

The Museums and the Industrial Heritage

A report from a conference held at
Odense City Museums, Odense
30. October – 2. November 2003

Kulturarvsstyrelsen 2006

Title

The Museums and the Industrial Heritage.
A report from a conference held at Odense City Museums
30. October – 2. November 2003

Published by

Kulturarvsstyrelsen
The National Cultural Heritage Agency, Denmark
2006

Edited by

Henrik Harnow, Keld Nielsen & Frank Allan Rasmussen
2006

**Questions regarding this publication:**

Kulturarvsstyrelsen
H.C. Andersens Boulevard 2
1553 København V
telephone +45 33 74 51 00
www.kulturarv.dk

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	
Henrik Harnow.....	4
THE CONFERENCE PROGRAMME.....	6
SHORT ABSTRACTS AND COMMENTS.....	9
OPENING SPEECH – A SPECIAL EFFORT FOR THE INDUSTRIAL HERITAGE	
Steen Hvass.....	14
BRITISH INDUSTRIAL MUSEUMS – EXPERIENCES, PROBLEMS AND PERSPECTIVES SEEN FROM SHEFFIELD	
John Hamshere.....	16
SWEDISH INDUSTRIAL MUSEUMS AND THE PRESERVATION OF THE INDUSTRIAL HERITAGE	
Ewa Bergdahl.....	29
CONCLUSION AND PERSPECTIVES	
Henrik Harnow.....	33
LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS.....	34
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS.....	36

INTRODUCTION

In the autumn of 2003 The Cultural Heritage Agency had just announced that for a period of three years research, recording, preservation and interpretation of the Danish industrial heritage would be given high national priority. Nearly twenty years had passed since the first large scale research and recording project dealing with industrial history and culture, *The buildings and dwellings of industrialisation* (1975 ff.), had been carried out.

A group of historians working in the so-called Industrial Pool, a meeting forum for Danish museums working within this field, felt the need for discussion and perspective before facing a three year period of intense activity. Three members of the pool took upon them to arrange a conference with Nordic participants and with participants from England and other countries, where relevant initiatives had been carried out lately. During the spring and summer of 2003 meetings were held between Keld Nielsen, Frank Allan Rasmussen and Henrik Harnow, including a few meetings with senior advisor from the heritage agency, Caspar Jørgensen.

The group announced the conference with a few lines of introduction:

“Buildings, landscapes, institutions and sub-cultures related to the industrial period are now changing, or disappearing, so rapidly that there is an urgent need for Danish museums to make an enhanced and concerted effort to preserve, study and publicize the national industrial heritage. In particular the most important artefacts need to be located and decisions on their conservation and future use are urgent matters for the Danish Cultural Heritage Agency and the Danish museums.

Working with the industrial heritage is not new to Danish museums. What is new is the need to coordinate and collaborate on a national scale, combined with the realisation that local industrial culture must be viewed and studied in an international perspective.

Even though the conference initiative has been prompted by the wish to boost collaboration and incentive among Danish museums, we think that the problems facing us are of a general nature and common to all countries that make an effort to preserve the national industrial heritage. Therefore the aim of the conference is to learn from national efforts on this scale in other countries

- get inspiration to take up new approaches
- widen the perspective on industrial culture, mentally and geographically

In this light the main themes of the conference will be

- the problems facing industrial museums and the future perspectives within this field

- collecting, recording, preserving, interpreting, and presenting the industrial heritage

The themes will be introduced by a number of invited keynote speakers. The conference programme will leave ample time for questions and discussions. The conference language is English and all discussions will take place in English.

The Museums and the Industrial Heritage is initiated by the National Cultural Heritage Agency in collaboration with Odense City Museums.”

Odense in November 2006
Henrik Harnow



Participants discussing the adaptive reuse of Odense Steel Shipyard from 1918 (Inger Busk fot.)

THE PROGRAMME

The conference was held at Møntergården, the city museum of Odense and a part of Odense City Museums. The conference programme for Thursday 30. October to Sunday 2. November was attended by 37 participants from Norway, Sweden, Finland, Estonia, Great Britain, The Netherlands and Denmark. The conference programme was as follows:

Thursday 30th October

18.00 Registration and welcome reception at Odense City Museums, Møntergården, Overgade 48, Odense. Welcome by deputy mayor Jørgen Lund, Odense City Council

Friday 31st October

Experiences, problems and perspectives – Industrial museums and the industrial heritage

09.00 Opening speech
Steen Hvass, director, The Cultural Heritage Agency, Ministry of Culture

09.15 Introduction to the first conference day
Chair: Henrik Harnow

09.30 British Industrial Museums – experiences, problems and perspectives seen from Sheffield
John Hamshere, managing director, Sheffield Industrial Museums

10.45 Coffee

11.15 The Dutch Industrial Heritage Year 1996 – an evaluation of the heritage year and its aftermath
Dr. Erik Nijhof, Department of History and Technology, University of Utrecht, Dutch representative and board member of TICCIH

12.30 Lunch at Café Fyrtojet

Chair for the afternoon: Frank Allan Rasmussen

13.30 The Norwegian industrial heritage and the role of museums in preserving and communicating that heritage
Gunnar Nerheim, director, The Norwegian Museum of Science and Technology

14.45 Coffee

- 15.15 Swedish industrial museums and the preservation of the industrial heritage
Ewa Bergdahl, director, Norrköping City Museum
- 16.30 Industrial Odense – excursion on foot to nearby early industrial parts of Odense
Henrik Harnow, Odense City Museums
- 18.00 Reception at Odense City Hall, main entrance from Flakhaven
Welcome by member of the City Council, architect Jess Heilbo

Saturday 1st November

Collecting, preserving, studying and interpreting the industrial heritage

- 09.00 Introduction to the second conference day
Chair: Keld Nielsen
- 09.15 The industrial heritage in Denmark
Dr. Ole Hyldtoft, Department of History, University of Copenhagen
- 10.30 Coffee
- 11.00 The Industrial heritage of Britain – a view on the preservation and interpretation of the industrial heritage during the last decades
Bob Hawkins, Listing Inspector, English Heritage
- 12.15 Lunch at Café Fyrtojet
- 13.15 Industrial open-air museums – the experience of Blists Hill
Alex Medhurst, General Manager, Blists Hill, Ironbridge Gorge Museums
- 14.30 Coffee
- 15.00 Preserving and exhibiting the industrial heritage of Catalonia – a co-operation between 16 museums
Jaume Matamala, Museum of Science and Industry of Catalonia, Terassa, Spain
- 16.15 Short break
- 16.30 Museums and the industrial heritage. What can Danish museums learn from the experience of other European museums of industry and technology and what are the prospects for the future?

Lars K. Christensen, The Danish National Museum, will chair the session and try to draw conclusions and point towards the future for the museums and the industrial heritage

17.15 Short break

17.30 Short paper session This session presents short papers by participants from the Nordic countries. We welcome abstracts from all participants. This session will end at 18.30
Chair: Caspar Jørgensen

Tuija Mikkonen: Documentation of industrial processes at a flax spinning mill – An example of a low-cost method

Jørgen Burchardt: The industrial heritage in the 21th century. New conditions for the work of preservation.

John Rendboe: On the preservation of the industrial heritage – seen from the National Tile Museum at Cathrinesminde

19.00 Conference dinner at Den Gamle Kro, Overgade 23. This will give the participants a new perspective on the preservation of cultural history! Den Gamle Kro (The old Inn) boasts the year 1683 on the facade, but let us face it: The facade was created in 1938, when it was totally rebuilt in a more brutal, medieval style. It is probably the most photographed building in this part of Odense

Sunday 2nd November

09.45 Excursion by bus to the old working class area Skibhuskvarteret, Odense Canal and Harbour and to some of the larger industries of the Odense of the 20th century -Thomas B. Thrige's Electromechanical Works and Odense Steel Shipyard, each formerly with around 5000 employees.

The old diesel engine from around 1920 will be working at Thrige's power station, we will walk along the eastern part of the old harbour and see the old steel shipyard which is presently undergoing development by the building developers Søtoftegaard Fyn AIS. We will be received by the director Frank Andersen. The bus returns to Odense, where we will have lunch at around 13.00 in the partly listed and reused textile factory Brandts Klædefabrik in the city centre, where an art gallery and two museums were established in the 1980s.

Tour guides: Frank Allan Rasmussen, Henrik Hamow and Keld Nielsen.

SHORT ABSTRACTS AND COMMENTS

British Industrial Museums – experiences, problems and perspectives seen from Sheffield

John Hamshere

In the 1990s all Sheffield's industrial museums were either closed or rescued from closure at the last minute with much reduced funding from Sheffield City Council, the local authority that owned and ran them. This experience reflected what many industrial museums in Britain have been through over the last ten years and while some survived others did not.

Sheffield City Council created an independent charitable trust to take on its industrial heritage and this has proved successful in drawing in new funding and revitalising the museums.

This paper will examine the following questions:

Why did the industrial museums in Sheffield and elsewhere suffer this fate? What was the rescue and survival strategy of the new Trust? Is this a model that can be applied more generally?

The Dutch Industrial Heritage Year 1996 – an evaluation of the heritage year and its aftermath.

Erik Nijhof

In his paper Erik Nijhof focuses on the Dutch Industrial Heritage Year 1996. He presents the ideas behind the heritage year and the projects that were carried out. Against this background he analyses the whole context of industrial society and the role of the industrial heritage in modern Dutch society.

It is arguable that regional identities were not weakened but reinforced by industrialization, and that the industrial heritage is indispensable for reaffirming regional identities.

Looking at the Dutch pattern of industrialization and regional identities, the paper points towards originally strong anti-industrial sentiments and a strong regional integration and differentiation. Dutch industrialization of the 19th century was characterized by its small scale that followed (and thus reinforced) the existing regional differentiation ("agro-industry"). The industrialization of the early 20th century was characterized by electrification that strengthened patterns of dispersion and small-scale industries.

The following period of de-industrialisation had no state policy to protect industries under threat. Instead, social security arrangements were a strategy for

exit from industrial employment and a transition to a post-industrial service economy. As a result most regions lost their characteristic industries during the post-war years.

In the post-industrial age the concern for the loss of such characteristics has given birth to a strategy of embedding the industrial heritage into regional identity. The turning point was the Industrial Heritage Year 1996, which met much unexpected support from regional policy-makers and from the population. The experience of 1996 points to the fact that industrial heritage can play an important role in creating a regional identity. Globalisation creates feelings of uncertainty and therefore acts as the basis for reinvented regional identities.

Norwegian industrial heritage and the role of museums in preserving and communicating that heritage

Gunnar Nerheim

In his paper Gunnar Nerheim will give an overview of the important industries in Norway from 1850 until 2000 followed by a presentation of what kind of industrial sites have been preserved. Against this background, the paper will present a discussion of how representative those sites are compared with the historical importance of the same industries in the Norwegian economy.

The main strategy for the preservation of industrial plants has been to make them into museums. The paper will also try to assess whether this strategy has been successful.

Swedish industrial museums and the preservation of the industrial heritage

Ewa Bergdahl

During the 1990s Swedish museums have made an increased effort to promote the documentation and interpretation of their industrial heritage. A factor of great importance has been the establishing of a professorship in industrial history at the Royal Institute of Technology in Stockholm. In combination with the courses in industrial archaeology and the research projects offered by a number of universities during the last years this has created a fruitful methodological discussion and a network of people working with the industrial heritage.

The official report "Questioning industrial society", published in 1999 at the request of the Department of Culture, resulted in a three-year governmental project focusing on the industrial heritage. In the final report published last year, the conclusions present a clear picture of the present situation. The paper will present some of the conclusions, which might serve to give a broader perspective.

Interest in and work with the preservation of the industrial heritage in Sweden has been growing steadily during the last ten years. A stronger emphasis has been put upon integrating the preservation and reuse of abandoned industrial sites with research and documentation of the non-material heritage. In this way the history of working people and the complex structures of modern industrial society have been included in the general way of dealing with the history of industrial heritage. The paper will present some examples which illustrate both the problems and difficulties of handling the physical remains of the industrial heritage alongside some of the possibilities that arise from these years of intensified work and interest.

Industrial heritage in Denmark

Ole Hyldtoft

Even though one can point to earlier pioneering contributions like the listing of a great number of wind and water mills and the establishment of the Technical Museum in Elsinore, it was not until the beginning of the 1970s that Denmark's industrial heritage attracted broader attention.

Changes in the governmental preservation policy have been numerous. Today about 40 industrial plants are listed, of which more than 30 have been protected since 1970. In addition, a number of related installations have been listed, like 28 public utility buildings, 22 light-houses and 40 railway stations.

A number of museums covering the industrial heritage of Denmark have been established since the late 1970s. Relatively large and with a broader focus are the Industrial Museum in Horsens and the Worker's Museum in Copenhagen. Several new museums deal with single trades or companies, like the Electricity Museum in Tange, the museum for the tile and brick trade at Cathrinesminde and the Carlsberg Museum in Valby.

Internationally unique in the late 1970s and 80s was the nationwide registration of industrial buildings carried out by the project Industrial Buildings and Dwellings. In continuation of that project, the Danish Society for the Preservation of the Industrial Heritage was established in 1979. Parallel to these initiatives a great number of studies on different aspects of our industrial history have been published, greatly stimulated by three larger research projects.

The industrial heritage of England – seen from English Heritage

Bob Hawkins

The issue of the significance of the industrial heritage has been at the heart of the conservation movement in Britain since the 1960s. This enthusiasm for the industrial past -buildings, machines, landscapes and processes now commands widespread support at national, regional and local levels, with industrial museums, and especially site museums as core institutions which link the early

days of the development of the discipline "industrial archaeology" with the present widespread interest in the industrial past. Recognition of the built industrial heritage is now strongly embedded in the Town Planning System of England, through which historic industrial buildings and sites are recognised, protected and managed. Over the last 40 years, this system has changed the way in which industrial buildings are perceived as heritage, and has moved the debate on from the consideration of individual buildings and sites of significance to the recognition and management of extensive complexes and distinctive industrial landscapes in both urban and rural contexts. This paper will summarise this process of development and explain the role of English Heritage in promoting and supporting the protection and care of the industrial heritage in England.

Blists Hill Victorian Town – the open-air museum and the industrial heritage

Alex Medhurst

The 42-acre open-air museum site at Blists Hill is rich in the remains of industrial activity. Hand in hand with the preservation and restoration of existing monuments, new exhibits have been constructed to illustrate working conditions and techniques in Shropshire in the late 1800s. The site contains 32 exhibits, most of which are manned by costumed demonstrators using third person interpretation.

Blists Hill Victorian Town, located in the Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage site, England, is celebrating its 30th Anniversary and has been one of the most successful attempts at creating a large-scale industrial open-air museum in Europe. This kind of museum is well known in Nordic countries in the form of rural open-air museums, but Denmark has so far only seen attempts on a small scale as regards its industrial heritage.

Creating and running open-air museums present both opportunities and limitations alongside a few paradoxes and compromises. Alex Medhurst, General Manager at Blists Hill, will present the story of Blists Hill and his views on the potential for this kind of museum. He will deal with the operation of an attraction with 250,000 visitors – staffing, the role of volunteers, budgets, the use of special events, the development of the site – and how all this interacts with the curatorial aspects of running a museum.

mNACTEC – a cooperative effort to preserve the industrial heritage of Catalonia

Jaume Matamala i Cura

Nowadays it is fashionable to open new museums looking for worldwide acclaim. The Museu de la Ciència i de la Tècnica de Catalunya (mNACTEC) neither wanted nor was capable of that kind of success.

Instead we decided to create a museum linked with the region's identity. A museum which explains the history and the evolution of global technology putting emphasis on things that were invented, designed or produced, or widely used in Catalonia and which profoundly influence our daily lives. The mNACTEC is not a "world cathedral museum". It is out of the ordinary in that it is spread over Catalonia with twenty different locations which, as a whole, form a picture of the contemporary history of the country.

The 20 museums explain and help people understand, through the use of their senses, the evolution and development of science, technology and industry. Twenty museums, both public and private, are working together through educational, environmental and marketing programmes to preserve our heritage. Twenty museums set in a territory of merely 32,000 km² and 6 million inhabitants located on the Mediterranean coast in the South-west of Europe called Catalonia.

In his paper Jaume Matamala gives a presentation of the mNACTEC, its background, organisation and funding and how the project deals with registration, documentation, preservation and presentation of the industrial heritage of Catalonia. He also asks whether this kind of cooperative effort could be relevant to the preservation of the industrial heritage elsewhere in Europe.

OPENING SPEECH – A SPECIAL EFFORT FOR THE INDUSTRIAL HERITAGE

Steen Hvass, director, The National Cultural Heritage Agency

I have been looking forward to welcoming you to this seminar, which we, The National Cultural Heritage Agency, are extremely glad to be able to present in collaboration with Odense City Museums.

Among a number of disciplines the interest in industrial culture has not least been rising in recent years. The interest has been rising in Denmark, too, although Denmark is still seen – I suspect – as primarily an agricultural country, where the few industries there might be, are considered to be connected with butter, bacon, beer and spirits. But in fact a wide range of industries have left their impact on Danish society for at least the past 150 years. Since the 1890's less than half the population has been employed in agriculture, a number that is down to only 4% today. And already in 1840 20% of the population was living in cities, a proportion which had risen to 84% in 1980.

The interest in industrial society is surely rising at the Danish museums. In Denmark the museums do not only have the responsibility for the moveable heritage in the form of artefacts. The new Danish museums law coming into force by 2002, place the museums as responsible also for advising the municipalities on matters concerning the built or cultural environment. On the other hand buildings, landscapes, institutions and subcultures related to the industrial period are rapidly changing or disappearing. And the industrial heritage is not commonly accepted as part of the Danish heritage.

This is the landscape for which the National Cultural Heritage Agency has been drafting a strategy concerning the industrial heritage, acting on the advice from a number of professionals working within this field in Danish museums. And this Monday the Danish government entered an agreement with all parties of parliament – The preservation of the cultural heritage 2003-2007 – in order to promote the safeguarding of – among other initiatives – the industrial heritage.

The agreement stipulates that the National Cultural Heritage Agency appoints the heritage of industrial society as a special area of action. The action should be multi-dimensional and include preservation and collecting of artefacts, documentation and research as well as the preservation of the built environment. Furthermore the agency must decide on a programme to this effect and work to promote public interest and debate concerning the industrial heritage. The main goals of this strategy are:

- To initiate public awareness of the industrial heritage
- To promote selection and safeguarding of artefacts as well as memories
- To promote selection of safeguarding of buildings and environments

The foundation on which all this must rest is documentation and research. The efforts are planned to culminate in an Industrial Heritage Year in 2007.

Working with our industrial heritage is not new to Danish museums and other concerned parties. What is new is the realization of the need to coordinate and collaborate on a national scale, combined with the realization that local industrial culture must be viewed and studied in an international or North European perspective.

The first step, which we have already taken, is to ask the Danish museums and other concerned parties which parts of the industrial heritage are to be considered the most important to safeguard. Later we will involve other partners. In the first phase of the project it is necessary to establish an overview of what has already been done, discuss directions, aims and methods. And we expect that the pointing out of the most important industrial sites in Denmark will trigger such discussions.

More or less inspired by the French historian Ferdinand Braudel we think that it is important to be specific about the geographical unit used and avoid being blinded by traditional categories such as "local" or "national"

Are we analysing at a local, regional, national and mega-regional level? This leads to

- questions about similarities and differences
- comparisons between regions
- to studies of contrast between regions, known from studies of technology transfer

Today and through out the whole conference the goal is to further a special kind of technology transfer:

- the technology of the industrial heritage whether in museums or as parts of landscapes
- to establish new contacts and exchange knowledge
- to keep up contacts already established during the Nordic-Baltic Industrial Heritage Courses

We think that the challenges facing us are of a general nature and common to all countries endeavouring to preserve the national industrial heritage. Therefore the aims of the conference has been formulated by the organizing committee as

- to learn from national efforts on this scale in others countries
- to get inspiration to take up new approaches
- to widen the perspective on industrial culture, mentally and geographically

At a later stage it might be an idea to take up a narrower theme; it could i.e. be the theme of industrial ports along the Baltic and the North Sea.

BRITISH INDUSTRIAL MUSEUMS – EXPERIENCES, PROBLEMS AND PERSPECTIVES SEEN FROM SHEFFIELD

John Hamshere, Executive Director, Sheffield Industrial Museums Trust

Introduction

In the 1990's all Sheffield's industrial museums were either closed or rescued from closure at the last minute with much reduced funding from the local authority that owned and ran them, Sheffield City Council. This experience reflected what many industrial museums in Britain have been through over the last ten years and some survived while others did not.

Sheffield City Council created an independent charitable trust to take on its industrial heritage and this has proved successful in drawing in new funding and revitalising the museums.

The paper is in three parts and will move from a general overview to a specific analysis of the Sheffield Industrial Museums Trust (SIMT) model:

- Why did the industrial museums in Sheffield and elsewhere suffer this fate?
- What was the rescue and survival strategy of the new Trust?
- Is this a model that can be applied more generally?

This is a personal view of what has happened in Britain and ranges beyond the confines of industrial museums to place the whole story in a wider context. Many of the comments will apply to all museums and some will be contentious particularly in reference to the national context due to the sweeping generalisations made. However, the purpose of this paper is to present the story as seen from Sheffield and therefore it is subjective and is not an impartial or neutral view.

Why did the industrial museums in Sheffield and elsewhere suffer this fate?

The Social Context

In order to place industrial museums in a social and political context as with so many issues in Britain it is inevitable that there has to be a discussion of the role of social class. There is a bias to what is perceived as 'high cultural activities' in the funding and support for the arts and culture in general. Art galleries are generally longer established, better connected and in historical terms better endowed by the great and the good. Great industrial cities have art galleries and museums endowed by local industrialists, but they did not build museums to reflect how they created their wealth. There has always been a greater social cachet to be derived from being involved in the arts. This is true locally and nationally, which means that the arts lobby has always been stronger than the heritage lobby and more funds go to it. It is higher profile with the performing arts able to command a very visible presence in all forms of media by its very nature of celebrity performers from theatre, TV, concert hall and Opera House.

The arts possess an audience drawn from the most educated and privileged elements of society. In the museum world this has always put art galleries in a strong position in the context of local authorities where the type of industrial museum that is the subject here, is generally found. Art galleries have a predominantly upper and middle class audience and it is these people who have a strong political voice. They are the complainers and writers of letters to Members of Parliament, local councilors, local press and any relevant institution or governing body. They are used to forming pressure groups and mustering support for a campaign. They often have the connections to get a celebrity name on their side.

In contrast industrial museums and industrial heritage do not seem to attract the same passion when threatened, although the visiting audience is also predominantly middle class. It is unclear on the surface why this should be but perhaps there is something in the nature and origin of industrial museums that can provide some clues. Industry in historical terms is perceived as being dirty, hard and oppressive. It destroyed beautiful landscapes and created great slum cities. Industrial history will often remind people of hard times, of economic depression and unemployment, of industrial strife, strikes and conflict. However, it can also reflect economic growth, social change, improved living and working conditions. It can generate nostalgia for a simpler slower life... "We were poor but we were happy then"....Nostalgia may not be true reflection but it is a powerful feeling and motivation for many people to visit industrial museums, particularly those presenting reconstructed villages or towns.

Another factor in the apparent comparative weakness of the industrial heritage movement in Britain during the last ten years may be that industrial museums and an interest in industrial archaeology are comparatively recent in Britain. There were examples of museums covering technology such as the National Museum of Science & Industry that grew out of Great Exhibition of 1851. Indeed one William Smith suggested an industrial museum for Sheffield in 1851, but it took until 1982 for one to open, although the industrial heritage site of Abbeydale Industrial Hamlet was rescued and restored in the 1960s having been given to the Council in 1933. In Newcastle The Museum of Science & Engineering was created in the 1930s. But true industrial Museums that encompassed the social or people's history as well as technological progress came later. The Scandinavian folk museum movement inspired some of the open-air examples created in Britain in the 1960s.

Another key feature of the growth in interest in the industrial heritage being lost during the 20th Century was that it was a movement from the grass roots. Groups and individuals had been formed to preserve canals, narrow gauge railways in the Welsh mountains, windmills and watermills. The 1950s and 60s also saw some key moments in creating a different feeling about the industrial past and recognition that Britain should be proud of being the 'First Industrial Nation' and not always look back to an imaginary world of village greens, cricket and warm beer. A key moment was the demolition of the Euston Arch in 1962, which contributed enormously to the raising of consciousness. During the same period the Beeching Report led to the closure of numerous local railway lines and stations.

The perception of change began to be reflected in popular culture in a series of films that presented examples of technological progress in nostalgic terms. In 1953 an Ealing comedy, *The "Tiffield Thunderbolt"*, covered railways, locomotives and resistance to local branch line closures. In the same year *"Genevieve"* promoted the pleasures of vintage cars and the annual London to Brighton race. In 1962 *The Iron Maiden* tried to repeat this successful formula with traction engines. However, these icons of industrial development and technological change were being incorporated into the idyllic view of rural England in these films, rather than representing the urban industrial society that created them.

The industrial heritage movement prospered and grew in the 1960s and 1970s in spite of the limitations arising from the social context outlined above. An obvious expression of this success was the creation of Beamish by Frank Atkinson and the opening of the Iron Bridge Gorge Museum encompassing several heritage sites, museums and reconstructions. Local authorities began to feel proud of their industrial origins and raised the funds to open their own industrial museums. Sheffield's Kelham Island Museum was opened in 1982 although its origins lay in the mid 1970s.

The Political Context

However, in the 1980s the political picture changed following the election of Mrs. Thatcher's Conservative Government. This was a Prime Minister who did not believe that Society existed and appeared to have an equally low view of, or perhaps more charitably an indifference to culture in all its forms. Cultural activity suffered under this Government as a philistine philosophy seemed to be at the heart of government – the individual and the market ruled.

Museums are not creatures that survive in the market, they are by definition an exercise in public subsidy as they exist for the public good, to contribute to society. In the UK there is not the tradition of private giving that supports many institutions in the USA and so museums from the Nationals down to the smallest local municipal museum depend on subsidy. However, the social role is now recognised in the UK as increasingly museums and cultural activity in general are perceived as a means of creating social cohesion and addressing issues of social inclusion. Museums, art galleries and theatres can be a productive means to work with culturally diverse and multiply deprived communities. SIMT has addressed this modern agenda through the creation of an Education & Access Officer at Abbeydale Industrial Hamlet, with funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund, to target and create a meaningful programme for the local community, which is drawn from the most deprived and ethnically diverse part of the City. Local Authorities were placed under a financial siege by the Thatcher Government in the 1980s. There was a struggle to control all public expenditure and restrain what were perceived as high spending Labour controlled Councils. A tier of local government was disposed of completely. These metropolitan counties were large, urban, Labour dominated counties covering conurbations within which there were cities and borough councils who were then given 'unitary status', that is a single tier of local government. The most famous case being the destruction of the Greater London Council.

However, in several cases these metropolitan counties had responsibilities for

museums and ironically it worked to the advantage of some of these museums, as for the first time it brought Central Government funding into local authority or regional museums. In Liverpool, the museums were changed into the National Museums & Galleries on Merseyside with complete independence from the local authorities. In the North East the former Tyne & Wear County Museums Service became Tyne & Wear Museums Service with £1 m of central government funds, although it was run by a joint body made up of the five local authorities.

However, the effect elsewhere was not so positive and the basic equation became a choice between closing schools, or other core social services or museums, as councils struggled under the mechanism of Central Government control – rate-capping. In the UK there are no votes in culture and so of course museums became increasingly marginalized in the political environment dominated by the desperation to continue to provide decent local services. Indeed given the middle class social context outlined above, museums became an increasingly peripheral activity. Year on year budget cuts throughout the 1980s were forced on local authorities through decreasing Central Government support, and 'rate-capping', which deprived the local authorities of the ability to determine their own local income streams through the property tax of rates'. The rates were replaced by a people based tax, the disastrous Poll Tax, which led to riots in London and was another expression of Mrs. Thatcher's attempts to destroy what she perceived as irresponsible and unaccountable Labour controlled councils, which had become in many cases unchanging one party states.

Councils continued to cut services and previously separate departments were combined together in larger directorates. Arts and museums might be placed together, both combined with libraries or put in education or leisure sections. The result was that at the same time museum management was being downgraded with fewer museum directors being chief officers. Increasingly they became second or third tier officers passed between leisure services departments, or education or multifunction directorates that comprise everything from libraries to planning.

The end result of the last twenty years has been a decline in spending on museums, which has had a negative impact on all aspects of museum work in the regions. The buildings have been poorly maintained, collections have suffered from poor storage conditions and lack of curatorial care as staffing levels have been reduced. Displays have remained unchanged leading to declining visitor numbers, which in turn undermines the case for continued funding. The pursuit of scholarship in local museums has been in long-term decline as specialist curators have been replaced with managers of activities, such as collections, marketing and exhibitions. The last change can have very positive effects as limited resources are applied to pressing problems such as cataloguing backlogs or the need to create change in an organisation. Indeed, there is a debate as to whether scholarship should be a role of local museums at all.

An answer to this litany of problems for regional museums has been presented in the "Renaissance in the Regions" Report, published in 2001. The report examines the funding crisis and proposes that the only way forward is for Central Government funds to go directly to museums in the regions. However, these

funds are to be focused on 'hubs' created from the major museums of a region. These hub museums will have specific outputs and targets relating to this funding. In 2003 the first hubs were created and significant funds were provided for those selected for a first phase with less going to the others. This is undoubtedly good news for the hub museums but it leaves the future of all the museums in the smaller local authorities as uncertain as it was before.

Within this bigger political and social context there are specific factors that work against industrial museums. The reasons leading to the creation of an industrial museum in a community are often those of decline, a desire based on wanting to show a proud but dying or lost tradition. This means that industrial museums maybe established in poor buildings that are at least a hundred years old, sometimes semi derelict and hard to maintain. The location will probably be an outlying area not easy for visitors to find or get to, rather than the centre of a city. There are many examples of this including Sheffield's Industrial Museums. The Leeds Industrial Museum at Armlet Mill and Bradford's Industrial Museum are in the same position. These locations are also out of the political heartland, out of sight out of mind, unlike the great municipal institutions of an art gallery or city museum established in the 19th or early 20th Century. These grand centrally located Victorian or Edwardian buildings are politically much harder to close.

What happened in Sheffield?

The short answer is – all the above. The end result was that after years of salami slicing of all budgets, by the early 1990s the Council decided that it had to target one museum and close it. It chose Kelham Island Museum and made the case that it was expensive to run and visitor numbers were less than others sites, which was an unfair comparison with the other sites that did not charge an entrance fee. It was the intervention of a Councillor, Peter Horton a retired head teacher, and the Assistant Principal of Sheffield Hallam University, Professor John Brooks that saved the Museum from closure. They combined together to put forward the idea of creating a charitable trust to run Kelham.

In fact back in the late 1970s it was originally proposed that the Museum be set up on the Ironbridge model of twin trusts: one to manage the museum and the other to raise cash as a development trust. The latter was established but was not very successful as the museum was in the end set up as a Council facility. It raised about £35,000 and was moribund by 1984 only two years after the museum opened, as the business community did not have a good relationship with the left wing Labour council at this time. However the funding they raised was to prove essential to the new Trust as it had grown to £90,000 by the mid 1990s and provided the match funding for Kelham's recently completed lottery funded project that has created a Collection Management Centre comprising new stores, offices, research areas and new displays in the main galleries.

What was the rescue and survival strategy of the new Trust?

Early Conflict

The Trust came into being in late 1994. It became clear within a matter of weeks that the base grant was insufficient as it was derived from out of date budget fi-

gures due to the time it had taken to establish the Trust. The Trust was expected to provide the same level of service on one third of the previous funding. There was a suspicion that the Trust had been set up to fail in order to be able to allocate the rest of the funding to the remaining sites and other arts activity. There followed three years of significant progress by the Trust set against a difficult relationship with the City Council due to the clear inadequacies of the original funding package.

The issue was finally concluded in 1998 with the creation of a new enlarged Sheffield Industrial Museums Trust that included Abbeydale Industrial Hamlet, which had been closed by the Council in 1997 to save funds that had been redirected to save the non-industrial museums and art galleries from further cuts.

The Inheritance

The original Trust, Kelham Island Museum Limited, inherited an unenviable position. Visitor numbers were in rapid decline and the main galleries had not been changed since the Museum opened thirty years earlier. The staff had adopted an inward looking siege mentality due to years of budget cuts. The collection was stored in poor conditions, was largely uncatalogued and had grown in an uncontrolled manner in the 1980s due to the recession affecting Sheffield industry. At the same time there was more competition from new attractions being developed for the Millennium and lottery funding favoring the big and the new as against the small and established.

The new Trust appeared to be facing an impossible task: to rescue a Museum that was in long-term decline with only one third of the funding that had been available to the previously failing institution. The only staffing was the new Executive Director, the one employee of the Trust as the rest were seconded from the Council, an Education Officer based at the Museum but who was also the head of the Council's Arts & Museums Education Section, and half the previous number of front of house and maintenance staff. The Museum desperately needed a realistic strategy to rescue it and ensure its survival.

The Rescue & Survival Strategy

There are certain basic elements that were needed to create such a strategy and appeared to be lacking at Kelham Island. We needed to know and understand what we were here to do, what was our purpose, our mission, as everything derives from a certainty of this. From the mission or aim we derived our vision for what we were going to do and what we were going to be. This was broken down into set of objectives and from these we derived a series of defined actions that formed a clear strategy.

The strategy needed to be realistic, achievable and convey an essentially simple message that was easy to explain and 'sell' to all the partners and stakeholders in the project. But it also needed to be aspirational to both re-engage a cynical and disillusioned staff and also to encourage a new Board of Trustees.

There were two key issues regarding the Board itself: the first was the need to make the Board understand the situation the Trust was in, as for a long time they could not believe that the settlement they had made with the Council was so disadvantageous; the second was to make them understand what a museum was.

The Trustees were made up of very successful businessmen, academics and representatives of the City Council. The businessmen felt that the Museum was like a badly run business that could be turned around with an underlying aim of financial independence from the Council. It took time but eventually it became clear that business logic could not be applied to museum. The analogy they understood was that it was like having a warehouse full of stock that you could not sell and had to keep in very good conditions, leading to huge overheads and a shop front that was so small that only a tiny proportion of your stock was on show to attract paying customers. At the same time your nearest competitors were free of charge. You also could not borrow from a bank to invest in your product to make it competitive. In an early Board meeting, one eminent Sheffield industrialist gave a clear and incisive business analysis of the state of the Museum – reflecting on the lack of investment over 20 years, the understaffing, the lack of marketing, the outdated product, the neglect in building a relationship with your customers all combining to lock the Museum into a spiral of decline. However, whilst this analysis was accurate, how could the position be turned around without any of the tools that would be available to him?

It was not long after this that the survival plan was outlined to the Board in 1995 and it is a strategy that has been pursued ever since. The presentation stated the terrible inheritance, but focused on the positive steps to be taken to move forward. The key elements were the creation of a clear purpose and the pursuit of change within two themes. The first element was referred to as 'The Kelham Concept' and established the aim of the Trust. The only reference to the purpose of the Museum was found in a prospectus for the Development Trust dating from about 1981 and this stated that:

"The aim is not just that the museum should be a place where people come to admire and marvel at the achievements of the past but that the museum should also be alive, showing what is being achieved today, and having a relevance to the future".

The key words in this were 'achievements of the past', 'being achieved today' and 'relevance to the future' and these formed the basis for the 1995 aim:

"To create a sustainable, living and working Museum that will be a major leisure destination, represent pride in past achievement, be a showcase for Sheffield industry and innovation, and an inspiration for future generations to continue the tradition of technological advance, fostering industrial change and enterprise by;"

However, there were significant changes and additions. The first was to make the Museum 'sustainable' as it clearly was not when the Trust took over. It still had to be a tribute to the past and represent the present, but rather than just have a relevance to the future it had to be an 'inspiration', particularly for young people. From this aim, a set of objectives was derived encompassing the traditional museum activities of collection care, interpretation and education, but also including some focusing on the customer and the sustainability issue. For example:

"OBJECTIVE 5 – Seeking additional sources of funding to develop new innovative attractions through sponsorship and from grant giving bodies."

The two key themes set out in the strategy were put under the heading 'What do we do about it?', referring to the inheritance and the first was very aspirational: to pursue being a 'Centre of Excellence' in collection care. This was part of the process in making the Trustees and stakeholders understand that at the core of a successful museum lay the collection and not the displays, which were simply an outward expression of that collection. Each theme had actions associated with it and in this case it was to seek funding for a collection specialist, a Registrar, to undertake an audit and establish a Collection Management Plan that would provide the basis for numerous grant applications.

The second key theme was in fact the one pursued first due to the needs of the Museum to achieve sustainability' and this was to adopt a 'Customer Orientated Approach'. The visitor had to be the focus of the Trust's activity and in order to do this the strategy proposed four policies: Immediate major change'; 'Ongoing change'; 'Permanent change'; and finally 'The big project'.

Immediate change' meant creating new displays and temporary exhibitions in order to generate an upward visitor trend, bearing in mind there was no funding to do this and it all had to be raised in grants and sponsorship. Ongoing change' meant establishing an events programme to guarantee visitors something different, generating re-visits, coverage in the local press and income. 'Permanent change' meant building a new attraction or facility within the Museum that would change the perception of the Museum. This led to the development of the innovative interactive experience for children under seven, 'The Melting Shop', where they are melted, converted, poured, rolled and hammered!

From these policies a set of 'Marketing goals' were set out with a particular focus on children in educational groups and in families. Each of these goals has been achieved.

What was achieved?

In the first three years of the Trust as Kelham Island Museum Limited, visitor numbers grew by 50% from 32,000 to nearly 48,000 and earned income rose by 80%. This had been achieved on one third of the grant available to the Museum when it was a local authority museum and due to that lack of funding it was only able to open on five days a week rather than six.

The success of the first Trust led to the creation of the larger Sheffield Industrial Museums Trust in 1998 encompassing two very important industrial heritage sites, Abbeydale Industrial Hamlet and Shepherd Wheel which had been closed by the Council a year before. The financial basis for this Trust was just as limited as had been the case with the original Trust as the Council only provided a grant to the same level that it cost to keep the sites closed. However, significant funding from the private sector had been promised to fill the gap and this was forthcoming in the first year, but in the summer of 1998 Sheffield's engineering industry hit another recession and the pledged cash evaporated. The Trust secured an additional grant from the Council, but it is never enough and always leaves the Trust in a very vulnerable position.

It could be argued that this was a policy decision to keep the Trust lean and mean' in its pursuit of funding from other sources and it has been very successful at

doing this. Every year the Trust matches the grant from the City Council pound-for-pound with funds raised from outside sources, earned income and donations. Over its life from 1995 to 2003 the Trust has raised 60% of its total income.

The final part of the 1995 change agenda was achieved in 2002/03 with the completion of the lottery funded Collection Management Centre Phase 1 project. This addressed both the 'Centre of Excellence' in collection care aim with the creation of new stores, research areas and curatorial accommodation and the 'Big Project' element in the 'Customer Orientated Approach' aim through the refurbishment of all the main galleries. Much else has changed and developed along the way over the last nine years with many short-term projects, the building of new education spaces and structures, and the restoration of Abbeydale Industrial Hamlet. Visitor numbers have not reached the peak of five years ago due to the increasing competition from much bigger new attractions and the Government deciding to make national museums free, as there is a cluster in Yorkshire. However, school visits continue to grow and are up by 20% this year fulfilling the decision to focus on children.

The strategy based on change in every aspect of what the Trust does is still the driving force, although the Objectives have been to drawn several times, most recently in 2002. In 1998 the aim was re-mutter comprising the same elements but without the word sustainable as the Trust believes it has answered that question and wants to move forward:

To create an accessible and inclusive experience, which is a tribute to past achievement, is a showcase for Sheffield industry and innovation and an inspiration for future generations to continue the tradition of technological progress"

The final part of the strategy that has never been part of a presentation or written down but never ends, is the need to be continually building alliances that will support the work of the Trust. It was essential in the early years to persuade Councillors to believe in the Trust and that museums perceived as failures could succeed. Equally, sympathetic Council Officers were needed to support the Trust behind the scenes. Advocacy and presentational skills were paramount in this game as every step forward had to sound like a major achievement and as soon as something positive happened it had to be packaged and sold internally and externally. In political terms this has become known by the pejorative term 'spin', but whatever it is called it is a vital part of any survival strategy.

Is this a model that can be applied more generally?

The advantages of a Trust Model

There several important advantages to the Trust model as established at SIMT and used in several other cases since, such as the creation of Sheffield Galleries & Museums Trust (SGMT) in 1998 to comprise all the non-industrial sites and more recently for all the local authority managed museum and art galleries in York.

The first is the managerial freedom of the chief executive of a trust. In reporting to a Board rather than working within a large bureaucracy decisions can be taken

very quickly and acted upon. There is more devolved responsibility and so less interference in the operation of the museums. This allows for a greater potential for entrepreneurial activity in both a commercial and social sense. A trust can react quickly to grant opportunities and is not driven by a changing political agenda. SIMT has been able to pursue a strategy laid down nine years ago and this has provided a structure for the successive business plans.

The Board of Trustees can be an advantage in itself, bringing business experience, private sector drive and a 'can do' attitude. Trustees from a business background are willing to take risks and back risk takers. They have high expectations of their managers and have the ability to remove them, but can offer performance incentives. They can open doors to sponsors, help secure 'in kind' support from companies, offer links to other charities through personal knowledge and some may have family connections amongst the 'great and the good' either in the locality, regionally or even nationally. The Trustees on a Board can be drawn from many backgrounds bringing knowledge and experience from a very broad spectrum, including other museums, academia, particular communities and interest groups.

There are political and administrative advantages in the freedom from party politics and from interference by politicians with pet interests. They can exert pressure but it has to be from the outside and through channels without the same direct leverage to cause disruption to plans. There is also freedom from the unending re-structuring of local authorities where museum responsibilities can be reallocated on apparently arbitrary grounds between departments.

There are significant financial benefits particularly in the freedom from the absurd annual budgetary round that afflicts UK local government. Council departments may not know what budget they have until 31st March when the new financial year starts on 1st April and then all the sections beneath the top will have to wait until well into the new financial year to know what they have to spend. SIMT works on three year cycle so even if the settlement at the beginning of each three year period is not what was requested or bid for from the Council, at least the Trust knows how little cash it has and can plan accordingly. The pattern has been to budget for a surplus in year one, break even in year two and a deficit in year three that matches the surplus of year one. Admittedly it has never quite performed to that precise outcome.

A key benefit is access to more sources of funding, such as charitable trusts and foundations. These are numerous in England and many will only give to other charities. The business sector is never comfortable giving to local authority institutions, particularly if they are run by councils where there may be political differences. The public may not wish to support appeals as they feel that as a Council Tax payer they have already paid once for the service.

The disadvantages of a Trust model

Perhaps the most important disadvantage has been referred to as the democratic deficit. The elected councillors do not control or manage the institution and yet the local authority still funds it at a core level. At SIMT income sources have been diversified, capital investment has been generated from outside and capital

from the Council has been multiplied by drawing funding from other sources, but the core funding that enables the Trust to exist still comes from the City Council. The Council do have a set allocation of seats on the Board, but the Councillors are not there as delegates of the Council, they are expected to act as Trustees in the same way as all the others.

Linked to the above is the issue of accountability. The democratic deficit leads to questions of accountability for the expenditure of public funds. SIMT is held accountable through the Scrutiny Board of the City Council. A sub committee of Councillors visits the sites and inspects the progress made and the Trust has to make an annual presentation explaining what it has done and future plans. However, it is also an opportunity for the Trust to raise issues particularly if the Council has not performed well in delivering its side of the responsibilities, or there are financial problems for the Trust, or to flag up issues that will form part of the funding negotiation for the next three-year period.

A major problem for the trust model is a tendency to financial fragility. A trust must be set up with adequate funding. SIMT was not and has had to fight for its survival. As stated earlier it has been said that if a trust is kept hungry it will fight harder for external funding. This may have a grain of truth in it, but SIMT would have moved forward much faster if so much effort had not had to be expended in fighting for additional funding from the Council.

There are also the underlying problems from cuts made before the Trust was created. For example the Trust's Museums are only open five days a week and this was a result of staff and budgets cut made 11 years ago. The Trust has never had the budgetary flexibility to address this within its own resources as the funding uplift each three years addresses the conditions of the present and not the past. Therefore if a Trust is to be created it should be for positive reasons, for the advantages laid out above and fluff o save money. The difference in the establishment of the two Sheffield Trusts is a clear example of this.

SIMT was established to rescue first Kelham from closure and then to reopen Abbeydale, but more than half the staff had gone and only a third of the funding remained. There was no flexibility at all and no room to restructure. SGMT was established to spend £1.5m of Arts Council Stabilisation funding and benefit from £6m Millennium Commission Funding to build the Millennium Galleries. The sites comprising SGMT had suffered from cuts in the 1980s and 1990s alongside the industrial museums, but had been saved from the biggest hits and Abbeydale was closed to protect the Art Galleries budgets at the time the applications to the Arts Council and Millennium Commission were made. Grant giving bodies are unlikely to support an organisation that is subject to cost cutting by its local authority.

The most important conclusion from this is that trusts should be created for positive reasons and for not budgetary savings.

There is an issue regarding the longevity of trusts, as ultimately a trust is the creature of the body that created it and provides the core funding. The funding

body could precipitate a cash crisis if it chose not to increase the funding at the end of a three-year cycle. The agreement SIMT has requires at least two years notice if the Council is going to withdraw funding, but by not raising the funding at least in line with wage inflation then a Trust would be forced to dissolve itself returning the assets to the Council or face insolvency. Therefore a political change could precipitate a crisis. However, it is an unlikely scenario in Sheffield as the costs of running the museums would be far more back in the hands of the Council.

Independent bodies are vulnerable to market conditions and Councils have been faced with hard decisions as to whether to rescue attractions set up with capital funding from bodies such as the various lottery distributing bodies. Government agencies may become involved with larger scale problems. Scottish industrial museums have been subject to several years of crisis and have had to receive some rescue funding to keep them open. In Wales a large botanical garden with a beautiful and huge greenhouse designed by Sir Norman Foster has not attracted the numbers predicted under its business plan and has recently closed due to the failure of a rescue package.

In Sheffield there is a very good example of this problem, the National Centre for Popular Music. This was a £15m project, which included a radical building design but was based on a misguided business plan. The location was in the heart of Sheffield, which was good. It was virtually next to the railway station, which was also good. But it did not have a car park and visitors were expected toted parking at the various public parking places, which of course add considerable cost to any visit. It also expected 400,000 visitors but it did not have the floor area to accommodate the crowds necessary to achieve that number. Visitors come in lumps during weekends and holidays and ratio a steady stream. It was full of interactives, which broke down. The Centre knew t did not want to be a museum of rock & roll memorabilia but could not decide what it wanted to be. It was accused of being the most expensive local arts centre ever'. In the end it attracted 100,000 and folded within 18 months. The creditors got virtually none of their investment back and eventually the buildings were sold to Sheffield Hallam University for a nominal amount to become a new Students Union.

This is straying from the world of industrial museums but the lessons are the same in creating a Trust. One of the pioneering working museums, Quarry Bank Mill at Styal in Cheshire, was taken back into the direct management of the National Trust having been run by an independent trust. The changing market place can undermine the most cautious and carefully drawn business plan. In Kelham's case the opening of the enormous Science Discovery Centre, MAGNA, within the former Templeborough Steelworks only a few miles away in Rotherham has damaged the numbers of family visits. More recently the Government decided to make national museums free and within an easy drive from Sheffield are the National Mining Museum, the National Museum of Film & Photography, the Royal Armouries and the National Railway Museum. Kelham cannot compete with the scale of these attractions or with their marketing budgets and so the Trust will continue to struggle to sustain its predominantly local audience.

Conclusion

Sheffield is an extreme example of what has happened to industrial museums in the UK over the last twenty years. The general picture applies to all local authority museums and industrial museums are not a special case apart from the social context with which we began. That picture is changing with the creation of the 'hubs' and those industrial museums that are located within a hub should benefit with the whole service from central government funding as long as it continues. The lottery funds have assisted numerous museums and heritage sites all over the country with capital investment, although the major problem of inadequate revenue funding persists. The Sheffield trust model for all its museums and art galleries is seen as one way forward and the 'Renaissance in the Regions' Report favoured a change of governance to this form.

However, in spite of the disadvantages and difficulties of being an independent trust, it is the advantages of the model that have saved the industrial heritage of Sheffield. If a Trust had not been created then Kelham Island Museum would have closed and maybe never re-opened and Abbeydale would have remained closed for many years. The survival strategy exploited the unique features of being a trust, but some of the lessons of that strategy could have been applied earlier within the local authority and perhaps prevented the crisis. Ultimately it is often the will to succeed of an individual or group of people that is the determining factor and not a particular structure, it is their passion for what they are trying to do and what they believe in that defines the future.

SWEDISH INDUSTRIAL MUSEUMS AND THE PRESERVATION OF THE INDUSTRIAL HERITAGE

Ewa Bergdahl, director, Norrköping City Museum

Dear colleagues,

The title of my contribution on this conference might be a bit wrong. It might be my own fault. I will not describe Swedish industrial museums, but I will try to give you an overview over the last 20 years of work with protection, researching and recording industrial Heritage and history of the 20th century society in Sweden.

And I will do this from the museum's viewpoint.

Today all local, regional and some national museums in Sweden are involved in one way or another in interpretation of industrial heritage. During the last five years there has been a growing interest in contemporary questions and a growing consciousness of the force of heritage in creation of society. There has also been interesting and important discussions going on among curators and antiquarians concerning their roles in this process of creating cultural values.

But let me start in the late 60s.

An innovative meeting was held in May 1968 at the Museum of Technology in Stockholm. The purpose was to start an inventory of buildings and sites connected to industrial work in society. All over Europe workers were protesting and striking together with students and left wing peoples. It was a period of new radical thoughts and strong political movements with revolutionary ambitions. 1965 about 1 mill persons in Sweden worked in industries, but the numbers of crisis and reductions had then started and many factories and workshops were closed down or had to reduce their numbers of employers. Branches like textile, steel, mine factoring, shipyards and wood were struck by competition from companies in the third World. The great strike in 1969-70 at LKAB:s mines in Kiruna-Malmberget in the upper north of Sweden was an important symbol for the ongoing changes in society. It also focused on the workers conditions and lives.

In the 70s the county museums were created in order to strengthen local and regional democracy and to increase local citizen's accessibility to cultural heritage. Many museums – both local and regional started recording contemporary life and focused on industries and factories. Interviews and photos concerning ordinary and contemporary life and work completed the collections of objects.

The network, SAMDOK (Contemporary Documentation) started 1977 in order to redefine the museums fields of activity, their role in society and their assignments. This network has been of great importance for the orientation of the museums towards a more active role in the public life and in the every day's political and ethical discussions.

Another important milestone, which has had impact on the interest in industrial heritage in Sweden, is the book, "Dig where you are" by Sven Lindqvist. The book initiated several hundreds of local study groups at working sites in Sweden.

Though these study groups did not manage to focus on contemporary questions, their records are still valuable.

During the next decade more efforts were put on official inventories made in the local municipalities in order to create instruments for social and economic planning. Local authorities initiated the work but it was directed by the regional and local museums. In some regions – like in Värmland – industrial heritage was looked upon as a resource and something valuable to preserve for the future. But in the whole industrial heritage was something complicated to deal with. The inventories were often made up in a traditional way. Industrial sites were seldom mentioned. The criteria's of cultural values were slowly changing and other aspects such as local peoples experiences and preferences were taken more in account in the planning of social changes in the physical environment.

The Swedish Association of Industrial History was launched in the beginning of the 80s and pointed at the industrial Heritage, but merely was concentrated on the history of technology. This association represented Sweden in the international Committee of Conservation of Industrial Heritage (TICCIH). It connected individual members with this international global organisation.

The journal *Technology and Culture* was published twice a year during the 80s and presented industrial preservation projects of dignity both in Sweden and in an international perspective. Though it was a very simple and humble journal its impact in the discussions was notable.

The new museology has in the 70s reached Sweden through international debates and participation in conferences arranged by international organisations such as ICOM (International Committee of Museums) and TICCIH (The International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage).

Two lines were important.

The first line is leading to the museologist Kenneth Hudson, who was one of the founders of the concept of Industrial Archaeology. During the 60s the research programmes and education in Industrial Archaeology in England was an important source for inspiration. Industrial archaeology gained a strong impact on some researchers and scientists in Sweden, though their interest was focused either on the architectonic qualities of the industrial Heritage or its technological aspects.

Kenneth Hudson also created the European Museum Forum as an informal network among European museums of all kinds. Kenneth Hudson was always advocating of the museum's responsibility to increase access for the general public to the cultural heritage through both exhibitions and collections. Hudson's thoughts about "putting the visitor in the centre" had a great influence on Swedish museums.

The second line can be traced back to France and the first ecomuseum in Le Creusot, created by two French museologists in the beginning of 70s in order to shape a truly democratic museum, where local inhabitants also were the decision-makers and interpreters of the local heritage and its values. Le Creusot

was a former steel- and coal producing area where the industrial heritage was overwhelming.

The concept of ecomuseum brought up a lot of questions about recording and collecting remains of the modern industry society. To collect, move and even to reconstruct industrial sites are very difficult or nearly impossible. Especially when it comes to whole system of infrastructure systems consisting of transport routes, energy resources and huge production sites, but also whole areas of dwellings and public halls and spaces for social life. The question of preservation was suddenly dealing with the whole modern society. Selections were complicated to do. And which type of criteria's should be determining in the selection process? The costs for preservation and conservation these type of sites and areas were also overwhelming.

The ecomuseums combined the creation of community museums where local citizens played a crucial role as decision-makers and the need to take care of immovable industrial heritage such as huge industrial plants, sites and whole areas could be realised. These ecomuseums areas were also looked upon as important factors for developing regional cultural tourism. They also expressed and made visible the identity of the landscape and its inhabitants. In Sweden the first ecomuseum was created in Bergslagen in the middle of 80s.

In the 90s the importance of preservation industrial heritage was stressed by the establishment of a professorship in Industrial History Research at the Royal High school of Technology in Stockholm 1992. During the last ten years there has been a number of scientific programmes, projects and courses inviting researchers, curators and architects from the Nordic and Baltic countries to participate.

The growing interest among museums, archives, research institutions and voluntary associations all over the country had resulted in a national network called "Industrihistoriskt forum" (Forum of Industrial History). This was – and still is – an informal umbrella organisation where representatives from museums, archives, universities and different kind of branches of business and industry regularly can meet in discussions on mutual questions and projects.

In 1993 the Government gave the Central Board of National Antiquities the commission to present a programme stipulating how to preserve and in a sustainable way manage the industrial heritage sites in Sweden. A national inventory was compiled consisting of more than 50.000 items in a database.

1997 another task was commissioned to The Central Board. The Government asked for a selection of twelve important industrial heritage sites in Sweden and in 2002 the Board could present a list representing both geographical, technological variety and different branches of industry. Research projects were connected to the selected sites in order to map the best practises and methods of preservation and managing.

In the budget proposal 1998 a special investment was made during a coming three year in order to give special attention to the industrial heritage. The Mi-

nister of Culture called on Professor Erik Hofrén to propose government measures to further protection of industrial heritage. 1999 Hofrén's proposal was published as a departmental report (SOU 1999:18) with the title; Questions to the industrial society. This was an unusual approach to the task, which instead of offering a concrete programme, indicated areas and aspects of concern formulated in 21 questions.

A committee was set up for three years with the task to invest 24,5 mill SEK in projects and programmes aiming to develop new methods of protecting, recording and interpret industrial heritage. Last year this committee submitted a report on its activities. 142 applications were presented to the committee, but only 49 of them were granted. Few of these project were innovative and many of them were conducted by established national organisations and museums. The committee's work could hardly be characterised by a bottom-up method. There is an obvious gap between the ambitions and the results.

Still the committee's work has increased the consciousness of the complexity of industrial heritage in Sweden and opened up for further discussions involving also the difficult aspects of i.e. environmental destruction, which are linked to industrial heritage. Many manufactured sites and contaminated and derelict landscapes have been left by past industrial activities. In what way can we protect and preserve the historical values of these places, when they must be reused and recycled into our urban lives? This question together with the challenge to truly involve the local citizens into the evaluating processes will be the great challenge in the next decade.

CONCLUSION AND PERSPECTIVES

Looking back on the conference and trying to draw some conclusions one has the advantage of hindsight and it is as always tempting to see connections and draw conclusions that are now obvious but maybe were not then.

As the arrangers of the conference we find that the conference was a formal success in attracting around 40 participants from mainly the Nordic countries. What we see as very important and maybe the most direct result from the conference in a Danish context was the vivid discussion that took place and the encouragement from especially the British speakers to go back and do something. We think that this discussion directly influenced the decision to plan and carry out the Danish Industrial Heritage Year of 2007.

In a larger perspective the conference can be seen as one of a number of contributions to the National Cultural Heritage Agency's attempt to boost activity in this field and a factor behind several initiatives that followed and are under way.

When pointing to directions for the future the conclusion may be banal in the sense that the enhanced co-operation between museums and the overall national initiatives of the last years no doubt have contributed to a higher quality of work and a much higher level of activity. The Danish museums need to keep in contact with the international environment and to take on the role of active participants, not only in traditional areas as recording and interpreting the industrial heritage, but also in local planning and development. The museums are in a position to take on a central role in these areas that are relatively new to Danish museums working with industrialisation, and the museums have much to offer in this field.

Henrik Harnow
Odense in November 2006

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

John Hamshere, *Executive Director, Sheffield Industrial Museums Trust*

John has a BA Honours degree in History and Politics, a Masters degree in Industrial Archaeology and is an Associate Member of the Museums Association (AMA). He began his career at the Museum of Science & Engineering in Newcastle. In 1989 John became the first Museums Officer for Allerdale Borough Council in Cumbria building up the Museums and Heritage Service to nine varied sites.

In 1994 he was appointed as the first Executive Director of Kelham Island Museum Ltd, a charitable trust set up to rescue Sheffield's industrial museum from closure. The success of the Trust led to its expansion in 1998 to form Sheffield Industrial Museums Trust (SIM1), with the addition of Abbeydale Industrial Hamlet, which had been closed by the Council in 1997. This is a very important water-powered scythe works with well-preserved crucible steel furnace. The Trust has re-opened the site to run on a seasonal basis and attracted grants from many sources to enhance cultural interpretation and to improve the physical condition of the site.

Most recently John has secured two Heritage Lottery Fund grants for the Trust. The first is a capital grant for a £500,000 project for Kelham Island Museum to create a new Collection Management Centre and re-interpretation of the main galleries. This project has just been completed. The second is a grant to build up new audiences for Abbeydale Industrial Hamlet.

Erik Nijhof

Dr. Erik Nijhof (born 1948) studied social and economic history at Utrecht University, where he is now an assistant professor in contemporary social history. His doctoral thesis was on the labour relations in the port of Rotterdam (1988).

Since 1992 he has been working with aspects of the industrial heritage on a local as well as a national and an international level. Erik has been a staff member of the Dutch Institute of the Industrial Heritage and is currently the secretary of the provincial industrial heritage association TICCIH, of which he is also a board member.

Gunnar Nerheim

Gunnar Nerheim (born 1949) was appointed executive director of the Norwegian Museum of Science and Technology in 1995. He has participated actively in organizations for the history of technology since the 1980s and has been a member of several subcommittees of SHOT.

He is the author or co-author of a number of books dealing with the history of technology and business history in Norway in the 19th and 20th centuries. During the 1990s he was involved in the writing of eight books dealing with Norwegian energy history – both water-power and oil and gas – shipbuilding and offshore industries. Nerheim has been the main contributor to the two first volumes of "Norsk oljehistorie" (The History of Norwegian Oil), 1992 and 1996.

He is currently working on a one-volume history of oil and gas in Norway from 1965 to 2000 seen in an international context and specially designed for the English reading market.

Ewa Bergdahl

Ewa Bergdahl (born 1948) holds diplomas in archaeology, in the preservation of the cultural historical heritage and in the economic history of the iron production areas of Sweden.

She worked as a field archaeologist and educational officer before she went on to work with the cultural heritage and buildings history in Bohuslän in the mid-1980s. In 1987 she was appointed director of the Department of Antiquities and Cultural Heritage at Bergslagen. From 1990 she was the executive manager of the medieval reconstruction of Nya Lapphyttan. From 1996 to 1999 she was the director of the Ekomuseum Bergslagen before being appointed director of the City Museum of Norrköping.

Ewa has lectured at a number of universities and has been active on a number of boards both in Sweden and internationally.

Ole Hyldtoft

Ole Hyldtoft is an associate professor at the Department of History at the University of Copenhagen. His doctoral thesis (dr. phil.) "Københavns Industrialisering 1840- 1940" (The Industrialisation of Copenhagen 1840-1914) of 1984 was a major contribution to Danish industrial history. Since then Ole has been a leading figure on the Danish scene. He has written a number of books, both general syntheses such as "Technological Change in Danish Industry 1870-1896", 1996, and studies of single branches such as the gas industry in "Den lysende Gas" (Illuminating Gas), 1996. Since 1988 he has been the chairman of the Danish Society for the Preservation of the Industrial Heritage, a member of the board of TICCIH since 1994 and chairman for the Danish Society for Economic and Social History since 1996.

Bob Hawkins

Bob Hawkins is a Historic Buildings Inspector with the Designation Team of English Heritage, which has special responsibility for industrial buildings and monuments. His work is primarily concerned with advising the Government on the listing of buildings of special architectural or historic interest in the North-west of England, including the industrial cities of Liverpool and Manchester. He began his career as a museums professional, and worked at Abbeydale, in Sheffield, and later at The Silk Mill Industrial Museum, as keeper of Industry and Technology. These are both important site museums, using historic buildings as both artefacts and as museum complexes. Bob later became an Historic Buildings Adviser working for the County administration for Derbyshire, and dealing with the conservation and management of historic buildings and areas within the planning system for England, dealing with planning proposals affecting historic buildings.

As well as dealing with listing casework, much of his current work is project based, dealing with the thematic study of historic industrial building types and distinctive historic industrial communities. This has recently extended into collaborative European projects, and, on behalf of English Heritage and under the Culture 2000 E.C. programme, he is currently leading a project in collaboration with partners from France, Italy and Catalonia entitled "Working Heritage – a future for historic industrial centres", on the European industrial Heritage.

Alex Medhurst

Alex Medhurst, Ironbridge Gorge Museums, is the General Manager at Blists Hill, formerly Director of the Royal Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra.

Jaume Matamala i Cura

Jaume Matamala i Cura was born in 1960. He holds diplomas in Philosophy and Education, in Management for State Administration, in Museum Management and is also trained as a journalist.

From 1986-90 he was the co-ordinator and manager of projects for the re-use of industrial areas which had been abandoned. In 1990 he was appointed General Co-ordinator for the creation of the Museum Colonia Sed6. In 1991 he became manager of mNACTEC (Museu Nacional de la Ciència i de la Tècnica de Catalunya)

Jaume Matamala has been a board member of CIMUSET-ICOM Board since 1998. Since 1989 he has participated in many international forums on industrial heritage, Science and Technology Museums (TICCIH, CIMUSET-ICOM, ECSITE) and cultural tourism. He has collaborated with a number of scientific, technological and industrial museums and taken part different in European projects.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Name	Institution	Country	E-mail
Kari Amundsen	Akerhus Fylkesmuseum	N	Kari.amundsen@akerhus.no
Marie Bach	Sydsjællands Museum	DK	marie.bach@indmus.dk
Ewa Bergdal	Norrköpings Stadsmuseum	S	eva.bergdahl@norrkoping.se
David Brand	Norsk Telemuseum	N	david.brand@norsktele.museum.no
Jens Breinegaard	Danmarks Tekniske Museum	DK	
Hans Buhl	Steno Museet	DK	steno hb@au.dk
Jørgen Burchardt	Museumskonsulent	DK	
Inger Busk	Odense City Museums	DK	ihb@odense.dk
Lars K. Christensen	The Danish National Museum	DK	lars.k.christensen@natmus.dk
Jaume Matamala Cura	MNATEC Museu	Spain	jmatamala@gencat.net
Bjørn Frederik Drangsholt	Stiftelsen Setesdalsbanen	N	bfd@setesdalsbanen.no
Per Einar Faugli	Norwegian Water Resources and Energy	N	pef@nve.no
Henrik Harnow	Odense City Museums	DK	hhkl@odense.dk
Caspar Jørgensen	The National Cultural Heritage Agency	DK	casjor@kulturarv.dk
Linda Klitmøller	Museet på Sønderkov	DK	
Rasmus Kreth	Industrimuseet, Horsens	DK	
Hanne Larsen	The National Cultural Heritage Agency	DK	hanlar@kulturarv.dk
Peter Ludvigsen	Arbejdersmuseet	DK	
Alex Medhurst	Ironbridge Gorge Museums	GB	
Tuija Mikkonen	Vaasa Museum of Labour	F	
Anders Myrtue	Odense City Museums	DK	asm@odense.dk
Gunnar Nerheim	Norsk Teknisk Museum	N	
Keld Nielsen	Elmuseet	DK	

Flemming Steen Nielsen	Danmarks Mediemuseum	DK	flemming@mediemuseum.dk
Erik Nijhof	Dept. of History, Utrecht University	NL	
Frank Allan Rasmussen		DK	far@indmus.dk
John Rendboe	Cathrinesminde Teglværksmuseum	DK	
Gustav Rossnes	Kulturminneavdelingen, Riksantikvariatet	N	
Mette Slyngborg	Esbjerg Museum	DK	
Jens Aage Søndergaard	Dansk Landbrugsmuseum	DK	jaas@gl-estrup.dk
Jan Tapdrup	Danmarks Tekniske Universitet	DK	
Hanne Thomsen	Gasmuseet	DK	
Jytte Thorndal	Elmuseet	DK	
Normunds Tries	Foreign Affairs Division, Riga City Council	Lv	normunds@rcc.lv
Harald Tønnesen	Norwegian Petroleum Museum	N	harald@norskolje.museum.no
Tinna Vlapola	National Board of Antiquities	F	tinna.valpola@nba.fi
Aslak Wegge	Vennesla Kommune	N	Aslak.wegge@vennesla.kommune.no



The participants at Odense City Museums, The City Museum Møntergården, where the conference was held (Inger Busk fot.)