

Is Industrial Heritage greater than or equal to the Heritage of the Industrial Revolution?

Dr Iain Stuart
JCIS Consultants, Sydney

A recent email discussion by the TICCIH Board on the scope of Industrial Heritage proposed for the joint ICOMOS/TICCIH Principles for the Conservation of Industrial Heritage Sites, Structures, Areas and Landscapes (the PCIHSSAL Charter?), identified that there is some disagreement about the scope of the field covered by the term Industrial Heritage. The point of concern was the emphasis on the Heritage of "Industrial Revolution" as being the focus of Industrial Heritage. TICCIH's own charter, the Nizhny Tagil Charter, states "*The historical period of principal interest extends forward from the beginning of the Industrial Revolution in the second half of the eighteenth century up to and including the present day, while also examining its earlier pre-industrial and proto-industrial roots*".

This is similar to many definitions of Industrial Heritage or Industrial Archaeology in the literature where the emphasis is directly on the "Industrial Revolution" being the field of study with a passing acknowledgement to industry prior to the "Revolution" and rarely a reference to post-"Industrial Revolution" industry although varying authors give the period from 1850 to 1900 as the end of the "Industrial Revolution".

My view of this definition is that it excludes much historical industrial activity. For example, Georgius Agricola's *De Re Metallica* illustrates the rich mining industry active in the Erzgebirge well before the Industrial Revolution started; is this not Industrial Heritage? China had a significant export porcelain industry; to Iran and the Middle East and then to Europe, all well before Adam Darby was a boy. Japan, as is well known, did not begin its program of industrialisation until the 1860's which in some views is after the Industrial Revolution. Is this not Industrial Heritage?

Clearly these examples are all significant parts of our Industrial Heritage and we would want key places and relics to be identified and protected for future generations. Yet by equating Industrial Heritage with the Industrial Revolution they are excluded. How did things get into such a mess?

Industrial Archaeology also has this problem of defining its scope. In the English-speaking tradition at least this stems from the practice's emergence from the ruins of the Industrial Revolution. To a large extent the field of study of Industrial Heritage reflects the scope of Industrial Archaeology as being the archaeology on the "Industrial Revolution". I would argue that there is confusion between the techniques of Industrial Archaeology and the field of study to which they are applied which has resulted in this limited definition of the practice which has flowed on to the practice of Industrial Heritage.

For Industrial sites, a particular archaeological skill set has been developed that focuses on material evidence and explains and interprets it. These skills include the standard archaeological ones of excavation and survey but, in particular with industrial sites, there are skills in understanding how a site worked: that is in understanding how raw material was transformed as it flowed across the site, the processes and technology involved and the finished products and wastes. There is also a strong tradition of looking at

environmental changes within the landscape. Industrial Archaeologists are probably more used to looking in detail at spaces, such as standing buildings and structures, than other archaeologists.

Notably, Industrial Archaeology is generally undertaken in an era where there is an extensive documentary component to industry and the Industrial Archaeologist has to develop methodologies for relating documentary evidence to physical evidence.

However, these techniques are not necessarily exclusive to the study of the Industrial Revolution; they can equally be applied to studies of contemporary industry as well as Australian Aboriginal stone tool manufacture and distribution. In short, Industrial Archaeology is clearly a method for studying the past not a study of a particular period of the past.

It follows that there can clearly be no objection to considering that Industrial Archaeology and the Heritage which it identified and values is much broader in scope than simply the Industrial Revolution. TICCIH needs to consider a Revolution in the Revolution and adopt a broader definition of the scope of the world's Industrial Heritage.

This is argument is not to say that the Industrial Revolution is not an important part of the world's Heritage. Nor is it suggested that Industrial Archaeology should not play a key role in studying the Industrial Revolution in all its direct and indirect manifestations. However, when the notion of Industrial Heritage is considered, the shackles of the Industrial Revolution should be discarded and recognition should be given to Industrial Heritage in its broadest sense by adopting definitions that acknowledge that the Industrial Heritage of different eras and different peoples is also as significant as the wonderful icons of Industrial Revolution.