



# SOCIETY FOR INDUSTRIAL ARCHEOLOGY

## N E W S L E T T E R

### SUPPLEMENTARY ISSUE N° ONE

March

1972

Some Thoughts on Industrial Archeology, Preservation, and Training by Ted Sande, AIA

On Saturday, December 4, 1971, an all-day workshop on architectural preservation was held at the University of Maryland. Through the kindness of James C. Massey, Chief of the Historic American Buildings Survey of the National Park Service who invited me to share the podium with him, I had the opportunity of speaking briefly to the group about industrial archeology and its relation to architectural preservation and university level training. For most of those present, my remarks were an introduction to our relatively young field. Thus the term "industrial archeology" had to be defined at the outset, before the issues of preservation and education could be discussed.

At this stage in our development, a somewhat self-conscious attitude with respect to who we are and what it is we believe to be important does not seem to me inappropriate. Indeed it is necessary and unavoidable in presenting ourselves to the public. We shall have to do a great deal of defining and explaining about industrial archeology until we are more widely known and our purposes understood. If we are to expect others to take us seriously then we owe it to them as well as to ourselves to be especially clear in defining our aims and the standards by which we intend to measure our working toward the fulfillment of these objectives. It is not my purpose here to give precise answers to questions of intention and the rules one ought to follow in pursuing a particular goal because: a) I'm more concerned with what are the right questions at this stage than with precise answers for what might be inadequate questions, and b) I have a very strong belief that for industrial archeology the questions and answers can be best formulated through the exchange of views among ourselves and the broad range of particular disciplines we represent. With these thoughts in mind, I offer the following notions for your consideration and debate.

#### *Industrial Archeology Defined*

As cited at the October 16th [1971] conference at the Smithsonian Institution, out of which came the formation of SIA, the best definition of industrial archeology thus far advanced is that of R. A. Buchanan, Director of the

Centre for the Study of the History of Technology at Bath [England] University, who stated some three years ago that:

Industrial Archeology is a field of study concerned with the investigation, surveying, recording and, in some cases, the preservation of industrial monuments. It aims, moreover, at assessing the significance of such monuments in the context of social and technological history.

Buchanan goes on to make a number of qualifying statements but this is the essence of what I understand to be his meaning and it is important for us in at least two respects. First, it makes clear that the very nature of industrial archeology is complex. That is to say, we are not concerned just with investigation, or surveying, or recording, or preservation; but with all of these as they bear upon the study of industrial remains. And second, as a result of this inherent complexity, accurate and comprehensive assessment of the industrial remains depends upon an interdisciplinary approach. Industrial archeology is enriched and made complete by the bringing together of many disciplines using a wide range of analytical techniques. There is no single "expertness" that dominates the field. Historians of technology, architectural historians, anthropologists, archeologists, architects, engineers, economic historians, and others, all contribute their separate skills in the larger cooperative search for an understanding of our industrial past.

Industrial "monuments" and the use of the term "past" take on broad connotations as well. The objects that interest us and their historical ages are not as finely limited as are those in, for example, English literature or art history. Thus Buchanan continues:

For the purpose of this definition 'industrial monument' should be interpreted very widely to include all sorts of relics of industrial processes and industrialization: it would take in, for example, the homes, public houses, and churches of industrial workers.

By significant monuments--or remains--of an industry, then, we legitimately include: relevant building types, equipment, machinery, products, written documents, illustrative views (paintings, woodcuts, steel engravings), and any other object or artifact that in any way increases our understanding of an industry or industrial event. Their