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The controversy around the future of Prague Žižkov Freight Rail Station and modern Industrial architecture

Professor Benjamin Fragner

Benjamin Fragner has been Director of the Centre for Investigation of Industrial Heritage at Prague Technical University (CTU) since 2002, organising the popular programme of biennial conferences ‘Vestiges of Industry’, and producing superbly-illustrated publications and guidebooks. He is a TICCIH Board member since 2009.

Modern industrial architecture dating from interwar Czechoslovakia symbolises a rare and fairly brief period of extraordinary creativity and dynamic economic growth in the country. Today, however, works from this period are among the most at-risk structures in the Czech Republic. A very recent example is the site of the unique former Žižkov Freight Station in Prague after it was targeted to make way, as happens so often, for the construction of a massive and unremarkable development project.

News about the planned demolition elicited a spontaneous negative reaction. Modern interwar architecture is viewed as much more important today than it was just a few years ago. This is no doubt due to the fact that structures from that period are being irrevocably lost or their authenticity weakened.

A series of professional debates and public protests soon took place, culminating in a student workshop and exhibition at the conference Vestiges of Industry 2011, with projects aimed at obtaining heritage protection for the site. This is a clear signal of how the public’s view of interwar architecture is changing, something that is increasingly apparent right across Europe.

It is important to note here that Žižkov Freight Station is still the largest intact surviving Functionalist structure in Prague. As a large-capacity terminal station it was built to facilitate the rapid unloading of goods, especially food, from trains on to trucks. Part of the site was also used for short-term storage in storage areas with installed cooling systems.
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It was built between 1931 and 1936, based on a project by Karel Caivas and Vladimír Weiss, to help deal with the supply problems of the rapidly growing city. It had a unique operating arrangement, a kind of combination train station building and multi-storey warehouse. It is a large, rectangular building set on a U-shaped layout with two long wings that envelop the inner area where the tracks, wagon ramps and platforms used to be.

While the inner area between the wings, which was used for freight storage, had a dramatic atmosphere, largely derived from the steel structures of the elevator towers, looming like two giant statues over the central ramp and linked by bridges on the upper floors between the opposite storage wings, the outer walls of the building facing onto the city are characterised by a rational, architecturally refined composition of window openings and smoothly plastered façades. From there freight was loaded onto modern trucks which then distributed goods around the city.

The station’s importance in the transport sector declined in the second half of the 20th century, and the expansion of truck freight ultimately contributed to its demise. The station closed in 2002. Since then pressure has mounted to put the land that the station occupies to commercial use. This is true of most railway station sites in Prague, as all of them occupy strategic locations and potentially lucrative development land. The current owner of the site, Czech Rail (České dráhy), smelt a special opportunity in this, and even though the station is public property, it decided to try to profit from the site, regardless of the public interest in it. Although the station was declared a cultural monument by the Ministry of Culture, Czech Rail and speculative developers challenged the Ministry’s decision and inclusion of the site on the list of cultural monuments of the Czech Republic was deferred. With renewed vigour the development firm started to promote a project that required the demolition of the object.

In the meantime architects and students at the Faculty of Architecture, Czech Technical University in Prague, organised a workshop of alternative projects for adapted new use. They prepared various proposals for other uses to which the site could be adapted without demolishing it. They integrated the site into the process of regenerating the district, conceiving it as a physical imprint of the memory of the place and a clear, transparent, and logical hub of future urbanist development. It is moreover structurally a very solid building with good foundations for various other uses (it is also worth noting that it was built by the best building firm in interwar Czechoslovakia). The workshop projects also aimed to have an impact on the on-going debate over the site and in late January and early February they will be exhibited at a prestigious architectural gallery in Prague.

This is the current background to the affair, which is the subject of much discussion and is expected to reach a head in Prague in the coming days. It is hard to predict how it will all turn out. There are a lot of personal interests and murky local politics involved. But the advocates of demolition are relying on a presumption that no longer applies, namely that only buildings that appeal to the wider public with a historicising appearance are well accepted by the public and are closer to popular taste.

For readers of the TICCIH Bulletin there is one other point that may be of interest in this respect. When the debate over this industrial monument re-opened at the level of the Czech Ministry of Culture, significant points raised in defence of the site as an industrial monument made use for the first time in an official setting of arguments and references to an authoritative document, quoting directly from TICCIH’s Nizhny Tagil Charter for the Industrial Heritage. I mention this here because there is much discussion at TICCIH of the need to use the influence of authority to protect industrial heritage, and this case is an example of how influential such authority can be when it comes to protecting industrial heritage at risk.
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**TICCIH News**

**TICCIH Board met in November**

Profiting from the presence of several members at ICOMOS’ general assembly in Paris, the annual meeting of the TICCIH Board was held at the UNESCO headquarters, on 29 November, with various other members in attendance including the Bulletin Editor.

The policy documents being prepared on TICCIH’s advocacy role communications are still being reviewed. Meanwhile, David Worth has put up a TICCIH page on Google+. Post your comments there now. Finally, our financial year will now start on January 1.

**Joint ICOMOS TICCIH principles accepted**

ICOMOS ratified the joint Principles for the Conservation of Industrial Heritage Sites, Structures, Areas and Landscapes that it has prepared with TICCIH at its meeting on 28 November, 2011. The Draft document accepted by the 17th general assembly is also referred to as the Dublin Principles. The Japanese Government had already agreed to use these Principles as a matter of national policy.

**ICOHTEC publications, Tampere conference news**

Submissions are being sought for volume 17 of the ICOHTEC journal ICON by Dr James Williams, President of ICOHTEC and interim Editor, in which he hopes to feature papers given at the joint ICOHTEC/TICCIH conference in Tampere in 2010. The guidelines for manuscripts can be found on their web site: www.icohtec.org. The deadline to receive manuscripts is February 2012 but an abstract and letter of intent to submit a manuscript in a timely fashion would be acceptable given the time constraints.

He also notes in a message to the Bulletin editor that ‘we are interested in adding to our list of possible manuscript referees and book reviewers, and we would welcome adding TICCIH members to our list. Simply send an email expressing interest along with a one-page resume that highlights one’s field of expertise’.

**Progress with TICCIH’s new book: ‘Industrial Heritage Re-Tooled’**

The project to produce a TICCIH-authored guide to international best practices in industrial heritage is gathering speed. At the Board meeting in Paris, the proposal to produce the book from Carnegie Publishing was accepted. The new working title, ‘Industrial Heritage Re-Tooled’, is taken from the conference last year sponsored by the Kaplan Foundation, which is also funding the book. The full list of essays and authors can be downloaded from the TICCIH website. The absolute deadline for receiving texts is the end of February 2012 so that the launch can coincide with the XV Congress in Taipei in November.

**XV TICCIH Congress**

The Organizing Committee of TICCIH has received several fantastic section proposals from our colleagues in Italy, Japan, Germany, UK and Taiwan. The section program will be modified accordingly and announced on our website shortly in January:

The deadline for paper abstracts has been rescheduled as follows:

- Paper abstract submission: 15th February 2012
- Announcement of accepted papers: 15th March 2012
- Full paper submission: 30th April 2012

Meanwhile, the first full English text manual of The Introduction of Taiwan’s Industrial Heritage will be published at the end of December. It will give the TICCIH 2012 Congress participants a brief overview of the industrial development of Taiwan through history and 21 sites introduction. Hsiao-Wei Lin

**Next issue of Patrimoine d’industrie/Heritage of Industry**

The forthcoming issue will include an appreciation of Professor Marie Nisser. The three sections include some thirty articles with a lengthy coverage of the candidacy of Sesto San Giovann in Italy for the World Heritage list.

**TICCIH membership 2012**

Members who need to renew this year will have received a reminder message from the office of the President. About half of TICCIH’s roughly 330 members will need to visit our Paypal service at www.ticcih.org, clicking on the ‘Renew’ button. You don’t need a Paypal account, just a credit card. This is a respectable number for the year before our triennial Congress, which always encourages new members to benefit from the discounted conference inscription.

**The Cetate open pit mine in Rosia Montana, Romania**

TICCIH has been asked to comment on the Canadian firm Gabriel Resources Ltd’s proposals to open Europe’s largest open cast gold mine project in this mountainous region.

Though promising ‘responsible mining and sustainable development’ there are fears for its impact on the extensive Roman mining heritage, the local economy, its environment and traditional communities.
How to balance private profit and public gain is one of the big questions increasingly tied to the re-use of urban industrial sites. As conservation and re-use become mainstream commercial options, we look at two contrasting projects, one public and one private, to ask ‘who gets most from heritage conservation?’

The New York High Line as an economic dynamo

Jan Kristek

A PhD Candidate at the Department of Theory at the Faculty of Architecture at Brno University of Technology in the Czech Republic, Jan Kristek’s focus is on public spaces in transition in the post-socialist city.

The High Line is nowadays already a well-known New York project which recycled a 2.5 km stretch of abandoned over-ground train track into a linear park, a promenade “rocketing” nine meters above the ground which allows the viewer to see lower Manhattan from a whole new perspective.

Through the systematic work of Joshua David and Robert Hammond, the two initiators of the whole process of rehabilitation, the High Line has gained an aura of miracle accompanied by broad public support. In the beginning, these two ordinary West Chelsea residents encountered the official will of mayor Giuliani’s administration to demolish the old rusting remnant by founding the non-profit Friends of Highline. An original image of nostalgia has gradually turned into a modern image, mirroring very much contemporary ways of how we can think about the city and architecture.

The architectural studios Diler Scofido & Renfro and James Corner Field Operations are behind the attractive design and landscaping, which succeeded among competition entries from globally-known architects such as Zaha Hadid or Steven Holl. However, their playful design, which has profited from situations created by the unique juxtaposition of typical New York grid and linear structure going straight through it, was just one piece that contributed to the final puzzle of its success.

It is symptomatic of our time that one of the crucial aspects in gaining public support at the beginning of the whole process were evocative images. Photographs by Joel Sternfeld from street level showed the unseen beauty of self-sown greenery, as the unused train bed evolved into a spontaneous park. The collective imagination was spurred. Today the project itself is a brandable image, where one can find photographs on the internet of hedge fund billionaires Philip Falcone and Edward Norton (official supporter and face of Highline) posing with David and Hammond in front of the Calvin Klein logo patterned with that of the High Line. These are from the Calvin Klein Collection’s “First Party on the High Line” which took place in June 15th, 2009 on the first section of the Park.

“The High Line Isn’t Just a Sight to See; It’s Also an Economic Dynamo” wrote the New York Times last year. And indeed, up to today the money spent by private investors in the neighborhood is estimated at 2 billion dollars and 29 new project are being built or on the way, some of them designed by star architects such as Frank Gehry, Jean Nouvel, Robert A. M. Stern, Shigeru Ban, Renzo Piano and others. Some anticipate that within the next 30 years there should be 4 billion dollars in private investments around the High Line and about 900 millions of revenue for the City of New York in various forms of taxation. In addition to this, mayor Bloomberg has claimed that the project has generated 8,000 jobs in construction and 12,000 jobs in newly created service economy around the High Line.
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The High Line became a powerful accelerator of the gentrification of West Chelsea. The process of gentrification followed well-known patterns from other parts of Manhattan before the High Line. The first period of a slow transformation began at the end of 1980s and at the beginning of 1990s, when hand-in-hand with the relocation of the Dia Art Foundation, a part of the art scene was looking for the raw romance and the low rent spaces of abandoned industrial warehouses. The intensity of rail operations on the High Line fell steadily since the WWII, mainly due to the expansion of automobile transportation. The last train loaded with frozen chickens went down the High Line in 1980. The pressure for High Line demolition came for the most part from private landowners whose interest lay in freeing-up the plots under the High Line for profitable construction. Their claims were supported by the Giuliani administration, when the mayor gave a green light for demolition just before leaving office in 2001. Since then the pressure on demolition of the structure was gradually raised. The landowner’s point of view was well expressed in the words of Joseph Rose, the City Planning Commissioner, in 1999: “That platform has no right to be there except for transportation, and that use is long gone”.

Schumpeter’s concept of creative destruction suggests innovation as the main motor of capitalism and explains the dynamics of our era and why old things are replaced with new ones. However, today the High Line has proven the Giuliani administrative wrong, and has shown that architecture represents a form of accumulated (cultural) capital which destruction doesn’t have to be literal, but could lie in the creative transition of its meaning.

The 180º turn came with mayor Bloomberg, who took the High Line project onto his political agenda. Within the run of industrialization in the 19th and early 20th century, and parks becoming public assets for everyone as we know them today, they became also part of the political and economical landscape of the city. The freed-up voids in the dense urban fabric of the rapidly-growing cities of the first industrialized nations were appropriated by a broad public as spaces for sports but also other events such as gatherings and political speeches. As a desirable urban amenity it also differentiated the real estate market and often divided people among those who could afford to live within walking distance of a park and those who could not. A good reference is just several blocks away, in Central Park where the property values gradually rise when approaching it.

Today, the High Line is one of the “flagship parks” to be built or improved as part of Bloomberg’s political program PlaNYC 2030, which claims to ensure a ten minute walking distance from quality park space for all New Yorkers. But the High Line is more than that. With its unique design and till-now unseen views of Manhattan, it is also an experience, a bit like taking the lift to the top of the Rockefeller Center or walking over Brooklyn Bridge. This is of course resonating with our era of tourism and “city voyeurism” and according to Robert Hammond, the High Line weekend crowds average 20,000 visitors a day.

The High Line is perhaps the most well-known example, but the rehabilitation of the other “flagship parks” should work in a similar manner: the creative input of architects paid from public sources attracts private investors who will pay for the future upkeep. Precisely those costs, the city is unwilling to pay on its own. In the case of the High Line, only 1 m$ from approximately 4 m$ of expenditure per year that the city has announced to pay. A proposal from the Friends of High Line to tax surrounding businesses and residents didn’t get a positive response. Undoubtedly, the High Line is an exceptional event where Bloomberg’s administrative has gained political capital, developers and land owners have profited by added value for their projects and residents has gained an attractive public space. The question remains if the established public-private partnership will survive in the future.
in the contrasting experience of Łódź in Poland, the massive former Poznański’s textile complex, converted into a commercial shopping centre by a French property developer, is increasingly taking over attractive public roles and functions of the city authorities but leaving behind some of the more challenging responsibilities.

Manufaktura - a revitalized post-industrial complex under private management in Łódź, Poland

Marta Drozdowska

The author is an architect specializing in the re-use and transformation of industrial buildings for public functions. She is developing a reconstruction strategy model for declining urban areas, part of her doctoral thesis on revitalizing post-industrial cities.

The city of Łódź in Poland experienced its glory years in the 19th century thanks to the textile industry. In the 20th century, the fall of that industry caused a slow decline of the city and the outflow of inhabitants. Factories went bankrupt abandoning giant areas in the very centre of Łódź. So the creation of a shopping centre out of the largest 19th-century textile factory complex next to the Old Market Square and the main street - Piotrkowska St. - gave hope for further changes.

Manufaktura Centre is a commercial area occupying about 27 hectares formerly belonging to the cotton empire of Izrael Poznanski. The history of Poznanski’s factory began in 1871 with the purchase of the first plot. The factory expanded to include additional land and buildings until 1914. The site is located on the west side of the so called New Town and includes the weaving mill, spinning mill, bleaching house, textile printing house, finishing house, fire station, workshops, railway sidings, multi-storey workers’ houses and the palatial residence of the owner. The project by Hilary Majewski is characterized by a decorative Art Nouveau style and shows unique material and stylistic unity.

When it was working, the complex was isolated from the city by a fence, and its characteristic urban layout created a closed form. The buildings formed a courtyard, which served for the internal communication and the movement of materials. This layout created a city within a city, with its own streets and buildings, at the same time separated from the urban tissue of Łódź.

In 2003, the French company Apsys acquired the post-industrial site belonging to the former Poznański’s factory, and created there one of the largest commercial centres in Poland, named Manufaktura. Due to a well-thought-out marketing strategy, Manufaktura became the new centre of the city, replacing the old market square.

The complex represents an interesting combination of old factory elements with modern design. The five-storey spinning mill hosts a business hotel, the weaving mill has an Art Museum, the finishing shop a cinema and factory museum and the power station holds a disco. The former courtyard has become a market square limited from the west by an enormous new shopping arcade. According to the owner, they have restored 45,000 m² of 19th century red brick façades. An above-average standard of design creates a positive image of the space. For foreign guests at the Andel’s hotel prefer spending time in a pleasant, safe space of the commercial centre than risk a walk down the neglected Piotrkowska St.

However, the demolitions have blurred the scale of the complex and destroyed streets and walkways between buildings. The composition of preserved and extended halls shows a lack of closure from the east and is limited by the overwhelming parking area from the north-west and west. The fence has been rebuilt and access control and security systems appeared. The contrast seems even greater beyond the exit to the Ogrodowa Street where neglected workers’ houses, an enclave of poverty, face the entrance to the luxury hotel.

The commercial area was designed in accordance with the latest trends in the development of shopping centres. It’s located in one of the most accessible and visible locations. It’s under single management and provides controlled and safe shopping environment and convenient parking possibility.
The owners boast numerous international awards for the opening campaign, organizing Fashion Week, a summer beach and Andel’s hotel interiors. They also organize unusual events, such as screening of Stanley Kubrick’s “2001 A Space Odyssey” with live music performed by the Philharmonic.

For several years now, popular events which used to take place in the city centre are now held within Manufaktura’s courtyard. The celebrations of the City Day and Manufaktura’s anniversary are being organized on the same weekend in the shopping centre area and are co-financed from public funds. Paradoxically, Manufaktura partially owes its success to the retreat of the city authorities.

Other public spaces have lost their importance and their original function. The Old Market Square, despite its historical heritage and a great location in the Old Town area, now has no cultural or service functions. The Old Town Park is a shortcut to Manufaktura. The main city square serves as a communication point. The former main street – Piotrkowska St.- was till the end of the 20th century centre filled with luxury shops, pubs and restaurants, but now comes alive only in the spring and summer.

The Manufaktura shopping centre has successfully been carrying out its assumptions for five years, is frequently visited and provides a variety of entertainment. However, the hopes of the government and local inhabitants for the reconstruction of Łódź through this investment have disappointed. The site became an island of success in complete isolation from historical structures and communications relations. The slow degradation of the city centre and the main street have highlighted the lack of a wider strategy for revitalizing the city and rebuilding its brand.

Manufaktura benefits from the history of the place, which is directly connected to the industrial heritage. However, it seems that the use of this heritage was not balanced by a contribution to the development of the entire city. It is weakly integrated with the city tissue and ensures insufficient impulse for spatial and social changes within the city centre. It is a private property carefully managed in order to bring profits.

Worldwide

News from the Russian Federation

Professor Vladimir V. Zapary

The Urals is an industrial region of Russia, rich with industrial heritage landmarks, but unfortunately many of them are being destroyed, pulled down, disappearing and are abandoned. We are facing a very important task to study these landmarks and preserve them. We must keep historical experience, traditions of the mining Urals, and some steps are being made in this direction.

There are sites, landmarks of industrial heritage in the Urals, in Sverdlovskaya oblast, which are connected with such great personalities as N.D. Demidoff and V.N. Tatishev. To preserve, support and develop these landmarks we propose a new cultural educating tourist route. For example a tour lasting several days through Ekaterinburg, Verkhny Tagil, Nevansk, Byngi, Nizhny Tagil, Kushva and Ust-Utka.

In 1987, a museum-national park (zapovednik) of the mining industry of the Middle Urals was created on the basis of the Nizhny Tagil, Nizhne-Saldinsky, Kushva factories and Vysokogorsky open mine. Thus multi-profile combination of specialized museums local history, historical-ethnographical, mineralogical and literature-memorial appeared in Nizhny Tagil. They were all united by one topic: “History of the Urals metal”. The factory-museum includes six expositions: blast-furnace worship, rolling workshop, energy production, equipment for mechanical processing of the metals and iron casting, and techniques of the finery process. It also has three exhibitions: rolling stock, factory equipment of the 19-20th century, and mining equipment. Many of the expositions and exhibitions of the museum are active.
It is naturally a reason of wondering, why there is still not any complex of technical museum in the Urals, which could enhance the main directions of the Urals industry. Of course, its own system of technical museums has been formed in the Urals. Firstly, the Sverdlovsk Regional Local History Museum is devoted to the problems of preservation, summary and propaganda of industrial heritage. It has a great collections on the history of technology. The Museum of Architecture, the A.S. Popov Radio Museum, museum expositions of some factories, institutes and organizations also have some exhibits.

Showing, with the means of museum exhibits, the evolution of different technologies development will be one of the main activities of the Museum of history of science and technologies in the Urals. For these we need to demonstrate genuine landmarks of history of science and technology, specially made models, which help the visitors to understand the laws of physics and chemistry.

Organizing science conferences devoted to the industrial heritage has become a noticeable phenomenon in Russia. Thus the conference “Industrial Urals”, which has become traditional since 1996 is held in Ekaterinburg. Here, the problems of industrial heritage, history of science and technoloe, economical history are seriously considered along with the other subjects. And this is not accidental. National representative of the RF in TICCIH V.V.Zapariy takes an active and main part in their organization and conducting.

Another important event was organizing a series of scientific conferences on the basis of Mordovsky State University (in Udmurtia) by Professor N.M. Arsentyev. These conferences are devoted to the problems of economic history and industrial heritage. The conferences were organized and held in a number of Russian cities under the guidance of the Russian Academy of science and National Representative of Russia in TICCIH.

Russian scientists and museum workers are doing research on studying and promotion of industrial heritage of Russia. The work to make industrial heritage sites into museums is being done in ever greater scale in many regions of Russian Federation. For example much work has been done in Vyksa, Nizhegorodskaya oblast at Verkhnevysunsky blast-furnace plant. Also in Nizhegorodskaya oblast they are doing work finding and registering towers built by a famous engineer V.G. Shukhov. Many of the constructions have not been preserved, but some of them have survived up to our times. These are the water tower in the town of Vyksa, covering of the rolling workshop and a tower in the town of Sormovo and power line bearing near the city of Dzerzhinsk. Now the problem of their conservation and preservation is being solved.

As for Moscow, the first steps in this direction were to re-equip the former textile factory “Krasnaya Rosa” where now a design center is situated, and garages of confectioner factory “Krasny Oktyabr” where a culture center is placed.

One should admit, that we have the necessary material foundation not only in a large number of historical sites, but also a large number of museums and especially museum (zapovedniks). There are more then 100 zapovedniks in the RF now and they play an essential part in preserving national cultural heritage of the people.

One of the most important ingredients of national policy of any country, as well as of Russia, is to create an attractive image of the country for its neighbors. The sites of cultural heritage can play a big part in it. It is because of the fact, that there are such zapovedniks Russia is represented in the world community not only by the capital, but also by its provinces. Because of it these centers long ago became the sites of national and international tourism. Total number of visits to the museum-zapovedniks by Russian and foreign tourists reached almost 20 m in the middle of this decade.

In connection with this, it is important for the local authorities, scientific community and public organizations to show legislation initiatives to get a clear and logical system of control, studying, preserving, rehabilitation and further usage of industrial heritage landmarks, which represent an enormous interest not only in the national but also international scale.
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Nizhny Tagil factory museum.
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Norway

Heritage at risk: Demolition of the Odda smelteverk in February?

Randi Baartvedt
Director, Norwegian Museum of Hydropower and Industry

The industrial heritage at Tyssedal/Odda and Rjukan/Notodden has been nominated for a place on UNESCO's World Heritage List. The lime kilns and coke driers at Odda smelteverk are part of the industrial landscape in the Hardanger fjord district. Odda is an example of an industrial township which has been almost perfectly preserved, in particular the completeness of the Smelteverk plant itself. But it has unfortunately been decimated since the bankruptcy in 2003 and by the demolition of two calcium carbide furnaces in 2009. Now the lime kilns and the coke driers, essential for all production at the Odda smelteverk, are at risk. The decision to demolish is done more by the municipality and confirmed by the state governor. The county of Hordaland has objected to no avail.

What can be done internationally to save this site?

TICCIH focused on the issue at the general assembly in 2009 urging Norway to keep the integrity of the Odda smelteverk. The general assembly also kept an eye on Rheinfelden powerplant (1895) in Germany that unfortunately was demolished in 2010.

In 2011 there has been a debate if it is worthwhile to keep objects of this kind in Odda. There are three places in the world where HC lime kilns are used in connection with carbide production: Odda, Union Carbide in Ashtabula, Ohio, and Denki Kagaku in Japan. To my mind there is no point in saying that other lime kilns exist in other parts of the world as these are the only ones in Odda and form one of the most important parts of the production line and the Odda story.

The lime kilns and coke driers at Odda smelteverk in October 2011.

Photo: Harald Hognerud, NVIM.

Conference Reports

The Second Conference of Chinese Industrial Architectural Heritage
18-22 November, 2011, Chongqing, China.

Yiping Dong

Since the State Administration of Cultural Heritage (SACH) started to pay attention to Industrial Heritage officially in 2006, the academic discussions have grown rapidly and reached some conclusions. The Industrial Architecture Heritage Academia Committee (IAHAC), which is the first organization about IH in China, was founded under the Architectural Society of China (ASC) in 2010's first conference of Chinese Industrial Architectural Heritage in Beijing. During this first Conference, the IAHAC raised the “Beijing Proposal” about saving Chinese Industrial Heritage, under the Nizhny Tagil Charter in 2003 by TICCIH and Wuxi Proposal in 2006 by SACH, and planned to continue the conferences every year.

The Second Conference in November last year was held by two Universities, Tsinghua and Chongqing, with support by SACH and ICOMOS China.
There were five sessions: 1) IH with regional perspective; 2) IH Conservation and Urban Regeneration; 3) Case Study on local IH; 4) Space Pattern and Transformation of Industrial buildings; 5) Industrial landscape and Art. Among the meeting, there were two exhibitions, one of old industrial images in Chongqing, and another about conservation design throughout China. Twelve key speeches in the first day were mainly about the survey and conservation of urban industrial sites in Chongqing, Beijing, Tianjin and Shanghai, which are now facing the rapid urban development, then the session discussion for the second day with 28 papers, following a great excitation about Chongqing’s IH. There were almost 2000 delegates and 75 papers, which doubled the 2010 meeting.

The high density speeches and session discussions show some trends in China’s IH research. Firstly, the geographical region of research has been enlarged, from the highly industrialized eastern coastal area and traditional industrial region to the mid-western such as Sichuan, Yunnan, Henan, Gansu, etc. Secondly, the time frame is no longer focused on the Westernization Movement (ca. 1860-1900) or before 1949, more papers discussing the first Five-year Plan (1953-1957) period and more closer period, the industrial construction aided by Soviet Union. Thirdly, some thematic topics emerged such as railways, including the Yunnan-Vietnam Railway (1889) and Chinese Eastern Railway (1896). Value analysis of IH, survey and recording techniques, and combining Creative Industries with IH, etc. The last but not least is the focus about relation of Reuse and Conservation. Some argue for Reuse as the final destination, and others insist that conservation is the most important issue, and reuse is just a method. This divergence resulted from the concept misunderstanding. Industrial Heritage is still a vague term in the Chinese context, and needs more clarification, while the selection of IH sites is quite a subjective process, lacking overall technological assessment.

As the organizer and participants and are mostly in architecture and urban planning, the discussion paid more attention to space issues and regeneration, while the historical perspective, especially technological history and social history of industry, are nearly absent from the discourse. The contamination problem of former industrial area hasn’t got enough attention. The next step should be getting more fields involved.

Other good news about IH in China: The Third National Monument Survey by SACH (2007-2012) is closing, having identified thousands of industrial sites, buildings and machines. The former Capital Steel Plant areas in Beijing, the Chinese Eastern Railway, are selected as the top 100 new discoveries from this Survey.

A lot was left to representation, images and perception of railway speed, which is eminently relative to the way we perceive or need it at a given moment in time.

The second day was centered on the French experience of the last half century and the way history could be made -and was made actually- in the presence and with the cooperation of major ‘actors’ or ‘witnesses’ who were expressing their views with hindsight (and, more often, their own perception of present developments), i.e. former railway CEO or State secretary.

The last half-day –which should have been longer- was left to a thorough examination of the effects of new railway networks on space, position of production units, land use and work/residence localization, modal split and transport competition.

The whole show was finally an interesting experience, the organizers making a point to throw together PhD students, junior and senior scholars and railway engineers, and browsed even superficially all the chapters of what should be a comprehensive history of railway speed.

One may ask the question: what about industrial heritage in this? Besides the fact that some high speed train systems, especially in Japan, France and Germany, have gone already through stages and technological changes which make advisable the keeping of original trains for museums (which in France is not done yet), understanding railway development sheds a light on industrial history and economy and helps understanding the relations between space and industry. To know how and for what the transport and energy networks were made is certainly a key to the history of industry. There are also side-effects to consider: to hear the railway managers in charge acknowledging the interest of history and heritage for today’s corporate management, industrial relations and prospective is rather comforting. Let us hope they will be true to their word.

The conference records with papers from Europe and the USA will be online in February, 2012 at www.ahicf.com. A volume of proceedings should be published by 2013.

Historic Concrete, 4 November, 2011, Glasgow, Scotland

Historic Concrete was a seminar to look at the history, development, repair and conservation of historic concrete organised jointly by IHBC Scotland and Docomomo Scotland.

Papers presented at the meeting included the history of mass and reinforced concrete, research and repair of concrete buildings and case studies of repair projects can be downloaded from docomomo.scotland.
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Many industrialised countries, where ‘men who once made iron now standing of the heritage of an age of industry that has now ended for
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World Heritage, data capture and documentation, project planning, and evaluation.

There is in general an encouraging interest in methodological issues over case studies, and the book follows the congress structure in dealing with ‘creative re-use’, conservation of technical heritage, landscapes, World Heritage, data capture and documentation, project planning, and evaluation.

Museums and interpretation get slighter coverage, a trend toward which Robert Vogel raised his eyebrows in his report on the congress in TIC-CIH Bulletin #46. More surprisingly, as it was one of the main themes, is the scarcity of papers directly linking industrial heritage and ecology. One reason may be that in much of the world this connection is still emerging, while in North America it is too familiar to merit comment: historians and archaeologists in historic preservation bureaux habitually work alongside their biologist and ecologist colleagues.

Finally, the volume opens with Neil Cossons’ keynote address and a rousing defence of the study, protection and especially public understanding of the heritage of an age of industry that has now ended for many industrialised countries, where ‘men who once made iron now pump it, and rather than work, we work out’.

This meaty volume can be ordered from the Chemnitz Museum of Industry.

Swedish Mining and Metalworking – Past and Present


Marie Nisser’s last publication project covers 4,500 years of mining and metal working in her homeland, with thirty-six of Sweden’s foremost experts from different subject fields such as technology, geology, archaeology, history of technology, economic history, history and cultural geography. This volume becomes number 24 in the National Atlas of Sweden. In Swedish and English. Parts of it will also be published on the Internet in SNA’s web atlas.

Vietnam - 13th World Conference of Historical Cities

16-18 April 2012 Hue, Vietnam. One of the sub-themes is ‘Industrial Heritage, Challenges and Solutions’.

Spain - 39th ICOHTEC Symposium: Technology, the Arts and Industrial Culture

10 – 14 July 2012 Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Barcelona.

Taiwan - XV TICCIH Congress: First call for papers

4 – 11 November 2012 Taipei. Post-Colonialism & Industrialization - Industrial Heritage of Others. The next full TICCIH congress will examine the close connections between historical, political, racial, environmental, economical, technical and social questions of industrial heritage. Contact: Dr. Hsiao-Wei Lin