded in these documents. Nguyễn Văn Huyên dreamed of becoming a historian. He wanted to write the history of Franco–Indochinese relations from the perspective of someone who had lived that relation. The French colonial administration refused him the archival access he needed. He became, instead, an ethnologist, a researcher of oral literature, folk religion, and material culture, fields in which the relevant "archives" were living communities rather than sealed depositories. The colonial gatekeeping of historical knowledge did not silence him; it redirected him. The discipline he became famous for was, in part, a product of the discipline he was denied.

4. Objects as microhistorical evidence

If the colonial surveillance documents are one kind of evidence, the personal objects on the museum's other floors are another. They testify to what Natalie Zemon Davis called the "texture of life": the sensory and material dimensions of historical experience that documentary archives rarely preserve.[9]

Consider the dinner plates. When Vi Kim Ngọc followed her husband north to Việt Bắc in 1946, joining the Việt Minh retreat from Hanoi as French troops re-encircled the capital, she brought this set of plates. The choice was a statement about the persistence of form, about the conviction that even in the most austere conditions of revolutionary wartime, certain practices of civility should be maintained. Vi came from a prominent family steeped in Confucian official culture; the plates encoded that formation, carried it across the rupture of 1945, and asserted that revolution did not require the abandonment of all inheritance. The plates are dense with meaning: they condense a family history, a class position, and a philosophy of cultural continuity.

The wedding photographs, displayed side by side, present a different kind. One shows Nguyễn Văn Huyên and Vi Kim Ngọc in Western attire; the other, in traditional Vietnamese dress. The juxtaposition maps the precise cultural location of their generation:

[9] Davis 1983.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. 15 Nov 2026 at 21:25:12, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use.

educated within Western modernity, committed to certain forms of Vietnamese tradition, unwilling to choose definitively between them. That Vi refused an arranged marriage and insisted on marrying for love adds another layer: in insisting on a marriage of her own choosing, she enacted a modern subjectivity that her husband's French education could theorize but that her own family, steeped in Confucian values, had never expected to encounter at home.

Most unexpected among the objects is a display case containing a Party membership application form that Nguyễn Văn Huyên once prepared but never submitted, because Hồ Chí Minh asked him not to. The reasoning, as Huy recounts it, was explicitly instrumental: Hồ Chí Minh needed someone near him who was not a Party member to demonstrate the Party's openness and political neutrality, to maintain the coalition of noncommunist nationalists that the revolutionary government required. Former Public Security Chief Lê Giứn described this broader practice in his memoir as "painting the top white": installing respected, noncommunist figures at the visible head of key ministries, while lesser known Party cadres ran the ministry's Party Committee and held the actual power.[10] Nguyễn Văn Huyên spent the rest of his life politically unaffiliated because his commitment took the form of obedience to a request from a leader he had reason to trust and little power to refuse.

Displayed alongside the unsubmitted form is a watch, with an inscription of Hồ Chí Minh on it, gifted to Nguyễn Văn Huyên by Vice Prime Minister of DRV Phạm Văn Đồng after the 1954 Geneva Accords. Initially, I read the watch as proof of a personal bond between the two men. But it is worth asking how far that bond really went: when Vi Kim Ngọc's extended family was targeted during the land reform campaign of the 1950s, Hồ Chí Minh extended political protection only to the immediate family members whose contributions to the country were deemed significant, and Nguyễn Văn Huyên's years of service earned his extended family little protection from that campaign's violence. Put the Party application form and the watch side by side, and a different picture emerges. Nguyễn Văn Huyên was useful to the Party precisely because he stayed outside it, his obedience carried out on instructions from above. Hồ Chí Minh was less a friend than a strategist, calibrating the political symbolism of his inner circle with precision. Neither of these men appears this way in the standard histories. Both emerge here, from an unsubmitted form and an inscribed watch, in a family museum.

The museum extends its microhistorical attention beyond Nguyễn Văn Huyên himself to the figures who made his career possible. A panel display notes that his sister, Nguyễn Thị Mao, was a graduate of the Indochina Pedagogy College and the first Vietnamese woman to qualify as a mathematics teacher—a fact that complicates any account of early 20th-century Vietnamese modernity that centers exclusively on men educated in France. What enabled both Huyên and Mao to reach these heights was, the museum suggests, the sustained sacrifice of their widowed mother, who spent most of her resources on her children's education. This is a maternal biography within the biography, a microhistory within the microhistory, and the museum does not allow it to remain subordinate to the more conventionally celebrated story of the son who went to Paris.

Finally, there are the fruit trees in the courtyard: guava, papaya, and others that are planted in Lai Xá; the same kinds of trees were planted in Vi Kim Ngọc's home in Tran Hung Dao

[10] Lê Giứn 1985.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. 15 Nov 2026 at 21:25:12, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use.

street. And when Nguyễn Văn Huy opened this museum, he replanted the same kinds of trees in Lai Xá with the meaning that the trees would remind the offspring about the stories and memories of the parents and grandparents, and of the family traditions. Vi Kim Ngọc's family had become a target of class struggle, and any return visit risked implicating local people. The trees were not metaphor; they were substitution, a material practice of displaced belonging. The museum's courtyard is literally a transplanted landscape, a garden built from longing. Without the story that a family member will tell you if you ask, the trees are simply trees. With it, they are what the museum is: a place where private grief and political history are inseparable.

5. Curatorship as microhistorical practice

The museum's theoretical coherence does not emerge from the objects alone. It emerges from the curatorial philosophy that organizes them. Nguyễn Văn Huy's description of that philosophy is itself worth close reading: "We should tell small stories originating from the artifact, the life of the artifact and its subject. Don't talk in a big way."[11]

This is, in essence, a methodological manifesto. It describes the same inversion that characterizes microhistory's relation to conventional historiography: starting not from the general and moving toward the particular, but starting from the particular, the artifact, the document, the anecdote, and allowing the larger contexts to emerge inductively, as what is required to explain the small thing. Huy describes the curatorial process as resembling the work of a novelist: each artifact requires research into its provenance and context, and the curators must then determine how to "combine the artifact into a series of stories" that give it meaning without overriding its particularity with predetermined narrative.[12]

The museum's design choices reinforce this philosophy at the level of form. Exhibition designer Véronique Dollfus has organized the exhibition so that each thematic period is represented by a distinct color, creating a visual grammar of differentiation that mirrors the chronological structure of the displays without imposing a linear triumphalism. The panels hung chronologically along the stairway walls create what amounts to a timeline that visitors traverse physically, moving through history by moving through space. The genealogy displayed at the entrance, a six-generation family tree centered on Nguyễn Văn Huyên and Vi Kim Ngọc, provides visitors with a structural map that the subsequent rooms flesh out. It announces, from the first moment of encounter, that this is a museum organized around kinship and descent, not around the nation or the state.

The most distinctive is the museum's relationship to oral history. It is open on weekends by default, but visitors can arrange weekday access by contacting the family, and when they do, a family member comes to tell stories. The institution is, in a formal sense, a living archive: the knowledge it preserves is not only in its objects but in the bodies and voices of those who carry the family memory. At the Nguyễn Văn Huyên Museum, the curator is often also an heir, and the distinction between institutional authority and family intimacy is deliberately and productively blurred. This is a mode of transmission that modern museums have increasingly sought to cultivate, but rarely with the directness of a grandson (Nguyễn Vũ Hoàng) who opens the door himself.

[11] Personal interview with Nguyễn Văn Huy and Nguyễn Vũ Hoàng on August 31, 2024.
[12] Personal interview with Nguyễn Văn Huy and Nguyễn Vũ Hoàng on August 31, 2024.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. 15 Nov 2026 at 21:25:12, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use.

The museum's Facebook page offers further evidence of this outreach: it shows that the museum has worked hard to collaborate with schools, and local schools arrange regular field trips to the Nguyễn Văn Huyên Museum, designing programs that let students paint or write poems based on their visit. Visitors are also invited to leave comments after their visit, which the museum shares on the page; visitors come from all over the world, and most comments remark on how surprising it is that this family memory yields such broad historical context without the strain of a textbook. Visitors have also noticed that Nguyễn Văn Huyên's notes from his years of study in Paris mix French, Chinese, and Vietnamese, a detail that itself testifies to the intellectual background he carried.

6. Conclusion: What the small story reveals

What does the Nguyễn Văn Huyên Museum, read through the framework of microhistory, tell us about larger questions of heritage, memory, and historical knowledge in contemporary Vietnam?

It demonstrates that private family museums can accomplish what state institutions are structurally prohibited from doing: telling stories that complicate and supplement the Communist Party's official narrative. The museum's account of Nguyễn Văn Huyên's pre-1945 scholarly career, his ambitions as a historian, his work as an ethnologist within EFEO, his navigation of French colonial academic culture, is not available in any state museum in Vietnam. It became available only when a private institution, freed from the Party's legitimating narrative, chose to display the whole person. Although scholarly attention to Nguyễn Văn Huyên's ethnological contributions has grown over the past decade, it remains confined to academic circuits, never reaching the publics that museums are uniquely positioned to address.

Museums have never been neutral spaces. Since the 19th century, public museums have carried a built-in contradiction: they present themselves as open to everyone, yet the way they organize what visitors see, what gets a room of its own, what gets a single case, what gets left out, has always doubled as a way of shaping the public, not just informing it. A museum decides what a citizen should know, and in doing so, quietly decides what kind of citizen that person should become.[13] Seen this way, the difference between the Nguyễn Văn Huyên Museum and Vietnam's national museums is a difference in purpose. One is built to discipline a public into a shared national story. The other is built to let one life stay as complicated as it actually was.

Furthermore, the Nguyễn Văn Huyên Museum illuminates a structural feature of colonial knowledge production that has general implications beyond the Vietnamese case. The archive is always already a political instrument, and access to it is always an existing question of power. The 1929 Ministry of Colonies document is an index. It shows how colonial administrations managed the epistemological threat posed by educated colonial subjects: through bureaucratic gatekeeping that treated the desire to know one's own history as inherently suspect, quieter than violence, and in some ways more effective. That this gatekeeping shaped the career of one of the most prominent Vietnamese ethnologists of the 20th century, redirecting him from the discipline he chose to the discipline he was channeled into, is a fact that unsettles any narrative of colonial knowledge institutions as spaces of purely scholarly exchange.

[13] Bennett 1995; Hooper-Greenhill 1992.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. 15 Nov 2026 at 21:25:12, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use.

Finally, the Nguyễn Văn Huyên Museum demonstrates that intimacy is not a limitation on historical understanding but one of its most productive conditions. What visitors encounter here exceeds information: it is the texture of Nguyễn Văn Huyên's life—the feel of choices made under constraint, of loyalties maintained across political ruptures, of a family carrying its history through plates and photographs and fruit trees. The small story, told with enough care and archival density, turns out to be the large one as well. The history of the country does indeed begin from each individual. It just takes a museum willing to believe that, to show us how.[14]

Pin-Hua Chou is a PhD candidate in the Department of History at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), where she works under the guidance of Professor Caroline Ford. Her research examines museums and contested colonial knowledge production across France, Indochina, and Japan from 1940 to 1945, with a focus on the circulation of scientific and cultural knowledge within overlapping imperial networks. She is currently conducting archival research in France as a Chateaubriand Fellow, hosted by the École française d'Extrême-Orient (EFEO). She has previously conducted fieldwork in Vietnam through the EFEO Hanoi Center. Her work bridges academic field and public humanities, and she is committed to making colonial and museum histories accessible to broader audiences.

Author contribution. Writing - original draft: P-H.C.

Acknowledgments. I want to thank Nguyễn Văn Huy and Nguyễn Vũ Hoàng for guiding me through the Nguyễn Văn Huyên Museum, agreeing to be interviewed, and welcoming me so warmly in the museum courtyard. The field trip would not have been possible without the support of UCLA Graduate Summer Research Mentorship and the Ecole Française d'Extrême Orient Field Scholarship. Finally, I'm grateful to my advisor, Caroline Ford, for supporting my field research in Vietnam.

[14] - Scholarship in English on the Nguyễn Văn Huyên Museum remains rare. One purpose of this article is to bring this institution to the attention of English language readers in museum studies and Southeast Asian history, for whom it represents both an underexamined case and a theoretically generative one.
- The majority of primary material in this article draws on the author's visit to the Nguyễn Văn Huyên Museum and interviews with Nguyễn Văn Huy and Nguyễn Vũ Hoàng.
- Comparable private or community-founded museums and memorials exist elsewhere in Southeast Asia and beyond. Taman 65 (Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia), founded in 2005 by I Gusti Ketut Agung on the site of his family's home, memorializes his father and other victims of the 1965–66 anti-communist killings, for which no state memorial exists. The Cheng Nan-jung Liberty Museum (Taipei, Taiwan), opened in 1999 by Cheng's widow, Yeh Chu-lan, occupies the room where Cheng self-immolated in 1989 rather than submit to arrest under martial law-era sedition statutes; the state did not formally recognize the date as Freedom of Speech Day until 2017, nearly two decades later.
- Scholars working across Southeast and East Asia have begun to map this same terrain. Roxana Waterson and Kwok Kian-Woon's edited volume *Contestations of Memory in Southeast Asia* surveys the tension between dominant and suppressed narratives across Burma, Laos, Vietnam, Malaysia, Singapore, the Philippines, and Indonesia, establishing that no national memory culture in the region tells a single uncontested story (Waterson and Kwok 2012). In southern Thailand, Mala Rajo Sathian shows how a private museum honoring Haji Sulong, a Patani nationalist the Thai state branded a rebel, fills a memorial gap the state has left deliberately empty, doing through objects and poetry what official commemoration refuses to do (Sathian 2022). In China, Zhu Yujie's study of private museums in Yan'an finds that they give local communities room to negotiate, and sometimes quietly complicate, the official memory the state promotes, without becoming sites of open confrontation (Zhu 2024). Kirk Denton's "Exhibiting the Past" extends this argument nationally, reading China's private and alternative museums, including the vast Jianchuan Museum Complex, as running a largely tolerated counterpoint to the state's official "red heritage" narrative (Denton 2013). These studies suggest that wherever a state museum's official narrative leaves a life or an episode unaccounted for, private and community institutions have stepped in to hold the space that narrative left empty.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. 15 Nov 2026 at 21:25:12, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use.

References

Bennett, T. 1995. *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*. Routledge.
Bhabha, H. K., and J. Rutherford. 2006. "Third Space." *Multitudes* 26 (3): 95–107. https://doi.org/10.3917/mult.026.0095.
Davis, N. Z. 1983. *The Return of Martin Guerre*. Harvard University Press.
Denton, K. A. 2013. *Exhibiting the Past: Historical Memory and the Politics of Museums in Postsocialist China*. University of Hawai'i Press.
Geertz, C. 1973. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture." In *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*, edited by C. Geertz, 3–30. Basic Books.
Ginzburg, C. 1980. *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller* (J. Tedeschi & A. Tedeschi, Trans.). Johns Hopkins University Press. (Original work published 1976).
Ginzburg, C. 2013. *Clues, Myths, and the Historical Method*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
Hooper-Greenhill, E. 1992. *Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge*. Routledge.
Lê Giứm. 1985. *Những Ngày Sóng Gió*. Nhà xuất bứn Thanh Niên.
Sathian, M. R. 2022. "Memorializing Conflict and History in South Thailand through Museums, Art, and Poetry." *The Public Historian* 44 (2): 7–28. https://doi.org/10.1525/tph.2022.44.2.7.
Waterson, R., and K.-W. Kwok, eds. 2012. *Contestations of Memory in Southeast Asia*. NUS Press.
Zhu, Y. 2024. "Private Museum as Public Space: Local Remembering and Memory Politics in Yan'an, China." *Memory Studies* 17 (3): 581–98. https://doi.org/10.1177/17506980241240718.

Cite this article: Chou, Pin-Hua. 2026. "The Microhistorical Museum." *Public Humanities,* 2, e165, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1017/pub.2026.10266

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. 15 Nov 2026 at 21:25:12, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use.