Industrial Archaeology: Its Place Within the Academic Discipline, the Public Realm and the Heritage Industry
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This paper presents a review of industrial archaeology literature and offers some initial thoughts on how this literature relates to my research on public perception and experience of Cornish mining landscapes. A brief summary of the development of industrial archaeology is given, which reflects on its amateur origins, its 'identity crisis' and its slow integration into university archaeology departments. The reasons for the transformation of industrial sites into industrial heritage is then examined and temporal models of change presented which relate to both an acceleration of the past into the commodity heritage as well as an affective progression from disdain to acceptance. The public's attitude to industrial archaeology is then discussed — which raises complex questions over the nature of such sites including, the importance of time and aesthetics as well as the phenomenological nature of perception and experience.

INTRODUCTION

In 2005 Marilyn Palmer noted that industrial archaeology had two faces — one side is concerned with the 'interpretation of the surviving material evidence in order to understand past human activity' and the other side is a preservation movement largely focused on the recording and description of individual buildings. She went on to note that: 'in the more professional and institutionalised climate of the last two decades, the distinction between the two meanings has become crucial to the acceptance of industrial archaeology as an academic discipline.' The divergent split between social archaeology (which focuses on industrial remains) and industrial archaeology or synonymously industrial heritage has allowed Casella recently to reflect on its subsidencial identity crisis. Industrial archaeology is still having trouble with academic isolation and with defining its scope and aims. Nevell in the meantime finds the term simply 'bewildering'.

In the meantime industrial heritage is 'one of the most vibrant and progressive areas of research and practice' reflecting a growing realisation of 'the immense importance of Britain's role as the first industrial nation'. In turn the industrial environment is being transformed; a number of sites have been interpreted and presented to the public. Furthermore industrial ruins are being cleaned up and made to look attractive for the increasing number of visitors. Concern over the protection and management of industrial heritage has lead to a range of specialist publications. Concern over the protection and management of industrial heritage has lead to a range of specialist publications.5

How does such transformation relate to changes in the public consciousness as well as the ways in which the public interact with industrial remains? The literature suggests that post-war Britain held a deep antipathy for its abandoned industrial sites, with the dumping of rubbish typifying an attitude of neglect and disdain. However, I will argue that this 'stage of abandonment' is a transitory period, through which the public come to terms with their 'disturbing' past and its connotations of industrial decline. The post-abandonment phase is characterised by acceptance and forgetfulness, during which 'triumphal' national narratives can be written. Thereby symbols of social deprivation and economic decline become over time symbols of regional and national pride.9

Industrial remains, therefore, lie on the cusp of history; they are within our lifetime becoming archaeology and heritage. Within the developing social archaeologies of industry, methods have been recently developed which seek, in Collingwood's terms, to see the 'inner side of the event' — to get at purpose and thought.10 This has led to the recording of industrial processes as industries are closing down or changing their working practices. I will argue that this anthropological approach can also be applied in order to question the nature of the relationship between the public and industrial remains.

DEFINITIONS, ORIGINS AND THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRIAL ARCHAEOLOGY

[A field of study concerned with investigating, surveying, recording and in some cases, with preserving industrial monuments. It aims, moreover, at assessing the significance of these monuments in the context of social and technological history.]12

© The Association for Industrial Archaeology 2008
The origins and development of British industrial archaeology have been recently and thoroughly critiqued. In the 19th century and early 20th century the subject concerned only a few individuals, mostly amateur historians. It is thought that the first use of the term appeared in 1896 in an article entitled ‘Archaeologia Industrial Portuguesa os Moinhos’, by Da Sousa Viterbo in the Portuguese journal *O Archeologo Portugues*. Amateur historian, Michael Rix, then popularised the term within English-speaking circles within his 1955 article ‘Industrial Archaeology’. Very little appears to have happened between these two dates.

Rix’s article was enormously influential. He insisted that the preservation of the industrial past was urgent and necessary, stating that: ‘Within living memory the motor car, radio and aeroplane have been invented. Yet the “Tin Lizzy”, the crystal set and the biplane are already so out of date as to be museum exhibits.’ This inspired the Council for British Archaeology (CBA) to set up a research committee on industrial archaeology. Importantly his message also provided representation for the disparate but growing number of amateur groups who were already stimulated by a ‘sense of urgency’ given post-war redevelopment. The key moment was the demolition of the Doric portico at Euston Station in 1962 — which galvanised public opinion in opposition to its destruction. Samuel notes the contribution of these ‘enthusiastic amateurs’.

It was not the economic historian but the steam fanatics — and after them the industrial archaeologists — who resuscitated the crumbling walls and rusting ironwork of eighteenth century furnaces and kilns; who kept alive, or revivified a sense of wonder at the miracles of invention which made mid-Victorian Britain the ‘workshop of the world’. It was not the economic historian but the steam fanatics — and after them the industrial archaeologists — who resuscitated the crumbling walls and rusting ironwork of eighteenth century furnaces and kilns; who kept alive, or revivified a sense of wonder at the miracles of invention which made mid-Victorian Britain the ‘workshop of the world’.17

However, during the early days of industrial archaeology during the 1950s to 1970s this focus on the industrial remains of Victorian Britain was not automatically accepted — and considerable debate focused on determining whether a period-defined or production-defined approach would dominate. Raistrick notably argued in 1972 that the term could equally be applied to Neolithic flint mines and he argued that with a broader temporal approach ‘it becomes much easier to see industrial archaeology as the investigation of the whole history of industry through the ages’. According to Nevell it was the decline in manufacturing industries during the 1980s and 1990s which led to an acceptance that industrial archaeology deals with the period from c. AD 1750 commonly known as The Industrial Revolution. Hence in this paper, I restrict myself to this generally accepted usage of the term.

Following the demolition of the Euston Arch, the Industrial Monuments Survey was established in 1963. Initially it was run jointly by the CBA and the Ministry of Public Buildings and Works before passing to the care of the University of Bath in 1965 to become the National Record of Industrial Monuments. It then transferred to the National Monuments Record in the 1990s. A national association in the form of the Association of Industrial Archaeology was established in 1973 and a series of annual conferences were held at the University of Bath between 1966 and 1970. In 1976 a specialist publication was launched in the form of the *Industrial Archaeology Review*.

Therefore the 1960s and 1970s witnessed growing public awareness of industrial archaeology, a unified record, a cohesive movement for documenting and recording industrial remains and an annual publication. During this period, however, industrial archaeology remained ‘on the periphery of the academic world’.

**INDUSTRIAL ARCHAEOLOGY WITHIN UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENTS**

Whilst Labadi states that the subject has ‘in Europe and North America, grown to become a sub-discipline of archaeology’, the majority of other reviews tend to concur with Cranstone’s description of a rocky and ‘painfully slow’ integration into the academic world. The developing significance of industrial archaeology as described above was not readily translated into academic research during the 1970s and 1980s. The reasons for this are clear. It was seen by many academics as a preservation activity undertaken by ‘hobbyists’ and has been dismissed as a ‘fun subject’. Whilst the focus of interest was concerned with description and technological function it appeared to happily exist without any apparent theoretical or methodological perspective.

Furthermore industrial archaeology’s temporal range, dealing as it does with the remains of the recent past, has also been cited as a reason for lack of academic interest. When compared to Prehistory, through which out of necessity much archaeological theory had been formed, it hardly seemed ‘real’ archaeology. In 1980 Buchanan severely critiqued the suggestion that only excavation methods should be included in its scope but nevertheless preferred to define the subject as a sub-branch of historical studies and advocated that industrial archaeology should be re-conceptualised as a part of ‘physical history’. He perhaps recognised the problematic nature of the study of the industrial period in relation to the broader discipline.
In the 1980s industrial archaeology in Britain diverged from that taken in North America. The latter developed a strong tradition in historical archaeology, characterised by a structuralist approach to the study of 18th- and 19th-century society and exemplified by the key work of James Deetz, Mark Leone and Charles Orser. Initially industrial archaeologists in Britain continued a thematic approach to the study of monuments before developing a more technocentric approach in the early 1990s which led to problems with the synthesis of data. Towards the end of the 1990s a split occurred in British industrial archaeology, with continuing monument-focused work on one side and socio-economic research on the other with the latter concerned with questions of consumption and production including issues of exchange, power, identity and social relationships. By the end of the 1990s a growing unease had set in, characterised by a feeling of disconnection between the conservation-led approach and wider academic thinking. The influence of North American historical archaeologies has been reviewed by a number of commentators.

During the 1990s industrial archaeology did, however, began to integrate very slowly into academic departments. However, historical archaeology also had a ‘rather dubious status’ in Britain. As Tarlow and West note, its role was ‘supplementary or illustrative at best, and at worst entirely irrelevant’.

Inevitably questions have been raised over nomenclature, the range and relative position of industrial archaeology to post-medieval and historical archaeology. Post-medieval archaeology has largely concerned itself with the 16th and 17th centuries, industrial archaeology with the 18th and 19th, whilst the more recent 20th-century archaeology (typified largely by military archaeology) has used neither term. Others have argued that industrial archaeology is an obsolete concept and should instead be reframed within a holistic archaeology of the later 2nd millennium. However, within British research the terms industrial archaeology or synonymously industrial heritage have largely been retained; for example the key British text Industrial Archaeology: Principles and Practice is firmly focused on pursuing the development of social theories. This suggests that the term is not necessarily going to go away in the near future.

In university departments industrial archaeology still has only a fairly limited presence. Units on offer at universities tend to concentrate on either the recording of standing buildings, therefore arguably continuing a ‘descriptive’ monument-focused tradition or the management of sites — therefore suggesting that the subject is mainly seen as practice based rather than theoretical.

**Industrial Heritage and the Public**

It is within the heritage industry that industrial remains have become increasingly significant and are now of considerable concern to the UK’s statutory bodies — English Heritage, Cadw (Welsh for ‘Keep’) and Historic Scotland. An increasing number of specialist publications link industrial heritage to regenerative schemes, particularly within urban areas. Industrial heritage is also taking on global significance. The UK government’s first list of tentative World Heritage Sites in 1986 only contained one industrial site — Ironbridge Gorge Museum — compared to the second list of sites in 1999 which contained 10 industrial sites, out of the total complement of 25. These include the Blaenavon Industrial Landscape in Wales, the Forth Bridge in Scotland and the Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscapes (Figure 1).

During the second half of the 20th century the cultural meaning of industrial structures began to change. A transformation occurred which turned industrial remains from derelict functional structures to icons of an innovative industrial past. Palmer and Neaverson suggest that such transformations are a matter of changing public perception, in terms of the ‘acceptability of elements of past culture in the contemporary landscape’.

In the mid-20th century they [industrial monuments] were regarded as relics of sweating labour and unacceptable working practice, consequently being swept away in urban development or land clearance schemes. Only in the last quarter of the twentieth century has the international significance of Britain’s industrial heritage been understood and its value as a cultural resource appreciated.

Van Der Hoorn asks: ‘How can a long undesired piece of architecture all of a sudden become an attractive souvenir for tourists, talisman, a valuable object?’ She also questions the extent to which the public ‘act’ as passive witnesses or active protagonists in the transformation of their built environment and the creation of new national narratives.

The public outcry over the demolition of the Euston Arch, although failing to achieve its aim, signifies nonetheless that public opinion can be collectively manifested, and can potentially influence local and national policy. With the development of social archaeologies of industry it is therefore also necessary to examine the contemporary social dimension of industrial sites and landscapes and to reflect on the process of transformation of place as it is happening.
Figure 1.
The Engine Houses of Crowns Mine, Botallack. Possibly one of the most photographed views in Cornwall. Designated World Heritage in 2006 as part of the West Devon and Cornwall Mining Landscape.
Some industrial archaeologists have already been considering what Collingwood terms the ‘inner side of the event’. This entails the recording of existing industries at work, particularly those which are about to undergo change, for example, a photographic survey was conducted of a nuclear power station in Ayrshire, prior to decommissioning. This active ‘process recording’ developed by Brian Malaws and modified by Anna Badcock gives industrial archaeology a ‘new level of social relevance’.43

Indeed such an approach, informed by social or cultural anthropology could help in developing methods which could also look inside the ‘heritage event’ developing questions of process and transformation, public perception and interaction which can be examined and potentially answered. As Adam Sharpe commented following an artists’ initiative at South Wheal Frances Mine, near Camborne, Cornwall:

We also recognise that it is just as important to ask ‘How did this site function?’, ‘How did it change?’, ‘What did it mean to the people who worked here?’, and ‘What has it meant to the people nearby since it went out of use?’ Perhaps most importantly we need to ask, ‘How do I relate to it?’ and ‘How might others interact with it?’.

As industrial archaeology within the public realm is quite simply everywhere, you could argue that there must be unlimited opportunities for public involvement and engagement. However, in The Familiar Past?: Archaeologies of Later Historical Britain (1999) Tarlow and West question whether the remains of the recent past are too familiar. Symonds likewise asks whether ‘industrial remains are simply not old enough to be considered truly archaeological by most people’. In his opinion they may belong to a period ‘after history, i.e., belonging to a slightly earlier version of us, just beyond living memory’. Instead, he argues, ‘the popular imagination’ is drawn to the archaeology of ancient civilisations.45

Therefore, industrial archaeology may not be real archaeology or the chosen past. Partly to paraphrase the title of Lowenthal’s 1985 publication, perhaps the past has to be a foreign (different and unfamiliar) country. Indeed, Tarlow and West argue that the ‘archaeology of historic periods is often about de-familiarising what we think is the known past’, thereby re-valourising the (industrial) product. This would then suggest that the public view is likely to be one of indifference or antipathy (Figure 2).

Others have argued that industrial remains are deeply symbolic, but this symbolism is highly negative. It is representative of a disturbing past; one which is a reminder of economic and social decline and poor working conditions.46 In a case study from the north-west of Britain, Cooper suggests that the region’s industrial heritage is seen as ‘backward looking, as a drag on regeneration and economic development, and symbolic of decline and failure’.47 If this is true, industrial remains belong to a past that needs to be forgotten.

Furthermore, derelict sites can become synonymous in the public’s minds with ‘danger, delinquency, ugliness and disorder’. Grunenberg suggests that they are a locus horribilis within which a range of deviant acts can take place by ‘undesirable’ people. For many, dereliction is taken as a sign for waste, signifying an anti-social present and perhaps more importantly an uncertain future. Yet Edensor points out that those who live amongst industrial remains already have a relationship to them, exemplified through their use as ‘free car parks and as places to dump rubbish’, these form part of the habitual and daily practices through which people engage with ruined sites, in ways which are however ‘unreflexively performed’ (Figure 3).

Adam Sharpe describes the history of South Wheal Frances Mine, near Camborne, in Cornwall. Its closure in 1918 was ‘swift and brutal’ and following its partial demolition local pride quickly turned to disdain. In the 20th century, however:

it has become a physical touchstone of a particular cultural heritage, a marker of Cornish identity, its interpretation panels speak of ‘cathedrals of industry’: it has become an icon to be visited and learned about, a must-see site within the recently inscribed Cornish mining WHS.49

Several commentators refer to what is commonly seen as a speeding up of time in western society, which means that the recent past now attracts attention along with pre-industrial sites. Edensor also refers to the ‘commodification of that which has only just passed into history’:

This nostalgia for that which has just happened seems to refer back to what was earlier identified as an accelerated ‘archaeology’ in which the recent past becomes ancient history in the endless production of the new.50

Edensor argues that there is a purposive need within society to reinvest space with (positive) meaning, for: ‘If spaces are conceived as disturbingly non-functional, they must be replaced and filled in — turned into abstract space — to remove these signs of unproductive and unfuctional blankness.’51 Van Der Hoorn’s research on the former national-socialist town of Prora, on the island of Rügenin, and on the Berlin Wall is interesting
in terms of what she concludes is a public need to exorcise material remains. This exorcism is enacted through the plundering, recycling, demolition and memorialisation of fragments of ‘national history’ often through the manufacture of souvenirs. Trinder presents a temporal progressive model of attitudinal change which transforms public opinion and policy from revulsion (as exemplified above), to mild amusement at the passing of the familiar, to acceptance. He suggests that the writings of W.H. Hoskins are an anomaly within this transition and questions the extent of Romanticisms power over the popular imagination.

Buchanan likewise comments that it was ‘necessary for the processes of industrialisation to mature and to develop through several stages, making obsolete the artefacts of earlier phases, before they could generate sufficient interest to encourage efforts to preserve them’ (Figure 4).

Such models suggest that ‘an interval of neglect’ is a stage within a process of transformation of environment and culture which provides ‘the incentive for restoration, and for a return to origins’. Here heritage becomes a vehicle for regional and national identities as Symonds comments; 21st-century...
regenerative schemes provide ‘reinforcement to communities in the form of narratives that highlight the skill and resilience of former populations’.56

It is necessary to question the extent to which changing aesthetic taste influences both perception and intervention within this process. Joseph makes a correlation between aesthetics and deviant behaviour in the following statement — ‘neglected land not only looks depressing’. It also encourages ‘fly tipping, graffiti and fly posting, all of which “uglify” the environment’.57 Recognition and status is often linked to aesthetics and where heritage values are concerned or regeneration initiatives are taking place there is often a desire to tidy up or ‘prettify’ sites.58 As Alfrey and Putnam put it, ‘conservation conforms to certain paradigms with its concomitant ideas about order, tidiness and the appearance of things’.59 This may also reflect more instrumental values, for example, Palmer notes the concern from home owners to tidy up or dispose of industrial eyesores.60 With mining landscapes the tidying up of mine waste and the capping of mine shafts has been the matter of some debate.61 Indeed aesthetic values compete with the desire to preserve the historic value of the archaeological context and issues of public health and safety (Figure 5).

From an archaeological position such an emphasis on singular sites is problematic as it affects the broader understanding and perception of complex landscapes.62 An industrial landscape can ‘represent a single phase of industrial development or several hundred years of activity’. Perhaps ironically, the conservation-led ethic of industrial archaeology may also have created a tendency to iconicise sites through its emphasis on individual monuments.63 The discipline does appear to be moving towards a position whereby whole complexes of buildings, monuments and landscapes are treated holistically, for example, through a characterisation methodology.64 However, the perception of industrial landscapes by the public may reflect what I would call a ‘Stonehenge effect’; with expectation focused on the monument, the rich prehistoric landscape in the meantime becomes nothing more than transitional space. According to Cooper there also remains a widespread public perception of heritage as individual monuments, in his words ‘probably timber framed buildings’.65 Although the public

Figure 3. Danger and delinquency or performance and engagement? The ‘decorated’ 20th-century dressing floors at Wheal Kitty, St Agnes.
visiting Cornwall’s World Heritage mining landscapes will probably not be looking for timber-framed buildings, their perception within the landscape may certainly orient itself towards iconic aesthetically-pleasing structures. The Cornish engine house is a prime example; silhouetted against the skyline on countless postcards and more recently as the logo of the World Heritage Site (Figure 6).

The foregoing discussion suggests that industrial ruins are problematic public spaces due to the complex range of issues and emotions they can invoke. Edensor, a Senior Lecturer in Environmental and Geographical Sciences at Manchester Metropolitan University, counters any charge that industrial ruins are a ‘waste’ of space in his 2005 publication *Industrial Ruins: Space, Aesthetics and Materiality*. Through a discussion of the urban landscape of central and northern England and central Scotland he seeks to celebrate industrial ruins as places of play, freedom (from boundaries, transgression and the ability to loosen the body in space) and the carnivalesque.
Since the original uses of ruined buildings has passed, there are limitless possibilities for encounters with the weird . . . unencumbered by the assumptions which weigh heavily on highly encoded, regulated space. Bereft of these codings of the normative — the arrangement of things in place, the performance of regulated actions, the display of goods lined up as commodities or for show — ruined space is ripe with transgressive and transcendent possibilities.  

Edensor’s discourse contradicts the equation between dereliction and anti-social behaviour seeking instead to valorise ruined sites as ‘alternative play spaces for children and adults’. He comments on the differential attitude to ruined structures (industrial as opposed to non-industrial) whereby castles, follies or ‘rural tumbledown cottages’, are the subject of romantic themes, particularly within the arts. Quoting Janowitz, this romantic discourse merges over time the natural with the cultural, creating a sense that state identity is in turn immemorial. Whilst prehistoric ruins have been given over to nature and relate in a Wordsworthian sense to landscape, national identity and romance,
industrial ruins are still very much part of human culture, but analogously play the same role as the Victorian haunted house — as ‘a sort of modern Gothic’. For ruins elucidate the close relationship between romance and horror, they ‘possess the attraction of decay and death, and to enter into them is to venture into darkness and the possibilities of confronting that which is repressed’. Here, ruins create a sense of melancholia and are a reminder of cycle of life and death; sentiments which parallel the Dutch biologist and writer Midas Dekkers assertion that human society has an innate fascination with decay, entropy and death.69

This visceral, sensual and psychological approach to industrial remains means that Edensor’s writing is phenomenological in nature; in that it speaks of perception and experience, of wanting ‘to capture something of the sensual immanence of the experience of travelling through a ruin’. His discussion is in part anecdotal in nature, drawing on, for example, childhood memories. Any political agenda in terms of such spaces provoking an anti-establishment sentiment or action is not
clear, although his concept of industrial play as ‘anti-tourism’ is clearly different from mainstream heritage literature. There is also no apparent attempt to accept, even in part, the contrary view that such sites are in fact economic, social or cultural waste.

Such criticisms aside, the themes that emerge are of industrial ruins as places where ‘forms of alternate public life may occur’ — leisure, adventure, acquisition, shelter and creativity as well as the pursuit of illicit activities. These themes however operate largely within a context in which individuals have freedom of access to sites; a situation which is likely to change as more sites are designated heritage. Although it is difficult to place the dumping of rubbish within Edensor’s celebratory rhetoric, importantly he highlights the social use and meaning of sites during the period of abandonment. These may not be empty places which are meaningless. People may value them for their historical or aesthetic value as well as for their possibilities of play. They may also value them as places to park their car or to take their dogs for a walk.

**Summary and Conclusions**

In summary, industrial archaeology has many faces and its breadth of application across conservation, social archaeology and heritage management has concomitantly prevented it from being taken seriously as an academic pursuit. It has had perhaps, an undeservedly negative and outdated image, as an amateur pursuit and atheoretical and unmethodological in its approach and aims — such a view today would, I believe, belie a lack of understanding as to its varied approaches. It is my hope, that at the very least, this paper demonstrates its multi-disciplinary nature, its possibilities and hence its strengths. The development of a social archaeology of industry has provided a fresh approach which attempts to answer much of the criticism aimed at the subject, yet it is perhaps dependent on the North American model and therefore the transplantation of historical archaeology within British universities.

Much of the foregoing discussion concerns the idea of singularity and identity — the identity of the discipline or practice, the identification of the subject matter, and the ways in which industrial remains become symbolic of changing national attitudes towards the past and the environment. The importance of the suffix is clear, -heritage, -ruins or -archaeology change the meaning yet can act synchronously. Industrial archaeology appears simultaneously to be highly negative, playful, Gothic, not very old, too familiar, beautiful, ugly, a waste of space and a handy place to park the car. However, despite such contradictory perceptions and whilst there is no singular identity, the monuments of industry can nonetheless take on over time an iconic singularity in the landscape. It will be interesting to see whether this archaeological problem can be resolved through, for example, site and landscape management or broad characterisation studies. The Millennium Project at Stonehenge may provide certain comparative material in terms of the archaeological desire to open out landscapes in tension with an assumed public desire to view single architectural features.

I have presented a number of models which all broadly theorise the transformation of industrial sites from reminders of economic and social decline into icons of industry. The post-war period in Britain typifies an attitude of neglect and antipathy, against which amateur preservation groups could react. There is clearly a tension between aesthetics, valorisation and abandonment. Metaphorically, the phase of abandonment can be viewed as a type of burial for physical remains which are above rather than below ground. Over time a reactionary process coupled with a changing attitude to ‘what counts as the past’ serves to reinvest relics of past industry with new and contemporary meanings. The recent appearance of industrial World Heritage Sites is indicative of a general shift in society towards a perception that industrial remains are now old enough to be the past, important enough to be international heritage and attractive enough to visit. However, from the triumphalism of national narrative to Edensor’s celebratory rhetoric, I would apply a caveat, and that is that our understanding of the public’s perception of industrial sites in the landscape is largely lacking in terms of comparative research, time depth and detail. Attitudes may be very different within contrasting geographical, social, cultural and political contexts and may importantly be determined by the concept or designation of heritage as opposed to regular built space. Edensor’s and Cooper’s industrial context was an urban one, whereas my research context is atypical in this regard, Cornish mining remains are found within a rural and a heavily romanticised and mythologised landscape.

I would, however, agree with Edensor’s sentiment that industrial ruins provide both foreground and background to public life, there is a relationship, though whether this is ‘alternate’ is however debateable. It is important to question the extent to which the public act as active agents or passive witnesses within each stage. The case studies from the former German Democratic Republic by Van Der Hoorn are interesting in this regard, as they present the public as actively doing — as plundering, exorcising and fragmenting their pasts. The challenge is to formulate methods
of data collection through which the public’s perceptions of these fascinating yet problematic industrial spaces can be examined. I hope to demonstrate Collingwood’s concept of the ‘inner side of the event’\(^1\) and a social or cultural anthropological approach, will in tandem, provide methods through which these fascinating yet problematic industrial spaces can be examined.
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