Spaces of Industrial Heritage:
a history of uses, perceptions and the re-making of
Liverpool Road Station, Manchester

A thesis submitted to The University of Manchester
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health

2020

Erin Beeston

School of Medical Sciences, Division of Medical Education,
Centre for the History of Science, Technology and Medicine
Contents

Title page.................................................................................................................. 1
Contents ..................................................................................................................... 2
Table of figures ......................................................................................................... 7
    Chapter 1.............................................................................................................. 7
    Chapter 2............................................................................................................ 8
    Chapter 3............................................................................................................. 9
    Chapter 4.......................................................................................................... 10
    Chapter 5.......................................................................................................... 11
    Appendix A ........................................................................................................ 12
List of abbreviations .................................................................................................. 13
List of building names............................................................................................... 14
Abstract .................................................................................................................... 15
Declaration ................................................................................................................ 16
Copyright ................................................................................................................... 16
Dedication .................................................................................................................. 17
Acknowledgements ................................................................................................... 17
Introduction ............................................................................................................... 20
    1. Introduction ................................................................................................... 20
    2. Thesis structure .............................................................................................. 22
Literature review ....................................................................................................... 25
    1. Memory .......................................................................................................... 25
    2. Technology .................................................................................................... 28
    3. The heritage debate ....................................................................................... 30
    4. Museology ...................................................................................................... 32
    5. Railways ......................................................................................................... 36
    6. Manchester and Castlefield ............................................................................ 38
    7. Station histories .............................................................................................. 41
Sources and methods ................................................................................................. 44
    1. Documentary sources ..................................................................................... 44
    2. Visual sources ................................................................................................ 46
    3. Objects ............................................................................................................ 47
    4. Oral history .................................................................................................... 48
Chapter 1. From relics of the railway to centenary celebrations:

Liverpool Road Station as site of memory ................................................................. 50

Introduction .............................................................................................................. 50

Section 1: Victorian commemoration of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway .... 53

1.1 Memorialising George Stephenson and the legacy of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway ........................................................................................................... 53
1.2 The Stephensons and the Liverpool & Manchester Railway on display .............. 58

Section 2: Preserving the LMR and Liverpool Road Station ..................................... 61

2.1 Victorian preservation of early locomotives ...................................................... 62
2.2 The relics of Liverpool Road and (not) saving Water Street Bridge ................. 66

Section 3: The Liverpool and Manchester Railway Centenary .............................. 73

3.1 The influence of the Stockton and Darlington Anniversary ................................ 74
3.2 Liverpool & Manchester Railway Centenary: a celebration of Liverpool .......... 78
3.3 At Liverpool Road ................................................................................................. 82
3.4 The legacy of the 1930 Centenary ...................................................................... 87

Conclusion ................................................................................................................ 91

Chapter 2. Beyond the passenger story:

Liverpool Road Station as a centre for Manchester goods ................................... 93

Introduction .............................................................................................................. 93

Section 1: Liverpool Road Station re-defined ......................................................... 98

1.1 Passengers and goods ....................................................................................... 98
1.2 The end of an era ............................................................................................... 107
1.3 The Station after 1844 ...................................................................................... 110

Section 2: Liverpool Road Station re-formed ....................................................... 113

2.1 Expansion: co-operations and tensions ............................................................. 114
2.2 Radical re-organisation ..................................................................................... 116
2.3 A modern station ............................................................................................... 119

Section 3: Changing technologies at Liverpool Road ........................................... 128

3.1 Power transitions ............................................................................................. 129
3.2 Power and haulage ........................................................................................... 134
3.3 Resilience .......................................................................................................... 138

Conclusion ................................................................................................................ 140

Chapter 3. The Station and the Camp Field:

At the threshold of the Victorian City .................................................................... 142

Introduction .............................................................................................................. 142

Section 1: The Station and its surroundings ......................................................... 146
1.1 Negotiating Liverpool Road.................................................................147
1.2 Passing through Liverpool Road........................................................149

Section 2: Radicals, the railway and the municipalisation of Campfield..........155
2.1 Unruly Campfield .............................................................................156
2.2 Civilising Campfield........................................................................160
2.3 Displacement .......................................................................................164

Section 3: The Camp Field enclosed.......................................................166
3.1 Space for spectacle .............................................................................167
3.2 Separation from the street .................................................................172

Conclusion..............................................................................................179

Chapter 4. The politics of preservation:

establishing a science museum in post-war Manchester..........................181

Introduction ..........................................................................................181

Section 1: Building a Science Museum to rival South Kensington: establishing the NWMSI in response to the de-industrialisation of Manchester..........185
Section 1.1 The Museum Project: preserving the past ...............................185
Section 1.2 The Museum Project: educating future scientists ...................189

Section 2: From unofficial tourist destination to potential museum site: heritage at Liverpool Road Station in the post-war period............................................192
Section 2.1 Liverpool Road Station & the tourist gaze..............................193
Section 2.2 Modernisation.......................................................................197
Section 2.3 Towards preservation ............................................................202

Section 3: The politics of preservation ....................................................205
Section 3.1 The University’s preferred spaces...........................................206
Section 3.2 Liverpool Road Station and the preservation agenda ..............212
Section 3.3 The Society and the Station ..................................................216

Conclusion..............................................................................................220

Chapter 5. Transforming Liverpool Road Station:

the politics of memory and museum-making .......................................222

Introduction ..........................................................................................222

Section 1: The Liverpool Road Station Society: from saving the oldest station to re-creating railway history .......................................................224
Section 1.1 Anniversaries and action........................................................225
Section 1.2 A Railway experience ............................................................234

Section 2: Re-making Liverpool Road Station ........................................237
Section 2.1 A transport museum in the making?......................................238
Section 2.2 The Air and Space Museum

Section 2.3 New objects, old narratives?

Section 3: Forgotten Freight?
The challenge of interpreting Liverpool Road Station

Section 3.1 The Station Building

Section 3.2 Freight buildings and spaces

Section 3.3 The 1830 Warehouse

Conclusion

1. Beyond the ‘oldest station’

2. Museumification

3. Commemoration and industrial heritage

4. Reflections

Bibliography

Primary Sources

1.1 Archival material

Bolton Library and Museum

Cheshire Archive and Local Studies

Chetham’s Library

Lancashire Record Office

Liverpool Archive and Local Studies Collection

Manchester Archive

Manchester Central Library, local studies

Science and Industry Museum Archive

Science and Industry Museum Records Management (Corporate Archive)

The National Archives, Public Record Office

National Railway Museum, including library and archival sources

Science Museum

Royal Mail Archive

University of Manchester Archive

1.2 Printed primary sources

1.3 Newspapers and Journals

National publications

Regional newspapers

Trade journals

1.4 Oral History interviews and personal correspondence
2. Secondary Sources ........................................................................................................... 291

Appendix A:

Suggestions for the Science and Industry Museum, Manchester .................................. 304
Section 1: Freight stores .................................................................................................. 304
Section 2 Power and technologies .............................................................................. 308
Section 3: Social Spaces ............................................................................................... 309
Section 4: Animals .......................................................................................................... 312
Section 5: Things ........................................................................................................... 314
Section 6: Connections .................................................................................................. 315
Section 7: The World ...................................................................................................... 317
Closing statement ........................................................................................................... 318

Word Count, including footnotes...................................................................................... 87,974
Table of figures

Chapter 1

**Figure 1.** Photograph of the statue of George Stephenson (left) by John Gibson in St. George’s Hall, Liverpool. (City Engineer’s Department, 20 July 1942, Liverpool Archive: 942.7213 GEO).
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**Figure 4.** Newspaper cutting shows young boy gazing at a model of ‘Rocket’ circa 1909. (Science Museum: T/1909-3 object history file for Stuart Turner Ltd. model of ‘Rocket’).

**Figure 5.** Henry Ford’s full-scale, working replica of ‘Rocket’ photographed in September 1929 outside St George’s Hall, Liverpool, prior to shipment to The Henry Ford Museum. (Liverpool Archive: Hf 385.2 CEN Newspaper Cuttings: *Liverpool Post & Mercury* 5 Sept 1929).
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Figure 12. Ceremonial activity at Liverpool Road Station on 15 September 1930. *The Daily Dispatch* (top) pictured the Mayors and guests at the booking office, whilst the *Evening Express* (bottom) showed the unveiling of the commemorative tablet affixed to the Station at street level (Liverpool Archive: Hf 385.2 CEN Newspaper Cuttings).

Figure 13. The remnants of the passenger station at Crown Street were further damaged by enemy action in May 1941. (*Railway Magazine* (March 1950) vol. 96, no. 587, p.155).

Figure 14. Front cover of *Meccano Magazine* vol. 15, no. 9 September 1930. Illustration of the first journey along the Liverpool and Manchester Railway through the Moorish Arch at Edge Hill (NRM: W/15R).
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Figure 8. Plan attached to an agreement between Manchester Corporation and the LNWR for land at Camp Field, 20 April 1854 (TNA: RAIL 791/118).

Figure 9. LNWR New Works and Additional Powers plans and section, 1867: Bridge over River Irwell and Water Street in Parish of Manchester County of Lancaster (Lancashire Record Office).
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Figure 21. Photographs of Walter Bowman of the cartage department, with horses the first taken between 1916 and 1923 and with Walter standing alongside a Karrier LMS delivery van in 1926 (SIM: YA 1996.1539).
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Figure 12. Plan attached to memorandum from the Mayor of Manchester to LNWR regarding the enlargement of Liverpool Road Station, 1 May 1867. Streets in brown to be ‘absorbed’ were cleared in 1879-1880 (TNA RAIL 791/271).

Figure 13. T.R. Marr’s Housing Conditions in Manchester and Salford, 1904 (Manchester Historical Maps).

Figure 14. Illustration of the covered Lower and Upper Campfield Market Halls by architects Mangnall and Littlewoods from The British Architect and Northern Engineer, March 1877.

Figure 15. Illustration from Railway Magazine volume 30 (Jan-June 1912) showing the conveyance of animals for Bostock’s Menagerie, held at the City Exhibition Hall.
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Figure 1. The North Western Museum of Science and Industry at the corner of Grosvenor Street and Upper Brook Street c.1979 (SIM collection).
Figure 2. Photograph of the City Exhibition Hall (Lower Campfield Market Hall) taken for the Ministry of Works during Festival of Britain preparations for the Land Travelling Exhibition, Jan 1950 (TNA: WORK 25/222).

Figure 3. Photograph of patrons of the ‘Old Manchester Rail Tour’ exploring the station on 12 May 1956 (W. H. Shercliff, Manchester Library collection).

Figure 4. Photograph of the ‘old bell’ displayed on the ground floor of the Station Building (formerly the first class booking hall) in 1955 (Manchester Library collection).

Figure 5. Section of coloured diagram of Liverpool Road Station, 1956 (in greyscale for legibility) (NRM: 2004-7758).

Figure 6. Cross section of the Old (1830) Warehouse from Chas E Goad Ltd., Manchester Carriers’ Warehouse District fire insurance plans circa 1899, annotated up to 1961 (SIM Archive: E2019.0032).

Figure 7. Visitor map showing the location of the museum, circa 1968-1971 (UoM Archive TPA/1/70 (1/2).

Figure 8. Notional perspective drawing of the Museum of Science and Technology by Hugh Wilson and Lewis Womersley, architects, March 1972 (University of Manchester Archive: TPA/1/70 (1/2).

Figure 9. Members of the Liverpool Road Station Society inspect the Station in 1978 (SIM Archive 2007/41/1/9).
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Figure 1. Photocopy of a flyer the LRSS distributed on the 149th ‘birthday’ of Liverpool Road Station: 15 September 1979. (SIM Archive 2007/41/1/9).

Figure 2. Guide to the ‘Great Railway Exposition’, the 150th anniversary celebrations of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway held at Liverpool Road Station from 2 August to 14 September 1980. (SIM Records Management, ‘150th Anniversary Special’ publicity folder).

Figure 3. ‘Site Layout for Festival’, by Thomas Worthington & Sons Architects, January 1980. (SIM Records Management: David Sumner file).

Figure 4. Thomas Worthington & Sons, Architects ‘The GMC Railway and Science Museum Liverpool Road Station’ site proposal, July 1980. (SIM Records Management: David Sumner file.)

Figure 5. ‘Liverpool Road Station and Warehouse: Proposed Museum of Science and Technology’, GMC County Planning Departments, Aug 1975. Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments, Liverpool Road Station grant application (1973 - 1978) (TNA: HLG 126/1702).
Figure 6. Titles discussed by the Greater Manchester Railway and Science Museum Trust. Table based on ‘title of new museum’ note by P.D. Quick, 17 Sept 1981 (Manchester Archive GMC 4/BOX 44).

Figure 7. Photograph of a poster for the ‘Home Improvements and Leisuretime Exhibition’, 1976, one year before a fire closed the City Hall (Manchester Archive: F1976/160, Crumpsall Station Posters).

Figure 8. Manchester Air and Space Museum, Pocket Guide, c.1983-4 (SIM Collections Centre, Air and Space Museum subject file).

Figure 9. Image of the ‘First Class Booking Hall’ mannequin display in GMMS Trust, ‘Souvenir guide to the working museum housed in the oldest railway buildings in the world’, 1986 (SIM Collections Centre, Museum history file,).

Figure 10. GMC County Planning Department illustration of the station building restoration, presentation drawing for press launch circa 1985 (Manchester Archive: GMC5/Box 150)

Figure 11. Excerpt from NWMSI ‘Proposed layout to Goods Shed at Liverpool Road Station’ by G. B. Nolan, scale 1-100, undated: c.1980. Freight objects can be seen adjacent to ‘Pender’ on the platform (SIM Records Management).

Figure 12. Publicity leaflet for the NWMSI circa 1969 – 1980 showing a member of staff attending the spinning mule, an object demonstrated by technicians (Richard Hills personal archive, Cheatham’s Library: 16.K.2.24).

Figure 13. Photographic record of the dismantling of 35 and 37 Dean Street. Image shows the late eighteenth century dwellings prior to their removal by MEDReG in 1984 (SIM Collection).

Appendix A

Figure 1. Museum of Science and Industry CAD Plan Review ‘Upper Yard’ by Watts Group Ltd. Scale 1: 1250, 24 Nov 2016. This shows the current extent of SIM’s 5 core buildings (Image courtesy of SIM).

Figure 2. Photograph of the interior of the Shipping Shed at Liverpool Road Station, showing staff loading vans with boxes of goods including tobacco, 1934 (NRM: 1997-7409).
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List of building names

Owing to the long periodisation of the thesis and contemporaneous use of more than one name per building, I have selected building names along the following lines:

- The railway warehouse erected in 1830 has been known by the Museum as ‘1830 Warehouse’ for three decades, I have retained this title (even in the earlier chapters) as a helpful distinction from the two 1831 structures. It was late known as ‘Old Warehouse’, but this would be anachronistic when discussing before 1880. ‘1830 Warehouse’ also provides continuity with the terminology Chapter 5.
- The original passenger facilities I have called the ‘Station Building’ as distinct from the adjoining 1831 extension. This too provides continuity with the Museum period, which has referred to the station as such since the GMMSI period.
- The no longer extant 1837 station for inbound passengers is referred to in contemporary sources as the ‘Arrival Station’.
- Several names were contemporaneously used for the 1856 goods shed on site, however, ‘Shipping Shed’ was common and has been employed here.
- The two additional warehouses constructed at the Station in 1831 were known as ‘Cotton Warehouse 1’ and ‘Cotton Warehouse 2’ on the 1850 Ordnance Survey, these names have been employed throughout.
- The 1844 ‘Pig Landing Station’ on Charles Street has been named such, with the later Water Street construction termed ‘Pig Station’.
- The LNWR and Manchester Corporation regarded the last warehouse on site, completed in 1880, as ‘New Warehouse’. As I made a case to SIM to reinstate this name after it was erroneously entitled ‘Great Western Warehouse’, I have used this throughout the thesis. Although it was interchangeably known as ‘Lower Byrom Street Warehouse’ - the name primarily used in the 1970s and 1980s.
- The 1869 ‘Bonded Warehouse’ has been named as such for continuity as there were two conflicting street name titles dependent upon date: ‘Charles Street’ or ‘Grape Street’ warehouse.
- The ‘Upper Campfield Market Hall’ and ‘Lower Campfield Market Hall’ have been consistently regarded as such since their construction, these names have been used unless I am referring to the Lower Hall’s use as the ‘City Exhibition Hall’ specifically (c.1908-1977) or the ‘Air and Space Museum’ (1984-1985).
Abstract

Built in 1830, Liverpool Road Station is the oldest extant passenger railway station in the world. For this reason, the Station was preserved and transformed into a science and industry museum in the early 1980s. Yet, the ‘oldest station’ story, perpetuated in the collective memories of local and national interest groups, has led to the neglect of other significant stories of this space of industrial heritage. The passenger service only operated for fourteen years, whilst the Station transported freight continuously for 145 years. Although strikingly visible in physical scale, freight infrastructure has been consistently invisible in responses to the Station across its history and in research, despite ultimately providing most of today’s museum spaces.

Inspired by Pierre Nora’s concept of lieux des mémoires, I consider the 1830 portion of the Station as a site of memory, where a break with the past has fixed a narrow set of memories to this place. I demonstrate how commemoration embedded at industrial heritage sites can limit our understanding of their past. Popular narratives of place are essential in galvanising preservation, yet, their persistence disguises layers of urban memory. Treatment of the freight structures in museum interpretation is inconsistent, from the oldest, 1830 Warehouse, presented so that galleries bear some relation to its history to the 1882 New Warehouse, treated as merely accommodation for galleries. A focus for explanation is how and why the museum developed as a traditional science museum with science centre elements, despite occupying a site with the hallmarks of a living history or transport museum. I particularly highlight the intellectual influence of the original iteration of the museum, the North Western Museum of Science and Industry.

Firstly, I establish how the Manchester terminus was memorialised between the nineteenth century and 1930s, showing commemoration was initially focused on the individual, George Stephenson, then locomotives and passenger railway ‘relics’, and only gradually associated with the Station itself. I suggest the Station can be considered materially a site of memory by the 1930 Liverpool and Manchester Railway Centenary. I then demonstrate what can be gained from researching the freight period, from tracing forgotten innovations and uncovering more typical aspects of the Station to its role in Campfield, a neighbourhood with diverse working class culture characterised by the civic elite as prone to ‘nuisance’. This provides fresh perspectives on Manchester’s urban history, such as the Railway’s role in the municipalisation of Campfield. Finally, drawing on previous findings on commemoration and freight uses, I show how the museum came to develop its complex site narrative as visions for North Western industrial heritage and science galleries were awkwardly combined with railway priorities. As a collaborative doctoral student, I advised the current Museum, therefore interpretation proposals appear in Appendix A, aimed at remedying the longstanding disconnect between historic buildings and gallery spaces.
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Introduction

1. Introduction

Liverpool Road Station is a collection of buildings, tracks and yards which hold a unique position in history as the oldest railway terminus for passenger transportation in the world. Constructed at the western edge of Manchester, the Station was terminus of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway (LMR). The story of the LMR’s pioneering passenger service underpins how the Station has been remembered, historicised and subsequently interpreted at the Science and Industry Museum (SIM), which is housed within the Station’s structures. The 1830 Station Building, which now houses galleries, itself materially represents the ‘oldest’ trope owing to its survival. The 1825 Stockton and Darlington Railway (S&D) is often considered the first railway, particularly by promoters in the North-East. Yet, as there were no discernible S&D railway stations, the Liverpool Road Station terminus is often regarded as the ‘first station’.¹ Despite opening five years after the S&D, the LMR is also widely conceived as the first modern railway as it ran entirely with steam power.²

Whilst Liverpool Road Station served LMR passengers for fourteen years, goods and livestock were transported from 1830 until 1975. The freight story beyond 1844 has been overshadowed by the ‘oldest in the world’ narrative of the site, which comprises many elements including: the story of its engineer, George Stephenson, the construction of the railway, its opening in 1830 and innovative steam powered locomotives. Significant to historians and archaeologists, interpretation of the surviving 1830 Warehouse to some extent brings freight into this narrative. However, freight post-1844 is scarcely commented on owing to the skew toward the passenger period. This restricts our appreciation of the layers of urban memory at this uniquely extant Station.

The continued privilege of the ‘oldest’ story over other histories and interpretations has resulted in the loss of other significant understandings of the Station. I have taken inspiration from Pierre Nora’s work on lieux de mémoire (sites or realms of memory), a fluid concept: ‘where memory crystallises and secretes itself’ from an historical moment,

‘where consciousness of a break with the past is bound with a sense of memory... torn out in such a way as to pose the problem of the embodiment of memory in certain sites where a sense of historical continuity persists’. By their nature, sites of memory affix a specific and narrow history to a place. I suggest that the Station was a lieu de mémoire symbolically from about 1880 and materially from 1930, when a plaque on Liverpool Road was unveiled during the LMR Centenary. Such ritual celebrations of the ‘first railway’ and ‘oldest station’ trope became a form of invented tradition. The communal perpetuation of the 1830 story was instrumental to the success of preservation campaigns to save the Station in the 1970s. Yet, it subsequently hampered the re-use of the Station in its entirety, limiting historical interpretation of the site to the 1830s structures. I argue that the use of heritage spaces primarily for commemoration limits our encounter of the past and a fuller appreciation these spaces over time.

Key to my analysis is the negotiation of these perceptions in the re-creation of the Station as a heritage space. ‘Space’ is a term with multiple meanings and applied in different ways by sociologists, geographers and historians. Here, ‘spaces of industrial heritage’ is strongly connected with place, however space has been used to frame this study as sites are experienced not only as locales of historical events but as zones of social encounters. In this history of Liverpool Road, I explore both tangible layers of urban memory (extant structures) but also spaces in-between used for work and everyday life. Space is also an apt category for analysis of the Museum in a literal sense as SIM encompasses the remaining structures but also voids where buildings once were. These spaces are manipulated to create visitor routes and are conceptualised as one ‘public realm’ by the current Museum.

The timeframe of this thesis, from the 1830s to circa 1990, encompasses the transitional period from a passenger and freight to a freight station and the history of commemorative practices surrounding the railway. This longitudinal approach maps the uses of the Station in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, a scale which contrasts with previous research gathered and commissioned by SIM narrowly focussed on the 1830s. This enabled me to chart perceptions over time, which provides the basis for analysis of the Station’s museumification. Evidence studied over this long period strongly indicates the prominence of the ‘oldest in the world’ narrative in the twentieth century, particularly from the
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Centenary onwards. The thesis closes with the Greater Manchester Museum of Science and Industry (GMMSI) opening in 1983 and the establishment of most permanent galleries by about 1990. Analysis of interpretation is therefore focussed on the original incarnation of the Museum, once the key elements of memorialisation were in place. Yet, conclusions on building interpretation, such as emphasising the placeless dislocation of galleries from the New Warehouse’s historical context, will resonate with contemporary issues at SIM where many spaces continue to be interpreted along similar lines to the GMMSI period.

2. Thesis structure

In Chapter 1, I chart how commemoration of the LMR and the ‘heroic inventor’ George Stephenson from the 1840s onwards led to the association of Liverpool Road Station with the ‘oldest in the world’ narrative. Initially, commemorative activity centred on individuals and locomotives, followed by the circulation and display of LMR relics in early science and railway museums. Liverpool Road Station did not figure in the historical consciousness until about 1880, and it was only with the crisis point of the demolition of Stephenson’s Water Street Bridge in 1904 that the significance of these structures and spaces were recognised locally. I argue that Liverpool Road was a lieu de memoire embodying the 1830s passenger service from the early twentieth century onwards, particularly with the physical marking of the Station Building with a plaque on the LMR Centenary in 1930. Understanding the origins of this story is integral to understanding how the Station was later historicised and interpreted as a Museum.

The strength of the ‘oldest in the world’ narrative has led to a historiographical skew towards the 1830s period. In Chapter 2, I illuminate the longer nineteenth century history of the site particularly focussing on freight. This shows what can be gained from moving beyond the ‘oldest’ passenger story and considering changes to the Station across the period. Whilst it could be viewed as a typical ‘disorderly clutch’ of freight buildings, the Station was re-configured and remade several times. A catalyst for change was a large fire in 1866, which initiated a large-scale re-organisation including the erection of a viaduct. This close study of Liverpool Road provides clues as to how Stations were adapted to integrate new technologies, particularly the use hydraulic power, which enabled heavier, larger goods to be moved with ease. Hydraulic power was a system that was incorporated
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into the ‘networked city’ of Manchester by 1894. Yet, whilst this is well documented, the earlier 1860s hydraulic system at Liverpool Road is not; this chapter therefore contributes insights into power technologies in Manchester pre-dating the civic narrative. Through studying the Station’s freight developments, private infrastructure can be considered in relation to the growth of public amenities, a theme taken up explicitly in Chapter 3 regarding Campfield’s markets.

In Chapter 3, I explore the relationship between the Station and its surroundings. Wolfgang Schivelbusch analogised the railway station’s position as the entrance to the industrial city as the city gate was to the medieval city. This provided a starting point for my conceptualisation of the Station and Manchester. After 1844, passengers no longer entered the City through Liverpool Road, but as freight continued the Station and surrounding spaces were used for the flow of goods in and out of Manchester; presenting a permeable boundary between industrial and civic space. In this chapter, I particularly concentrate on the municipalisation of the Station’s locality: Campfield, now known as Castlefield. This reveals tensions between the Station’s operators, the London North-Western Railway (LNWR) and Manchester Corporation’s Markets Committee. Historians have charted the governance of the liberal city, with Patrick Joyce highlighting the severance of traders from the street and street life with the enclosure of open spaces. I demonstrate what can be gained from considering the role of the freight terminus in this process, revealing residents were besieged by the encroaching Station on one side and subject to the extension of Corporation controls over the Camp Field (the open space from which the neighbourhood took its name) on the other.

In chapters 4 and 5, I consider the consequences of the ‘oldest’ narrative on twentieth century uses and the re-making of Liverpool Road. Charting ‘the political life of ordinary buildings’ is a method employed to understand the historical production of space in urban studies. The decision to create a museum at Liverpool Road taken by Greater Manchester Council was highly political, taken after years of campaigning by preservation groups and a dedicated society. In Chapter 4, I reveal the alternative sites where the Museum may have
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been situated and that, despite the prominence of the ‘oldest in the world’ narrative locally, staff at the existing North Western Museum of Science and Industry (NWMSI) were invested in an alternative institution to integrate ‘town and gown’ along the Oxford Road education corridor. Contemporaneously, Liverpool Road was considered as a potential international freight hub under modernisation plans, contrary to the dominant narrative of inevitable decline. Nonetheless, the 1830 listed structures received attention from numerous high-profile preservation campaigners and the possibility of a museum at Liverpool Road was long mooted.

Chapter 5 begins with the transitional phase between Station and Museum, from 1978 to 1983, here we see contests between stakeholders and public groups, particularly the Liverpool Road Station Society (LRSS), over what the museum should be. Visions varied and overlapped considerably, dependent upon how the individual or group conceptualised the site. A transport museum, a living history museum, a science centre and an industrial heritage experience were all considered viable templates for the Station site. I show how these competing visions influenced the ultimate realisation of the GMMSI. Furthermore, the consistent engagement with the significance of the 1830s buildings ensured the ‘oldest station in the world’ story continued at the west end of the vast site, whilst freight infrastructure at the east end were designated for a self-contained science centre and narrative galleries on industrial themes.

Museum interpretation, the configuration of visitor routes, priorities for restoration and gallery development all demonstrate the elevation of the ‘oldest station’ story above the wider influence of the Station over time. In addition to concluding that commemoration of Liverpool Road Station has hindered the opportunities to understand its wider significance, especially as a freight station, I offer practical suggestions for future interpretation (Appendix A) aimed at professionals to remedy this imbalance. Recommendations for reinterpretation offered in ‘Appendix A’ range from small adjustments to those that would require major grant funding but ultimately reform the visitor experience. It is hoped that findings will encourage other museums at historic sites to reflect upon their role marking irrecoverable lost memories as lieux des memoires and to research beyond the fixed point in the historical consciousness that led to their preservation.
Literature review

Across the thesis, my approach owes much to the tools of the urban historian, such as analysis of social relations in the city, displacement, civic governance, boosterism, public space and local identity formation. What differs in my approach to the history of the Station is the thread of museology running throughout. This contribution is particularly prominent in the first, fourth and fifth chapters. Complementary influences from museum studies include approaches to architecture, museums and ‘civic seeing’, considering the culture of collecting, museum governance, the formation of gallery narratives and how all of these interact with cultural memory. By combining these methods, we can better understand the relationship between cities and museums and explain how the urban past is framed in the present. This has aided the development of my central thesis: that commemorative narratives and actions limit historical understandings of places to a specific temporality. Starting with the broadest relevant analytical frameworks to the most detailed historiography on Liverpool Road Station, literature is reviewed as follows: memory, the history of technology, the heritage debate, museology, railways, Manchester and Castlefield and lastly, histories of the Station.

1. Memory

The study of memory spans numerous academic disciplines. Here, I discuss the concepts that have influenced my analysis of the interaction between history and memory at Liverpool Road Station. ‘Collective memory’ is a concept pioneered by the sociologist Maurice Halbwachs, who contended that individuals share memories and the past is understood though group experiences: ‘every collective memory requires the support of a group delimited in time and space’. Halbwachs distinguished ‘historical memory’ from ‘autobiographical memory’ based on their differing empirical origins, historical memory is gained from written records and reinforced by commemorative practices whereas autobiographical memory is rooted in first-hand experience.\(^9\) It is the historical memory of the Station that is particularly pertinent, although where possible autobiographical memory has been captured. Whilst Halbwachs sharply distinguished the creation of written
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histories from the collective memory and characterised history as framed by fixed boundaries in contrast with irregular and uncertain memory, Raphael Samuel later argued that ‘history has always been a hybrid form of knowledge, syncretizing past and present, memory and myth, the written record and the spoken word’. Definitions and distinctions between history and memory are problematic, however, Astrid Erll demonstrates that it is the ‘umbrella’ quality of memory that allows us to investigate a broad spectrum of the phenomena.

Collective memory is often discussed in terms of national identity, reinforcing a shared past of ‘imagined communities’, conceptualised by Benedict Anderson. In the British case, ‘Blitz Spirit’ during the Second World War is a prime example of an historical moment recollected and re-told to reinforce a sense of national identity. Whilst the Liverpool and Manchester Railway (LMR) and Liverpool Road Station are considered in relation to national narratives (discussed in Chapter 1), I am primarily concerned with the ‘oldest in the world’ trope in relation to regional collective memory from city administrators, conservation bodies, railway enthusiasts to local history societies. Their shared sense of the past underpins much of the preservation activity surrounding the saving of the Station. Collective memory was the basis for Pierre Nora’s 1980s project: Les Lieux de Mémoire, which identified sites of memory significant to the French national past. Nora’s realms of memory are a fluid category of interactions between history and memory – realms can be a place or a tradition.
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Jay Winter has more narrowly defined ‘site of memory’ to mean physical sites where commemorative acts take place, explaining: ‘the group that goes to such sites inherits earlier meanings attached to the event, as well as adding new meanings’.\textsuperscript{14} Whilst Winter’s case studies commemorate conflict, the idea of simultaneously inheriting and making new meanings is equally applicable to ostensibly celebratory sites. Although Andreas Huyssen states ‘explorations of memory in our world cannot do without the notion of historical trauma’,\textsuperscript{15} I suggest that collective memory of the first intercity railway, which is imbued with triumphant national pride, provides the opportunity to explore the realms of memory concept without an explicit sense of pain. The implicit trauma arguably linked to Liverpool Road is the legacy of industrial decline and the loss of the ‘golden age of steam’ to the railway enthusiast. Collective memories of groups involved with railway sites are often characterised as ‘nostalgic’, a form of remembering with a bitter-sweet quality distinct from the trauma recounted at memorials. Yet, nostalgia for steam constitutes a cultural phenomenon, as Neil Cossons points out, the demise of steam provoked an unprecedented outcry.\textsuperscript{16} The memorial role of railway heritage, therefore, is ripe for further interrogation; I establish the roots of memorialisation in Chapter 1, and the legacy of Liverpool Road Station as \textit{lieu de memoire} across chapters 4 and 5.

\textsuperscript{14}Jay Winter, ‘Sites of Memory and the Shadow of War’ in Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nunning (eds) \textit{A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies} (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), pp.61-74, p.61.


2. Technology

A significant aspect of the academic history of technology is concerned with challenging the notion that technologies always improve our lives, succeed outdated models and move society towards our present state.¹ David Edgerton highlights that the conventional received timeline of the history of technology is firmly hinged upon invention and innovation.² The history of the LMR that has been presented to the public in many mediums (not least in museums) forms a linear narrative of progress. Acknowledging the continued popularity of the progress model is important as we see the history of Liverpool Road Station bound with celebrations of innovations in steam powered locomotives and their inventors. Edgerton approaches the history of twentieth century technologies from a use perspective to counter the grand narrative of innovation: ‘we shift attention from the new to the old, the big to the small, the spectacular to the mundane, the masculine to the feminine, the rich to the poor’.³ Similarly, David Nye has analysed machines as social constructions, built into narratives to consolidate a sense of place. Nye highlights the construction of these narratives to explain the transformation of space into landscape by technologies. Like Edgerton’s use-based approach, Nye has considered the consumers of technologies: ‘each energy system has been used to shape distinctive domestic patterns, work routines, urban structures, and agricultural methods, imparting particular rhythms and contours to the everyday round’.⁴ Historians of technology have already begun to address Dolores Hayden’s call to consider the social context of technologies in the construction of urban landscapes.⁵ William Cronon’s *Nature’s Metropolis* is a notable
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example of this, taking an environmental perspective, Cronon presents the transformation of the Western American landscape by urbanisation, trade and technology.\textsuperscript{6}

Several theorists have also explored the influence of technologies upon both space and temporality. In the 1980s, Wolfgang Schivelbusch offered a Marxist perspective on the railway’s ‘annihilation of time and space’, in which he conceptualised a distinction between industrial space, railway space and outlaying landscapes. David Harvey’s theory of ‘timespace compression’, another Marxist concept, describes the sense of shock and disorientation witnessed during intense periods of technological change with the faster circulation of capital and information. Jeremy Stein has analysed timespace compression considering this relationship between technologies and urban life. Reflecting that the application of this theory to the nineteenth century is a form of technological determinism, Stein argues that new technologies may have gradually re-structured time and space but these were adapted to pre-industrial work and religious routines.\textsuperscript{7} These perspectives have driven my attempts to capture the affect of freight technologies and how spaces were shaped and encountered across chapters 2 and 3.

In popular history, narratives of progress frequently focus on individual celebrity scientists to tell wider histories of science and technology.\textsuperscript{8} In recent historiography, the nineteenth century origins of valorising ‘heroes of science’ have been uncovered. Christine MacLeod’s research into a wave of hero veneration of inventors in their own lifetime from the 1840s illuminates the political context of the patent controversy. MacLeod also demonstrates that this was part of a mid-nineteenth century turn towards non-military heroes spurred on by the peace movement.\textsuperscript{9} National and local agendas often underpinned the celebration of the lives of eminent scientists and inventors, as Patricia Fara has demonstrated in the case


\textsuperscript{9} Christine MacLeod, \textit{Heroes of Invention: Technology, Liberalism and British Identity, 1750-1914} (Cambridge: CUP, 2007).
of Issac Newton.\textsuperscript{10} Pnina G. Abir-Am argues that individuals and institutions figure more in the celebrations during the first half of the twentieth century, whilst scientific discoveries dominate the second, suggesting science practice had become central to ‘commemorative mania’.\textsuperscript{11} MacLeod and Jennifer Tann have shown the beginnings of this trend, demonstrating that professional scientists harnessed the centenary of Michael Faraday’s discovery of electromagnetic induction to propagate the importance of scientific research over the figure of the inventor.\textsuperscript{12} An area ripe for further analyse is the influence of ‘hero inventor’ commemorations upon the evolution of public science and industry collections, which I brooch in relation to George Stephenson and the Victorian preservation of the ‘Rocket’ locomotive in Chapter 1.

3. The heritage debate

The Greater Manchester Museum of Science and Industry (GMMSI) was established at Liverpool Road Station between 1978 and 1983 during the ‘heritage boom’. To Margaret Thatcher’s Conservative government heritage was a commodity in the wider ‘enterprise culture’.\textsuperscript{13} During the 1980s and early 1990s cultural commentators and historians reflected upon the heritage industry’s unprecedented growth. A wide rift developed between critics of heritage with journalism and cultural theory backgrounds and historians. In 1985, the first major critique by cultural commentator Patrick Wright responded to the earlier Heritage in Danger, in which Conservative MP and historian Patrick Cormack presented heritage as an ‘expression of civilisation’. Wright argued that whilst the national past had been gradually constructed, this intensified as social and economic crisis escalated in the early 1970s. Whilst Wright highlighted the ways in which the British consciousness responded to post-war perceptions of decline using detailed case studies, art critic Robert


Hewison juxtaposed heritage with decline to make an explicit economic argument: that heritage was being produced in places of industrial decline, replacing manufacturing. This argument highlights a break with the industrial past of the kind Nora considers a pretext for *lieux de mémoire*. The heritage debaters engaged with the notion of Britain in decline, whilst problematised by historians like Edgerton, the rhetoric of decline dominates twentieth-century British history.\(^{14}\)

The idea that people looked to an imagined past for comfort and therefore neglected to respond to contemporary issues was central to both Wright and Hewison’s arguments. Raphael Samuel, History Workshop founder, fiercely rejected this notion, labelling Wright, Hewison and other journalists ‘heritage baiters’.\(^{15}\) Samuel argued that memory is dialectically related to historical thought, theorising that the growth in heritage was a part of a wider democratisation of history. This was at odds with the perspective of David Lowenthal, who claimed that heritage served the elite, stating: ‘preservation holds little appeal for those whose sense of the past is sullied by insalubrious memories’.\(^{16}\) The public dispute between Hewison, Wright and Samuel continued with *The Guardian*’s publication of a rebuttal to Samuel’s ‘heritage baiter’ accusation. Here, Wright stated: ‘heritage may be ‘people’s history’ in one manifestation, but it is also a quango-culture, and tourism paraded as an alternative for industrial policy.’ In 2009, however, in a new edition of *On Living in an Old Country*, Wright conceded Samuel’s argument has some validity, particularly his outline of post-war conservatism.\(^{17}\) In *Theatres of Memory* Samuel presents railway heritage as a popular movement, arguing that this form of heritage and the establishment of industrial collections began prior to economic decline. The complexities of the preservation of Liverpool Road Station support Samuel’s argument, as I outline in Chapter 4 with the post-war civic and academic origins of the NWMSI.
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\(^{15}\) Samuel, *Theatres of Memory volume 1*, p.263.


Heritage centres or attractions with elements of reconstruction or experiential interpretation were central to the heritage debate. Living history museums were particularly criticised; for Hewison, the recreation of historical settings and actor impersonations of real characters compromised authenticity. Beamish, a compilation of a North-East mining village which opened in 1972, with workings for a deep mine over a non-existent shaft, was described by Hewison as the ‘height of historic invention’. He argued that ‘while this charming world was being created, the life of the North East was being destroyed.’ In 1992, Stella Butler (a former curator at GMMSI) highlighted that unemployment in coal, steel, iron and other heavy industries provided the expertise to demonstrate machinery and working practices at heritage sites. Fiona Candlin recently argued that most museums and heritage centres that opened during the ‘boom’ were on a small, independent scale and were largely ignored by commentators who focused on large site studies.\textsuperscript{18} Despite its vast scale, the GMMSI was spared criticism, yet, in essence, it shares many of the hallmarks of a living history museum, including a replica railway and working exhibits relocated from their original contexts. I explore the potential museum types embodied by the GMMSI in chapters 4 and 5, considering political decisions in the context of this debate.

4. Museology

Space and place have become prominent themes in the discipline of museum studies, particularly since the late 1980s with \textit{The New Museology} edited collection prompting a re-examination of the role of museums within society.\textsuperscript{19} Michel Foucault’s concept of ‘heterotopias’, physical locations ‘outside of all places’ where other reals sites can be simultaneously represented, contested, critiqued or even altered. ‘Heterotopias’ have been used as a critical tool by museologists such as Eilean Hooper-Greenhill. Foucault viewed the museum as an example of a heterotopia as the accumulation of time is present at one place.\textsuperscript{20} This theory aligns with the conceptualisation of \textit{lieux de memoires} where a fixed time is represented; in museum spaces, time accumulates rather than progressing.


\textsuperscript{19} Peter Vergo ed. \textit{The New Museology} (London: Reaktion, 1989).

\textsuperscript{20} Michel Foucault, ‘Of other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias’ in \textit{Architecture/Mouvement/Continuité} (Oct, 1984) Jay Miskowiec trans. from ‘Des espace autres’ (March 1967) p.4; Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge} (London:
Tony Bennett contributed to the New Museology movement by considering the ‘exhibitionary complex’: relationships between the visitor and the nineteenth century museum in terms discipline, order and self-regulation based on Foucault’s *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison.* This analysis influenced subsequent work on museums space. For example, Kate Hill challenged the notion that gallery spaces disciplined the behaviour of the visitor, demonstrating that self-display was encouraged in the provincial nineteenth century museum. More recent studies have moved beyond Foucauldian perspectives; for example, Sophie Forgan emphasised the larger context of place to museum architecture and characterised the museum as an artefact, an approach evident amongst both NWMSI and GMMSI curators highlighted in Chapter 5. Where museology intersects with the history of science, questions of place are raised as the placeless activity of intellectual scientific enquiry manifested itself in objects, collections and institutions.

Museum Studies also provides comparative material and analytical tools with which to interrogate museum-making at Liverpool Road. In the following paragraphs, I highlight perspectives on transport museums, science museums and science centres. In the post-war period, the Station was framed as a potential transport museum (explored in Chapter 4). Jack Simmons, an eminent railway historian, first critiqued transport museums’ social purpose in 1970. Soon after the demise of steam on British Railways in 1968, Simmons boldly claimed that: ‘the truest railway museum, it might be argued, is the railway that remains in service’. Ian Carter has studied railway enthusiasm and found that the volunteer labour force of Britain’s preserved railway lines was highly political, with tensions high between the few paid staff and volunteers and within hierarchies of volunteers. Colin Divall and Andrew Scott upheld the role of railway enthusiasts in preservation and to the


maintenance of railways inside and outside the museum.\(^{24}\) Owing to the involvement of enthusiasts in numerous transport museums, the style and standard of curation have been subject to criticism. Hewison, for example, directed satire at railway volunteers in his critique of the heritage industry.\(^{25}\) Yet, Divall and Scott argue that transport museum exhibitions have moved beyond the limitations of specialist interpretation. Neil Cossons applauded the National Railway Museum for their labelling aimed at the non-enthusiast, decrying railway museums ‘all over the world which appear to have been designed by railwaymen for railwaymen’. The GMMSI was not immune to such tensions with the significant involvement of volunteers during the Museum’s nascence, which I explore in Chapter 5.

The science museum evolved from a space of scientific practice and comparative analysis – the ‘museological science’ as John Pickstone defined it, to a medium of public education.\(^{26}\) Anna Bunney has demonstrated that children became a significant audience of the early Science Museum, whilst Kristian Nielsen has highlighted that didactic historical children’s displays were found to be unsuccessful by mid-twentieth century visitor studies, shifting the trend in interactive exhibits towards instructional and entertaining science. By the second half of the twentieth century, this educational role was characterised as contributing to the ‘public understanding of science’.\(^{27}\) This was an explicit aim of the
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NWMSI during its foundation in 1966, with ‘a wide public’ regarded as its audience. Authenticity was not a priority for science museum curation, as objects have been dissected, enhanced or replicated to communicate ideas (this is also common practice with archaeological collections). Peter Mann has framed the curatorial practices behind demonstration in technical museums as ‘destruction’, with transport artefacts the worst affected. This ethos of technical displays through demonstration was integral to the NWMSI, which was transferred with its collections to the GMMSI in 1983.

In the second half of the twentieth century, science centres with interactive, hands-on exhibits emerged as a counter-site to object-centred museums. With the principle of discovery underlining this new medium, science centres were designed to be placeless, as Sharon MacDonald explains: the model presents universal scientific principles deliberately without social or cultural context. Richard Toon has described the modern science centre as a ‘black box experience’, in terms not only of the experience of the visitor in a dark enclosed space, but also as sites of Bruno Latour’s concept of ‘black box science’: unquestioned scientific practice. Swiftly, traditional science museums assimilated this new model for learning into galleries within their institutions, starting with the Science Museum and ‘Launchpad’ in 1986. The style of exhibits – disconnected from their context retained a ‘placeless’ quality despite being integrated into a museum imbued with national semiotics. Stella Butler, however, suggests that the ethos behind GMMSI’s interactive gallery Xperiment! was inspired by key scientific discoveries of Manchester scientists displayed elsewhere in the Museum – a local historical context. Whilst science centres present universal concepts, these institutions and galleries should be considered in their national and local contexts, as Barry has shown with his comparative analysis of


29 Further research into the display of technical artefacts at the NWMSI and GMMSI is being undertaken by Francesca Elliot, a Collaborative Doctoral Award student at the Centre for the History of Science, Technology and Medicine, University of Manchester with the Science Museum Group.

30 Hilde Hein, The Exploratorium, Museum as Laboratory (Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1990). In the UK, only Richard Gregory’s Exploratory existed when the GMMSI opened, as Launchpad was still in the development stages at the Science Museum.

31 Sharon MacDonald, ‘Exhibits of power and powers of exhibition’, p.12.


33 Butler, Science and Technology Museums, p.97.
‘Launchpad’ and the Cité des Sciences et de l'Industrie.\textsuperscript{34} Whilst in one sense ‘placeless’, Toon describes science centres as a ‘Russian Doll’ - institutions that simultaneously encapsulate numerous spatial practices.\textsuperscript{35} The connection between science centre space and place is ripe for further examination; this shall be considered in relation to Xperiment! as a science centre disconnected from its historical surroundings in Chapter 5.

5. Railways

Across railway literature, the emphasis on studying passenger transportation frequently precludes detailed examinations of the significance of freight in the development of railways. For example, Jack Simmons only briefly included goods in his survey of the Victorian railway. Gordon Biddle also afforded freight little coverage in his earlier work, however, recently presents more even coverage through the gazetteer format.\textsuperscript{36} The ‘incomprehensible pattern of freight trains’ superimposed onto Lancashire’s passenger services was broached by G. O. Holt, although details are scant. In Michael Freeman’s cultural history, the goods station is considered in the context of urbanisation as ‘the apex or ‘citadel’’ of railway commodity circulation. Whilst Freeman highlights freight’s economic and social role, the goods station is afforded considerably less attention its passenger counterpart due to the subject matter: popular reactions to the railway. Railway literature is often informed by popular responses, therefore, creating a skew towards the more relatable and commented upon passenger experience.

The social space of the railway station has received critical attention, although usually in relation to passenger spaces. Wolfgang Schivelbusch analysed railway station space, presenting it as a gateway between industrial and urban space, yet again this related to the passenger experience.\textsuperscript{37} Jeffrey Richards and John M. MacKenzie focus on the passenger station in their social history. They present social relationships inside the station, for


\textsuperscript{35} Toon, ‘Black box science centres’, p.35.


example the emergence of a complex hierarchy of the workforce and the imposition of discipline within the space. These trends could also be considered in relation to the staffing of freight stations, albeit with fewer cross-class social interactions. A thorough study of the working lives of railwaymen was undertaken by P. W. Kingsford, which covered themes of hierarchy and discipline, however, Kingsford did not relate the employee’s daily experience to operations at the railway station.\(^{38}\) Across chapters 2 and 3, I consider social interactions in and around Liverpool Road, extending Schivelbusch’s gateway analogy to freight space and civic space in Campfield.

As early as 1969, founder of the urban history movement, H. J. Dyos, and economic historian, D.H. Aldcroft, surveyed the impact of railway construction on communities and the displacement of people. Contemporaneously, J. R. Kellett also considered railways as ‘a conspicuous, abrupt and direct agency’ of social change in cities. Michael Freeman views this process as ‘creative destruction’, noting it was seen earliest and most visible in Manchester.\(^{39}\) In the introduction to Moving Manchester, Derek Brumhead and Terry Wyke note the absence of local studies on the impact of railway stations, particularly concerning displacement and working-class diaspora. Brumhead’s study uses census records to show the movement of people after the construction of Manchester Central Station and Great Northern Warehouse on Deansgate, which destroyed most of the Aldport settlement. Brumhead highlights the *laissez-faire* attitude of Manchester Corporation, who welcomed the demolition of slum properties and the erection of commercial properties. In Chapter 3, I present original analysis of the relationship between Manchester Corporation and the LNWR, illustrating cooperation and tensions, such as the encroachment of municipal powers upon the Station’s pig market.


6. Manchester and Castlefield

Asa Briggs’ seminal 1963 work *Victorian Cities* has influenced how historians and geographers approach Manchester. Briggs highlighted the ‘shocking’ effect of the unprecedented population growth and rapid industrialisation in Manchester, evident in commentaries from the later 1830s and 1840s. Harold L. Platt in his comparative account of the urban environments of Manchester and Chicago used the ‘shock city’ notion to frame his analysis. Geographers, Jamie Peck and Kevin Ward suggested that the 1840s ‘shock city’ is mirrored in present accounts of Manchester. This trend, of covering the early to mid-nineteenth century followed by comparisons with recent history, is common.\(^{40}\) By focussing on the dual representations of Manchester as a Victorian ‘shock city’ and a symbol of post-industrial revival, historians, geographers and cultural theorists tend to overlook the late nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century. Therefore, I include coverage of these periods across chapters 1 to 4 informed by current approaches in urban history, particularly analysis of civic rituals in the twentieth century by Charlotte Wildman and Peter Shapely and work on pageantry and display by Tom Hulme and Mark Freeman.\(^{41}\) There are also rich studies in liberal governance of the City, which feature in Patrick Joyce’s *Rule of Freedom* and Chris Otter’s study of illumination and the organisation of vision across the long nineteenth century.\(^{42}\)

Later nineteenth century perceptions have influenced a growing emphasis on the trade role of Manchester. Alongside the ‘shock city’ narrative is the conceptualisation of Manchester as ‘Cottonopolis’, a term coined in the 1850s to highlight the City’s position in the centre of


\(^{41}\) Mark Freeman, ‘Splendid Display; Pompous Spectacle’: historical pageants in twentieth-century Britain’, *Social History* vol.38 no.4 (2013) (pp.423-455); Thomas Hulme, ‘A Nation of Town Criers’: Civic Publicity and Historical Pageantry in Interwar Britain’, *Urban History* vol.4 no.2 (May 2017) (pp.270-292); Charlotte Wildman, ‘Urban Transformation in Liverpool and Manchester, 1918–1939’, *The Historical Journal* vol.55 no.1 (Mar 2012) (pp.119-143); Peter Shapely, ‘Civic pride and redevelopment in the post-war British city’, *Urban History*, vol.39, no.2 (May 2012) (pp.310-328).

Lancashire’s textiles industry. Simon Gunn highlights that Manchester’s image moved beyond the factory to the warehouse and consumer city in the 1860s and 1870s. Alan Kidd and Terry Wyke have characterised the ‘warehouse city’ in terms of the grandiose ‘warehouses like palaces’ of Portland and Princess Street. The imposing architecture of the warehouses is often compared with Manchester’s ambitious civic building projects and wider municipalisation in the city.

Canal and railway warehouses sat largely outside of the commercial centre and appear infrequently in primary commentaries; they therefore figure less in the ‘warehouse city’ narrative than the Portland and Princess Street edifices. However, industrial archaeologists like Mike Nevell emphasise the significance of Manchester’s early freight infrastructures. In contrast, Jack Simmons regarded Manchester’s early warehouses as unremarkable. Derek Brumhead has investigated the later Great Northern Railway Warehouse to assess the social impact of its construction. Roger Scola, an economic historian, assessed the role of Manchester’s early railways in the food supply, specifically considering Liverpool Road Station’s role. The specific nature of Scola’s study means there remains scope for research on the Station’s role in the City beyond the food chain. The relationship between Liverpool Road Station, its warehouse infrastructure and the surrounding urban environment is the focus of Chapter 3.

Castlefield, the current name for the area in which Liverpool Road Station is situated, receives high-profile albeit uneven coverage in histories of Manchester. Wyke identifies three periods during which Castlefield’s history has defined or ‘redefined’ Manchester: the
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43 “Cottonopolis, n.” in OED Online (Oxford UP, June 2017) <www.oed.com/view/Entry/42499> [accessed 5 Jan 2018]. The OED cites 1851 as the first recorded usage of the term, which is defined as: ‘Cotton City’: a sobriquet for Manchester as the centre of the cotton industry.


development of the Bridgewater Canal in 1760, then Liverpool Road Station in 1830 and
lastly, regeneration in the 1970s and 1980s. A project on Manchester and the canal age by
Peter Maw, Terry Wyke and Alan Kidd has recently enhanced the history of Castlefield as a
water transport hub.49 Brian Rosa focussed on the post-industrial life of Victorian railway
viaducts in Castlefield characterising ‘the persistence of dereliction’ between 1835 and
1945, then focussing on the ‘revalorisation’ of the viaducts in the latter quarter of the
twentieth century.50 Castlefield now encompasses the nineteenth century neighbourhood of
Campfield, the location of Manchester’s first Free Public Library from 1852 to 1877.
Martin Hewitt has studied the role of Campfield Library in terms of the ‘civic economy of
the book’.51 As with Manchester’s wider history, there is a lack of Castlefield studies
between the Victorian period and the post-industrial revival.

Castlefield figures as an area ‘re-conceptualized’ or ‘re-produced’ from industrial landscape
to 1980s heritage park in several studies of urban space. Rebecca Madgin and Michael E.
Leary-Owhin both consider the relationship between the voluntary sector bodies and
public-sector groups involved in the regeneration of Castlefield.52 In Madgin’s chronology
of key agents in the regeneration process, voluntary societies are grouped with the work of
the Greater Manchester Council (GMC, 1974-1986) in the initial phase. Leary, however,
suggests that the Liverpool Road Station Society and other amenity groups were
responsible for the ‘counter-representation’ of Castlefield as a heritage space (as opposed
to a defunct industrial landscape), which was ultimately accepted by the local authorities.
By considering the pre-history of the Museum in Chapter 4, the agency of the NWMSI
emerges, refining Leary and Madgin’s analysis. As well as local government bodies and

49 Terry Wyke, ‘Castlefield and the Making of Manchester’, Anglo Files: journal of English teaching
(Aalborg (Denmark): Engelsklaerforeningen, 2003). Maw, Wyke and Kidd collaborated on several
papers including ‘Canals, rivers and the industrial city: Manchester’s industrial waterfront 1790-
50 Brian Rosa, ‘Underneath the Arches: Re-appropriating spaces of infrastructure in Manchester’ PhD
diss., University of Manchester, 2013.
51 Martin Hewitt, ‘Confronting the modern city: the Manchester Free Public Library, 1850-1880’,
Urban History vol. 27 (1) pp.62-88.
52 Rebecca Madgin, ‘Reconceptualising the historic urban environment: conservation and
regeneration in Castlefield, Manchester, 1960-2009’ in Planning Perspectives Vol. 25, No. 1 (2010),
pp.29-48. Michael E Leary ‘The Production of Urban Public Space: A Lefebvrian Analysis of
Castlefield, Manchester’ PhD diss., Goldsmiths College, University of London, 2010 & ‘The
Production of Space through a Shrine and Vendetta in Manchester: Lefebvre’s Spatial Triad and the
Regeneration of Place Renamed Castlefield’ in Planning Theory & Practice Vol. 10, No. 2 (2009)
pp.189-212; Monica Monserrat Degan, Sensing Cities: Regenerating Public Life in Barcelona and
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preservation societies, Manchester’s academic and museum professional community influenced the direction of heritage interpretation at Liverpool Road Station and, by extension, Castlefield.

7. Station histories

In this section, I survey literature on Liverpool Road Station and the Liverpool and Manchester Railway, beginning with particularly influential primary accounts. The opening of the LMR has been the subject of several books and articles, fuelling the ‘oldest in the world’/’first station’ narratives. Following the transfer of the passenger service to Hunts Bank in May 1844, the Station figured less in commentary on railways or indeed Manchester, which is reflected in secondary accounts. The earliest articles specifically on Liverpool Road bolster its image as the ‘oldest in the world’; in 1902, an article with this title appeared in Railway Magazine. A wider survey of LNWR operations in 1912 by former employee, D. H. F. Meacock, provides a rare insight into freight operations, although the trope of the ‘oldest station’ remains prominent. The LMR Centenary in 1930 produced a flurry of publications with railway historian, Dendy Marshall, providing the fullest account of the LMR’s inception and opening whilst the poet, C.M. Grieve, wrote an essay for the official programme depicting an intercity struggle between Liverpool and Manchester.

The structure and content of Centenary publications influenced subsequent literature. Fifty years later, for the 150th anniversary, George Ottley introduced the re-print of T.T. Bury’s 1831 illustrations with the oft repeated elements of the opening: the genius of George Stevenson, William Huskisson’s accident and the novelty of train travel. Popular historians R. H. G. Thomas and Frank Ferneyhough both focussed on the 1830s, with only minimal coverage beyond the 1840s. Only Thomas J. Donaghy has given a detailed account of LMR


54 C.M. Grieve, ‘A short history of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway: How the LMR was evolved’ in Liverpool and Manchester Railway Centenary Celebrations: Official Programme (Liverpool, 1930) pp.33-44; Robert Gladstone, Centenary celebrations of the opening on 15 September 1830 of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway Catalogue of the Railway Exhibition held in St Georges Hall, Liverpool 13 – 20 September 1930 (Liverpool, 1930).
operations including the 1840s, although coverage ends when the Company was amalgamated in 1845.  

The 1970s preservation campaign for Liverpool Road Station and early 1980s plans for the museum boosted the output of historical, architectural and archaeological research. R. S. Fitzgerald’s *Liverpool Road Station, Manchester: An Historical and Architectural Survey* provided the first survey based on primary research and evidence from surviving structures. Michael Stratton notes Liverpool Road is the only ‘provincial’ terminus subject to its own book on architecture. In 1980, the Liverpool Road Station Society (LRSS) preservation group produced a volume of essays on the site. *Oldest in the World* (a title shared with the 1902 *Railway Magazine* article) directly addressed the popular narrative. Anita George’s essay in the volume, however, provides a rare insight into goods operations from 1844 to 1975. George used evidence from interviews with workers recorded by LRSS members as the main source. I have been unable to recover the original recordings, although these were probably the source for the edited cassette and booklet issued by the North-West Sound Archive in 1992. The use of oral testimony to illuminate working history is an approach considered further in ‘Sources and Methods’.

The work of industrial archaeologists and Museum staff in the 1980s and 1990s contributed considerably to our understanding of the site. The GMMSI’s first director, Patrick Greene, worked with archaeologist, Robina McNeil to produce articles on the 1830 Warehouse from the Greater Manchester Archaeology Unit (GMAU) findings. The GMAU surveys
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generated three reports between 1991 and 1997.58 These studies re-affirmed Fitzgerald’s explanation that this was not a distinctive railway building, rather a structure based on canal warehouse design. Elaborating on this evidence, H. John Yates, argued that there was no such thing as typical railway architecture in the nascent years, suggesting that surviving early stations are ‘indistinguishable’ in style from contemporaneous building types. Michael Nevell has presented archaeological case studies from the area completed since the 1980s, such as the canal basin and workers cottages on Liverpool Road.59 Whilst these works present significant findings, the focus on the earliest 1830 buildings contributed to the skewed site narrative – with later buildings (from the 1850s to 1880s) largely omitted.

Publications addressing the transfer of the NWMSI to Liverpool Road and their ambitions for interpretation provide invaluable insight into key actors’ perspectives. Donald Cardwell, historian of science and technology at the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology (UMIST) and a founder of the NWMSI, presents Castlefield as the most important place in the history of transport, after the Museum was transferred.60 Richard Hills, Cardwell’s research student and first curator/director of the NWMSI, wrote memoirs providing a first-hand account. Hills reveals that initially Liverpool Road was not viewed favourably by staff investigating it as a potential museum site.61 This complicates the picture Castlefield regeneration, which Madgin and Leary analyse in terms of local government bodies’ relationship with the preservation campaign.62 Neither author considers the agency of the NWMSI in the selection a new museum site the 1970s, which I address using primary sources in Chapter 4. Once the Museum (GMMSI from 1983) was
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established at Liverpool Road, Patrick Greene and curator, Gaby Porter, co-authored an article highlighting their ‘deliberate strategy to place science and technology in their social context’ and emphasising that the GMMSI was not a traditional science museum. Stella Butler has highlighted the ‘sacrosanct’ nature of the site to railway enthusiasts, whilst also considering the legacy of the UMIST collection of working exhibits in the displays. In chapters 4 and 5, I assess the divergent aspirations and plans for the site, comparing how actors recalled events with primary material on the transfer to Liverpool Road.

Sources and methods

As a collaborative doctoral award student between the Science Museum Group (SMG) and the University of Manchester, I have been based at SIM and have therefore regularly explored the buildings and spaces I was writing about. This allowed me to experience a tangible connection to the past and enabled me to visualise structures and spaces no longer extant. It also provided me with much inspiration for my argument, through observing contemporary interpretations of and interactions with the site. Research methods selected for this thesis range from the traditional tools of the historian to those more usual in museum or material culture studies. As well as an interdisciplinary approach, the variety of sources used owes much to the long timeframe selected. For example, a wider variety of media is employed in the twentieth century chapters and oral histories were recorded regarding events in living memory.

1. Documentary sources

Railway Company records provide accounts of uses and transformations at the Station, although the level of coverage of the Manchester site varies. Successive companies ran the Station, beginning with the LMR, the Grand Junction Railway (GJR) in 1845, from 1846 the LNWR, then the London, Midland and Scottish Railway (LMS) from 1923 until the nationalisation of the railways. From 1947 until 1975, British Rail (BR) ran Liverpool Road.

through the London Midland Region area board. These Company records are largely held by The National Archive (TNA) and present evidence of high-level decisions, although in places working life can be gleaned through correspondence and reports that refer to staff experiences. Twentieth century reports on modernisation and BR publications were consulted at the National Railway Museum (NRM). Given the long period covered, it was not possible to conduct exhaustive research of the railway records, however thorough investigations were undertaken into periods of great change; for example, expansion in the 1850s and 1880s.

For the passenger and freight period, I viewed 1830s and 1840s railway guidebooks written for the passenger on the LMR, GJR or connecting routes such as the London and Birmingham Railway (L&B). These contain both timetabling information and descriptive accounts of views along the railway line and locations passengers could explore. Descriptions of places are similar in style to local trade directory introductions, another type of source I consulted. The guidebooks present a different angle, aimed at visitors rather than locals; the descriptions of places are picturesque and idealistic, yet this form makes the crowded description of the area around Liverpool Road more distinctive. The archive and library of the National Railway Museum holds particularly early examples, with further material consulted at the University of Manchester Archive (UoMA) Railway Collection.

I viewed material from the Manchester Corporation, later Manchester City Council, held at Manchester Archive to illuminate the role of the Station in the City. For example, minutes of the City’s Markets Committee, who dealt directly with the LNWR, provides local economic context and evidence of disputes. The UoM Archive provided material on GMMSI’s predecessor, the North-Western Museum of Science and Industry (NWMSI), which was created and managed by staff at UMIST. I also consulted the private archive of Richard Hills, the NWMSI curator/director, at Chetham’s Library in Manchester. I considered City Council and Greater Manchester County Council (GMC) records in relation to the creation of the GMMSI at Manchester Archive, which also held early museum reports (some are duplicated at SIM). I accessed the corporate archive at SIM, known as ‘records management’, for material ranging from nineteenth century deeds to notes from GMMSI curators. I also consulted ephemeral material like leaflets in curator’s subject files (accessible to the public in the Collections Centre before 2019). Occasionally, internal corporate records were shared by staff, such as original exhibition content material.
I used newspapers and periodicals as key source, whilst commentary on events in the press are influenced by the publication’s ethos and political leanings, these provided ample material on perceptions of the site. For example, *The Manchester Guardian* reflected the views of Manchester liberal elite. Correspondence, as well as editorials, provide responses to the Station area whilst adverts in local newspapers with tenders for construction works often complement evidence in Railway Company records. Alongside local publications and national newspapers, I analysed specialist periodicals for groups such as engineers, architects and railway enthusiasts. The main repository consulted was British Newspapers 1600-1950 available online via the British Library/Gale database. This provided not only local papers such as *The Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser*, but also papers for related areas like Liverpool and Yorkshire. The Chartist newspaper published in Leeds, *The Northern Star*, was also accessed here. I also mined the online search engine ProQuest for relevant *Guardian* and *Observer* articles. Elsewhere, online databases were used for *The Times* and *The Illustrated London News*. I consulted local material in person at Manchester Local Studies in the form of microfilm records of *The Manchester Evening News* and thematic press cutting books. A particularly comprehensive collection of articles on the LMR Centenary was viewed at Liverpool Archive. SIM equally held relevant cutting books and magazines, with a vast array of railway publications consulted at the NRM and UoMA.

2. Visual sources

Maps and plans provide evidence of the composition of Liverpool Road Station, with illustrative details of buildings no longer extant or much changed, including internal details unavailable elsewhere. The politics of metropolitan mapping, highlighted by urban historians including Patrick Joyce, has influenced my approach to maps and plans as tools in the organisation of space. A key source from the mid-nineteenth century is the 1850 Ordnance Survey (OS) plan of Manchester, one of the few northern towns recorded with six inches to the mile detail. The OS and contemporaneous Adshead’s Map of Manchester influenced maps in trade directories and railway guidebooks. I accessed the Manchester
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Historical Map Collection online, whilst the Ordnance Survey and other original maps were viewed at the UoM Library Map Collection. Railway Company records include some site plans and documentation relating to parliamentary powers for expansions that show intended structures. In places, plans did not come to fruition but reveal Company ambitions for the Station.

Contemporary illustrations, most commissioned by railway companies, are particularly valuable historical sources as maps provide only scant evidence of the pre-1850 Station and no 1830s plans survive in public collections. Richards and MacKenzie assert ‘without exception these prints stress the engineering miracles... and formal order of the system’, thus infrastructures is prominent. A series of hand-coloured aquatints after Thomas Talbot Bury’s illustrations, Coloured Views on the Liverpool and Manchester Railway printed by Rudolph Ackermann, were popular in the early 1830s. Whilst structures aren’t necessarily proportionate and a story is told through idyllic scenery, no longer extant buildings can be compared with descriptive sources like Francis Whishaw’s 1840 survey. The Ackermann series does not feature the Station Building nor the 1830 Warehouse, however, an 1830s illustration by the engineer James Nasmyth in the SIM collection is a significant survival as it shows freight operations and passenger traffic from track level (as opposed to a street view). From the freight period onwards, artworks present only the passenger Station Building along Liverpool Road – either showing the Georgian frontage or the view from Ackermann’s scene with an 1830s locomotive on the Water Street Bridge, reinforcing the ‘oldest’ narrative. From the turn of the century, photographs taken by the LNWR and Manchester City Surveyors allow for visual analysis of extant freight structures.

3. Objects

Whilst the thesis is not primarily concerned with collections, material culture from the Station and the LMR have provide tangible evidence of the proliferation the ‘oldest’ trope. In Chapter 1, I demonstrate that the earliest commemoration of the railways was through objects. It was through the restoration and display of artefacts such as the ‘Rocket’
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locomotive that the story of the railway entered the popular imagination. ‘Rocket’ was exhibited in the ‘Making the Modern World’ gallery at the Science Museum in London until March 2018. Here, I observed the object in situ and viewed historical exhibition files on LMR objects. Wherever possible, I viewed artefacts in person and familiarised myself with their materiality before exploring complimentary source material. I frequently visited the National Railway Museum York for archival material and observed objects on display such as the statue of George Stephenson from Euston Station. I also viewed displays of contemporaneous locomotives at partner institution: Locomotion in Shildon, a site of the Stockton & Darlington Railway. The division of labour between library, archive and museum collections has been ambiguous, at times ephemera and artworks have appeared amongst papers in archives and libraries.

At the Museum, objects relating to the Station are either on display (for example, the 1833 sundial discussed in Chapter 1), in storage or neither catalogued nor accessible. For example, portable items discovered during the renovation of the 1830 Warehouse have been stored in the building’s basement. Through my privileged access to the Museum, I have viewed these unaccessioned objects, which range from desks to building fragments. The strength of the SIM collection, in conjunction with NRM and the other constituents of SMG, are the objects and artworks relating to the LMR. The scope of these collections, and comparative lack of accessioned freight artefacts, supports my argument that the freight uses of the Station are neglected as the ‘oldest in the world’ narrative remains prominent in public history.

4. Oral history

The later period of the thesis enters living memory; accordingly, I have used the method of oral history to record interviews with individuals who either worked at the Station, were involved in preservation campaigns or in the Museum’s development. At the beginning of this process, a sign was set up in public gallery space in the recreated first-class booking hall in the Station Building at SIM, to attract individuals to come forward. Others were sought out for their role in setting up the Museum. Overall, eight interviews were undertaken over the course of 2014-2015. The decision to interview was based on the strength of individuals connection to Liverpool Road, availability and whether they had previously been interviewed. I actively gathered memories from new contributors (except for David Rhodes,
who set up the Liverpool Road Station Society). I interviewed Richard Hills, NWMSI director (1969 – 1983) and first curator of GMMSI and a colleague interviewed Patrick Greene, the GMMSI’s first director from 1984. Whilst their recollections are particularly important in understanding the nascent years of the Museum, other interviewees were selected for their involvement in the LRSS or the Station itself. As goods operations were wound down in 1968, I was fortunate to be contacted by two participants who worked at Liverpool Road. Other individuals who came forward, but wished not to be recorded, kindly shared photographs and written reminiscences.

Evidence from the oral history recordings has been used in conjunction with textual and visual primary source material. Subjectivity and the unreliability memory are criticisms levied at reminiscence led sources, however, in the context of this thesis, perceptions of the site over time is important in understanding the position of the Station in collective memories. In places, the interviews also illuminate sensory experiences and responses to the buildings that cannot be gleaned from the written record.
Chapter 1

From relics of the railway to centenary celebrations:
Liverpool Road Station as site of memory

*History begins with monuments and inscriptions, and as the record of the built environment suggests, not the least of the influences changing historical consciousness today is the writing on the wall.* – Raphael Samuel

Introduction

On 12 January 1939, British Pathé introduced the nation’s cinema goers to a short newsreel about the ‘oldest station in the world’, highlighting the historic significance of Liverpool Road Station to almost half of the population.¹ The short feature began with shots of the exterior of the Station from Liverpool Road; by the 1930s, the Georgian façade of the passenger station was the well-established image of the Station. The Station also appeared at track level with ‘the old ticket office’ and close-ups of original features, including an 1833 sundial. Material culture carried meaning as signifiers of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway (LMR) period, some displayed in a ‘museum of relics’ by goods station staff. The camera lingered on a plaque unveiled in 1930 declaring the hundredth anniversary of the Station. Whilst specialist interest groups circulated the ‘oldest station in the world’ narrative from the late nineteenth century, it was with the LMR Centenary that the Station became synonymous with the railway story amongst a wide audience. Whilst Liverpool Road continued to operate as a goods station, it was presented to new audiences as the world’s oldest passenger railway station.

In this Chapter, I trace how the Liverpool and Manchester Railway (LMR) was historicised after the closure of the passenger service at Liverpool Road Station in 1844 and the amalgamation of the LMR Company in 1845. I consider the interaction between written

history, material culture and memory in the narrativization of the LMR and the labelling of Liverpool Road as ‘oldest station in the world’. Whilst the Station was not considered an historical monument during the nineteenth century, the commemorative narrative was transformed into a story grounded in place; thus, Liverpool Road Station became a site of memory by the 1930s. The changing landscape of history and memorial practices reflected upon in this Chapter also echo Kate Hill’s assertion that the fin de siècle period saw the development of new memory practices, with emerging commercialisation and commodification in heritage.2

I argue that by the turn of century, there was a growing awareness of the LMR sites and a concern for the authenticity of surviving infrastructure. In a period when ecclesiastical architecture, medieval ruins and monumental structures were the dominant forms, Liverpool Road Station was an unlikely site for heritage.3 Rather than suggesting Liverpool Road Station was a heritage site in the early twentieth century, I consider its gradual repositioning as a realm of memory anchored by the opening of the LMR in 1830. As Nora conceived les lieux de mémoire, memory ‘secretes itself’ from an historic moment in these sites, which is problematic in spaces where a sense of historical continuity persists. As histories of the LMR were increasingly associated with the place in the early 1900s, international visitors made the pilgrimage to Liverpool Road to see the ‘first railway station’.4 The site was understood as historic – not only symbolising but embodying the opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway, whilst simultaneously operating as a goods station of little public interest. Liverpool Road Station can only be considered an example of lieu de mémoire once there was a will to remember it.5 In this Chapter, I demonstrate how the Station grew in the collective memories of distinctive groups: railway


5 Nora, ‘Between Memory and History’, p.19.
enthusiasts, authors of local historical knowledge such as journalists and civic leaders, and the railway companies that operated the site, who used nostalgia for ‘railways in the thirties’ to promote themselves. Thus, by the Liverpool and Manchester Railway Centenary of 1930, with the physical marker of a commemorative plaque, Liverpool Road Station was both intellectually and materially a lieu de mémoire. The plaque inscribed the Station with history: ‘the writing on the wall’, which, as Raphael Samuel identified, influences the historical consciousness.  

Anniversary celebrations, such as jubilees and centenaries marking the birth of famous individuals or significant events, were regular features of public life throughout this period. These events are not simply evidence of popular engagement with history, rather, they demonstrate how local councils and businesses used local and national narratives to attract tourism and bolster civic pride. The LMR and George Stephenson Jubilees were not celebrated locally in Manchester or Liverpool as both cities had already developed distinct civic accounts of the past, in contrast with the towns associated with the alternative ‘first railway’: the Stockton and Darlington Railway (S&D), which opened 1825. I propose that in many ways S&D celebrations set the key elements of the narrative of progress of early railways and the format of the later LMR Centenary. Ultimately, it was the convergence of the interwar period trend for large-scale civic pageantry in industrial towns with the publicity agenda of the London, Midland & Scottish Railway Company (LMS) that instigated weeklong celebrations for the 1930 LMR Centenary.

This Chapter begins with a broad picture of the historicisation of the LMR and the closely bound reputation of George Stephenson. In the second section, I consider the collection of objects for display in disseminating the established story via a new medium: the public museum. This broader material is included to understand the prominence of aspects of the story and certain relics of the railway, prior to the association of Liverpool Road Station with this narrative. I demonstrate that Liverpool Road came to prominence when engineering periodicals noted the absence of a site-based jubilee in 1880. This was followed by artworks and articles that associated the Station with the LMR story, which was
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further highlighted when part of the original infrastructure was threatened with demolition in 1904. This Chapter closes with coverage of the LMR Centenary, the first large-scale public history event celebrating the railway line. I then reflect upon the legacy of the Centenary and the ascent of Liverpool Road’s status as ‘oldest in the world’ amongst national audiences by 1939. The Station’s position in national narratives of the early railways and collective memories of the site by Mancunians and railway enthusiasts heralded heritage activity in the mid-twentieth century (discussed further in Chapter 4).

Section 1: Victorian commemoration of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway

In this section, I explore early forms of commemoration of the LMR and celebrations of George Stephenson during the 1840s and 1850s. In 1.1, I consider the interwoven reputations of the LMR Company with the heroic inventor, particularly the role of LMR Directors in positioning it as the ‘first’ railway. I highlight that Liverpool rather than Manchester was the location for a monument to Stephenson, owing to the role of the city as LMR’s administrative centre and home to key proponents of the railway. In part 1.2, I consider the earliest collection and display of LMR/Stephenson artefacts, including material at the Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of all Nations of 1851, as these displays influenced later exhibits. At this time, Liverpool Road Station was an expanding freight hub for the London and North Western Railway (LNWR) and there is no evidence that the site was associated with the evolving story of the LMR as the earliest railway line. Therefore, I present a broader history and the establishment of national collections in order to show how the grand narrative of the railway formed, which is crucial to understanding later repetition and adaption of this history in Liverpool and Manchester.

1.1 Memorialising George Stephenson and the legacy of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway

Commemoration of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway (LMR) as the ‘first’ railway was closely bound with the reputation of its chief engineer, George Stephenson. Christine MacLeod has identified the veneration of engineering ‘heroes’ revered in their own lifetime as a commemorative trend during the 1840s, against the backdrop of the patent
controversy.\textsuperscript{9} The ‘cult of personality’ that replaced religious figures in the newly secular state of France flourished in this period.\textsuperscript{10} This trend influenced the British state, when, in 1841 the Select Committee on National Monuments and Works of Art conceptualised national monuments primarily as memorials to illustrious individuals.\textsuperscript{11} Hero-worship in the 1840s was also shifting from military heroes to men of the arts and scientists, worthies of \textit{Pax Britannica} immortalised by the Great Exhibition.\textsuperscript{12} This commemorative turn coincided with the improved status of ‘gentlemen engineers’, with the further professionalisation of civil engineering and the growing field of mechanical engineering.\textsuperscript{13} It is against this background that George Stephenson found fame with his contemporaries. Stephenson was renowned for his achievements in the construction of early railways with the 1825 Stockton to Darlington Railway (S&D), and his role in the engineering of the LMR line and subsequent railway works.

Despite being regarded as ‘old’ by 1844 when passengers were redirected to Victoria Station, the relatively recent 1830 buildings at Liverpool Road Station did not figure in LMR commemoration in this period. The design of the neo-classical stucco fronted Station at street level appeared conventional and indistinguishable from other urban architecture, a form Wolfgang Schivelbusch has characterised as a ‘gateway’ mediating urban space and the industrial railroad space concealed within.\textsuperscript{14} Evidence from May 1844 suggests a break with the past with the withdrawal of the passenger service. Newspaper reports emphasised the ‘magnificence’ of the new passenger facilities; in contrast, Liverpool Road became known as the ‘old’ or ‘former’ station.\textsuperscript{15} The rhetoric of progress in responses to the Victoria Station coupled with the commonplace Georgian façade at Liverpool Road made it indistinctive. In this period of continued expansion of railway lines and the re-building of many early stations, railway companies were looking to the future rather than reflecting on


\textsuperscript{10} Quinault, ‘The Cult of the Centenary’, pp. 305-6 on French influences.

\textsuperscript{11} Swenson, \textit{The Rise of Heritage}, p.57.

\textsuperscript{12} MacLeod, \textit{Heroes of Invention}, p.212, 215.


the past. Furthermore, Liverpool Road Station operated as a freight hub, an unlikely location for commemorative activity more commonplace in civic spaces. However, whilst the early railway structures were not considered in terms of heritage, the LMR Directors highlighted the historic nature of their ‘first’ railway and sought to bolster this claim through continued association with George Stephenson.

Discussions amongst the LMR Board and their partners, the Grand Junction Railway (GJR), during the 1840s firmly bound the history of the railway with Stephenson’s personal achievement. Directors frequently paid tribute to George Stephenson as the steadfast father, with the familiar sentiments of Victorian bourgeois masculinity. The response of the GJR Board during the amalgamation of the LMR and GJR in 1845 was to commission a statue of Stephenson for display inside St George’s Hall, a grand neo-Grecian civic building under construction to house concert rooms and Liverpool’s Assize court. The Report of the Directors stated that:

There could be no reluctance in the minds of the proprietors of this railway, of which Mr Stephenson was the father, when it was about to lose its distinctive character, if not its name, by the intended amalgamation, to pay this mark of respect to that eminent man.

Several members of the Board, such as Secretary Henry Booth, had been with the Company since the establishment of the LMR. The Directors worked to incorporate the story of their line into Stephenson’s legacy. This description of Stephenson as ‘father’ of the railway became common in contemporary journalism. In 1851, John Francis in an early history of the railways noted that Stephenson was ‘affectionately termed the father and founder of the railway system’. With Stephenson cast as a father figure, the LMR was referred to in maternal terms. For example, reports of board meetings in the Railway Chronicle described the Company as ‘the good old mother of railways’.

---

17 Railway Record (8 Feb 1845), Report of the Special Meeting of the Grand Junction Railway.
18 Railway Chronicle (1 Feb 1845) p.113, published report of the LMR Directors half-yearly meeting held 29 Jan 1845. NRM 1943-217: Prospectuses of the LMR/GJR, Twenty-sixth half-yearly report of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway, 29 Jan 1845.
The decision to place Stephenson’s statue in St George’s Hall established Liverpool as the primary location for LMR commemoration; Manchester’s urban elites, guided by aspiration for city status, curated its own pantheon of scientific and engineering heroes. The skew towards Liverpool is unsurprising given the greater influence of ‘Liverpool gentlemen’ over the railway. LMR’s administrative base for board meetings throughout the 1840s was the Cotton Room of the Exchange Building, whilst Lime Street Station - the major passenger terminus - was directly opposite the new civic Hall, as GJR Chairman John Moss noted. The amalgamation of the GJR with the London & Birmingham and other lines into the London and North Western Railway (LNWR) in 1846 led to an administrative shift towards London (although regions retained some autonomy at district level). The Institution of the Mechanical Engineers, where Stephenson was the first President in 1847, erected a statue of him in the grand hall of LNWR’s London Euston Station in 1854. The Company monument remained at the Concert Hall of St George’s Hall in Liverpool. This early anchoring of memorial activity in Liverpool by the Company set a precedent for later celebrations. Neither the city of Manchester nor the original station buildings there were associated with commemoration of the LMR or Stephenson until the twentieth century.

The statue of Stephenson was commissioned during his lifetime, however, it was not completed until after his death on 12 August 1848, transforming the figure’s meaning to a posthumous memorial. Samuel Smiles later recorded that ‘the statue of George Stephenson…was on its way to England when his death occurred; and it served for a monument’. Monuments to the dead can form lieux de mémoire, and as Antoine Prost has noted, the significance of these stems first from their relationship to the space in which

21 Manchester Corporation consciously enshrined the Royal Visit of 1851 with civic ritual to pronounce the town’s importance to the aristocracy (Simon Gunn, The Public Culture of the Victorian Middle Class: Ritual and Authority in the English Industrial City 1840-1914 (Manchester: MUP, 2000) pp.164-168. Manchester’s established local heroes of Science were John Dalton and James Joule (James Sumner, ‘Science, Technology and Medicine’ in Alan Kidd & Terry Wyke (eds) Manchester: Making the Modern City (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2016) (pp.119-179).

22 The LMR was initiated by a committee formed in Liverpool in 1822. Liverpool merchants, particularly Thomas and Henry Booth led the railway’s promotion. Henry Booth became secretary of the GJR and director of the northern section of LNWR. See Francis Watt, rev. Ralph Harrington, ‘Booth, Henry (1789-1869) railway projector and manager’ in Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (OUP, 2004) <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/2881> [accessed 18/02/18].


they stand. Sculptor John Gibson, who made the Company monument to Stephenson, also produced two posthumous monuments to William Huskisson, the former Member of Parliament killed on the opening day of the LMR. Both statues of Liverpool’s Tory MP were erected in civic spaces; the first was placed in Liverpool’s new cemetery in 1831 and the second was unveiled in front of the Customs House in 1847. During Gibson’s visit to England on 15 October 1847, he spent time with Charles Lawrence, former Chairman of LMR and Board member of the GJR, who hosted Gibson at Liverpool’s Exchange. Gibson’s patrons, including Lawrence, a former Mayor of Liverpool, and William Huskisson’s widow, Eliza, demonstrate the influence those involved with the railway curried in the City and crucially how monuments of men linked to the railway were swiftly embedded in the organisation of civic seeing in Liverpool.

Figure 1. Photograph of the statue of George Stephenson (left) by John Gibson in St. George’s Hall, Liverpool. On the right is the contemporaneous statue of Sir Robert Peel (City Engineer’s Department, 20 July 1942, Liverpool Archive: 942.7213 GEO).


When St George’s Hall opened 18 September 1854, the statue of Stephenson was unveiled alongside that of former Prime Minister, Sir Robert Peel, who died in 1850. The Peel Testimonial Committee raised subscriptions for the Liverpool statue and in 1851 sought permission for its position inside the building from the St George’s Hall Committee. A number of Northern industrial centres erected posthumous statues to Peel owing to his reputation as a Free Trade Conservative, responsible for the Repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. Terry Cavanagh has noted a shift in the purpose of St George’s Hall when the original Architect, Elmes died and was replaced by Cockerill in 1851; the role of the Concert Hall shifted from a space for musical entertainments to ‘a nascent civic pantheon’. Unlike William Huskisson, who had represented Liverpool in Parliament, neither Peel nor Stephenson had strong links to the city, except through the outcomes of their work. The Liverpool Mercury reported: ‘among the worthies who have conferred lasting benefits upon their country none more fit could have been selected, with the view of honouring their memories in this community’. With the influence of the Conservative leaning businessmen of Liverpool, the city’s new civic heroes were not local ones.

1.2 The Stephensons and the Liverpool & Manchester Railway on display

In the mid-nineteenth century, as the progressive narrative of the LMR imbued monumental forms of Stephenson, artefacts were also preserved or created to serve this story. The Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of all Nations held at the Crystal Palace in 1851 featured displays of objects that present this narrative. The purpose of the Great Exhibition was to show British dominance in art and industry, and to educate artisans, workers and the wider public. Displays included decorative objects showing railway engineers - material evidence of the proliferation of ‘heroic inventors’ on display for a mass

---

28 Terry Cavanagh, Public Sculpture of Liverpool (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997) pp.270-1; Cavanagh cites correspondence from Henry Booth and Charles Lawrence to the Committee (reported in The Times 27 March 1851) and from the Committee of Subscribers to the Liverpool Peel Testimonial (Liverpool Council Minutes 13 August 1851) requesting permanent positions for the statues in the Hall.


30 Cavanagh, Public Sculpture of Liverpool, p.270.

audience. Amongst the Works in Precious Metal and Jewellery section in the South Central Gallery was ‘The Great Railway Salver’ or ‘Brassey Testimonial’ (a decorative silver serving tray). This showed the family shield of Thomas Brassey, prolific civil engineer of the railway network worldwide, along with enamel portraits of renowned railway engineers including George and Robert Stephenson with a ‘view of a principal work... above the portrait of the designer’. As MacLeod highlights, Robert Stephenson was one of the first generation of inventors heralded as a celebrity in his lifetime. Robert was associated with the LMR for his design of ‘Rocket’, the locomotive that won the Rainhill Trials in 1829 and became the first to operate on the LMR in 1830. Nearby, Joseph Meyer, a designer and manufacturer of Liverpool, displayed a silver salver (also known as a waiter) featuring Queen Victoria to commemorate the exhibition. The boarder of Meyer’s salver included medallions showing ‘great men of our country, as representatives of arts, commerce and civilisation.’ George Stephenson again appeared, alongside engineer James Watt and potter Josiah Wedgwood.

Robert Stephenson also influenced the poetics of locomotive display, as a Commissioner for the Great Exhibition. In January 1851, Stephenson was eager to display ‘Rocket’ and ‘Locomotion No. 1’ of the Stockton and Darlington Railway (S&D) at the Crystal Palace alongside ‘one of our last improvements’. Stephenson arranged for ‘Rocket’ to be repaired with the cooperation of James Thompson, then owner of ‘Rocket’, as it had been out of use since about 1840. The restoration and display did not go ahead, therefore only contemporary locomotives were included in the exhibition. However, Robert Stephenson’s idea of contrasting the earliest locomotives with a contemporary design

33 MacLeod, Heroes of Invention, p.199.
34 Ibid., p.674.
35 In museology, the internal arrangement of exhibitions to create meaning is considered the poetics of display; this is closely related to the politics of display through which social meaning is constructed and conveyed to the museum visitor. See Rhiannon Mason, ‘Cultural Theory and Museum Studies’ in Sharon Macdonald (ed), A Companion to Museum Studies (Blackwell Publishing, 2006).
37 Ibid., p.41.
became a standard display method to demonstrate progression in design, used in publicity and at exhibitions by railway companies in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.38

Figure 2. A replica ‘Rocket’ locomotive displayed at Crewe Locomotive Works as a technological benchmark, with the 1843 ‘Columbine’ and a ‘Royal Scot’ class 1920s locomotive, creating a visual chronology of the kind Robert Stephenson intended for the Great Exhibition. (Modern Transport vol. 21 no. 546, 31 Aug 1929, p.5.)

Whilst the British Museum and the National Gallery already collected and displayed imperial material culture and art collections, the Great Exhibition also displayed contemporary industrial artefacts, including many working exhibits in the Hall of Machinery. It was in this space that the London North-Western Railway (LNWR), LMRs successor, showed contemporary railway vehicles.39 LNWR’s most recent express locomotives, ‘Liverpool’ and ‘Cornwall’, were located here. Designed by Francis Trevithick, ‘Cornwall’ was built in 1847 to demonstrate that stability at speed was possible on a

38 For example, evidence from National Railway Museum Collection: LNWR Ledger of Models shows that at the 1910 Japan-British Exhibition at White City in Shepard’s Bush, London, LNWR displayed an 1842 London and Birmingham Railway carriage – Queen Adelaide’s Saloon, along with a turn of the century ‘Diamond Jubilee’ class engine.

standard gauge locomotive (in response to the broad gauge advocated by Isambard Kingdom Brunel on the Great Western Railway (GWR)). Meanwhile rival railway company, GWR, displayed the contemporary broad-gauge Gooch 4-4-2 engine. The indoor, static display of full-sized locomotives set a precedent followed by railway companies at subsequent trade exhibitions, and later in museums. Objects displayed at the Great Exhibition formed the nucleus of national museums: the Victoria & Albert Museum and the South Kensington Museum, forerunner to the Science Museum. Both the commemorative memorabilia and technological exhibits influenced the nature of railway collections in the public museum.

Section 2: Preserving the LMR and Liverpool Road Station

In Section 2.1, I consider the preservation of LMR artefacts, particularly the earliest locomotives designated as historically significant by railway companies and the Patent Museum. In 2.2, I trace how preservation shifted from artefacts and ephemera to original structures, when, in 1904 the Water Street Bridge was threatened with demolition. The Water Street Bridge was a structure of cast iron beams made by Fairbairn and Lillie in Manchester under the direction of George Stephenson. I argue that the prominence of iconic artefacts from the railway, like Stephenson’s ‘Rocket’, increased awareness of the LMR nationally, whilst locally, physical relics of Liverpool Road Station were considered in terms of civic history. The turn of the century marked a shift towards the association of the railway story with the Station, as railway enthusiast publications, Manchester Corporation Architects and local newspapers related the narrative of the ‘first’ railway and George Stephenson’s invention explicitly to Liverpool Road Station. This rooted a nascent sense of placial historic significance amongst two communities: railway enthusiasts and Manchester citizens.

---


2.1 Victorian preservation of early locomotives

‘Rocket’ and ‘Locomotion No. 1’ became synonymous with the LMR and S&D pioneer railway lines respectively, as Robert Stephenson’s aborted plan to display them together at the Great Exhibition demonstrates. These objects were both signifiers as tangible remnants of the early railways and acted as symbols of progress. Not all surviving 1820s and 1830s locomotives were revered in this manner, with many re-used in different contexts, rather than preserved. For example, on 26 May 1859 the LNWR sold ‘Lion’, an 1838 LMR locomotive, to the Mersey Dock and Harbour Board. The Harbour Board re-cycled ‘Lion’ for use as a stationary steam engine to power sixty-nine working chain pumps at the Prince’s Dock, until electricity replaced it in the 1920s. The LMR Directors initially sold ‘Rocket’ for re-use in 1836 on the colliery railway network in the Naworth coalfield. The engine fell out of use around 1840 and was retained by its new owner, James Thompson, for sentimental reasons. According to a local newspaper: ‘it now stands no less as a monument of the genius of the inventor than as a mark of esteem in which his memory is held by Mr Thompson’. Similarly, recognition of the historical significance of ‘Locomotion No. 1’ was evident as early as the 1840s, when it was employed in railway ceremonies, such as featuring ahead of a procession at the opening of the Middlesbrough and Redcar line in 1846.

The first permanent static display of a locomotive was ‘Locomotion No. 1’ in 1857, which was elevated on a pedestal outside North-road Station, Darlington. ‘Rocket’ was also preserved and statically displayed inside the Patent Museum. Bennet Woodcroft, clerk to

---


43 TNA ZSPC 11/550/19: W.E. Hayward Collection, file of ephemera relating to LMS (and its constituent lines) cutting from The Locomotive (15 Jan 1929), p.32.


45 The York Herald and General Advertiser (York, England) 6 Jun 1846, p.3; The Yorkshire Gazette (York, England) 6 Jun 1846, p.5. In the former, ‘Locomotion No. 1’ is referred to by its previous title: ‘The Active’.

46 Ian Carter, British Railway Enthusiasm (Manchester: MUP, 2008) p.110 on the presentation of Locomotion and Robert Stephenson’s Derwent by NER.
the Commissioners of Patents, acquired ‘Rocket’ for the Museum in 1862. In 1876, ‘Rocket’ was loaned to the South Kensington Museum for display with scientific apparatus in the South Gallery.47 Woodcroft’s acquisition demonstrates the national historical significance assigned to ‘Rocket’ by this historian of technology, whose priority was retaining early designs for inventors to consult.48 These different display contexts - the first in Darlington, the locality most associated with Stephenson’s 1825 S&D Railway, the second in what became the core of the national Science Museum collection in South Kensington - present Stephenson’s work in local and national contexts. As Patricia Fara has shown in her work on sites of memory associated with Isaac Newton in Woolsthorpe, Cambridge and London, a scientific hero could simultaneously serve as a national genius whilst representing local interests.49 These locomotive displays led to the proliferation of the idea of the S&D and LMR as the ‘first’ railways and George Stephenson as their instigator, regionally and in the capital.

48 Bud, ‘Infected by the Bacillus of Science’, p.15; MacLeod, Heroes of Invention, p.260.
Figure 3. A full-scale, mostly wooden model of ‘Rocket’ on display at the Stockton and Darlington Railway Centenary exhibition in 1925 (NRM: Misc Photo Album 117).

Figure 4. Newspaper cutting shows young boy gazing at a model of ‘Rocket’ circa 1909. (Science Museum: T/1909-3 object history file for Stuart Turner Ltd. model of ‘Rocket’).
Whilst ‘Rocket’ and ‘Locomotion No. 1’ were displayed for their provenance as ‘real’ objects made by the Stephensons and as witnesses to their historic railways, by the end of the nineteenth century replicas and models also acted as symbols of this story. Several full-scale working replicas were commissioned during the opening decade of the 1900s, as well as smaller, working models for display. As early as the 1860s, treatises to inform children and amateurs how to construct model locomotives were in circulation. Inclusion of models for museum displays across the nineteenth and twentieth century was predicated on their purpose as educational aids. The turn of the century also marked a watershed in their prominence in displays, a prime example of new memory practices enabled by the growing commercialisation of heritage. In 1907, the South Kensington Board of Education commissioned a small-scale model of ‘Rocket’ from model-maker Stuart Turner [Figure 4]. This was for display in the machinery section of the Victoria and Albert Museum. Turner had already made a model of ‘Rocket’ for the German State Railway’s museum in Berlin. British Railway companies also sought replicas of early locomotives; LNWR administered a register of models, the numbers maintained were so numerous by 1910. This ledger provides an insight into their uses: from large-scale models displayed at national and international trade exhibitions to miniature, coin activated working models used to fundraise for charities at railway stations. A full-sized non-working replica of ‘Rocket’ was commissioned by LNWR in 1911 and made at the Crewe locomotive works, which Michael Bailey and John Glithero believe was a re-build of an 1881 version. In 1929, Henry Ford commissioned Robert Stephenson’s Company in Darlington to create an operable example [Figure 5] for his new museum in Dearborn, Michigan. The latter toured


51 Carter, British Railway Enthusiasm, p.195.

52 Staubermaa & Swinney ‘Making Space For Models’, p.27.


54 Science Museum: T/1909-3 Object history file for model of ‘Rocket’ by Stuart Turner Ltd.

55 Ibid., extract from Ernest A. Steel & Elenora H. Steel, The miniature world of Henry Greenly (Model & Allied Publications ltd.) p.77.

56 NRM: London North Western Railway Company Ledger of Models

57 Ibid., for example ‘old locomotive ‘Rocket” model was displayed at Euston Station to raise money for the Railway Orphanage Fund, Derby.
the UK prior to shipment to America, with displays at the Science Museum in August, and outside St George’s Hall in Liverpool in September 1929.\footnote{Liverpool Archive: Hf 385.2CEN Newspaper Cuttings: \textit{Liverpool Post & Mercury} 5 Sept 1929} Bailey and Glithero recorded eight replica Rocket locomotives manufactured between 1881 and 1935, six of which were made between the wars.\footnote{Bailey & Glithero, The Engineering History of ‘Rocket’, p.176.} The legacy of this wave of replica construction can be seen at transport museums and heritage railways, discussed further in Chapters 4 and 5.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{rocket Replica.jpg}
\caption{Henry Ford’s full-scale, working replica of ‘Rocket’ photographed in September 1929 outside St George’s Hall, Liverpool, prior to shipment to The Henry Ford Museum. (Liverpool Archive: Hf 385.2 CEN Newspaper Cuttings: \textit{Liverpool Post & Mercury} 5 Sept 1929).}
\end{figure}

2.2 The relics of Liverpool Road and (not) saving Water Street Bridge

By the late nineteenth century, Manchester was developing and presenting its place in the past and the genius of George Stephenson was not required to bolster the industrious City’s image. Whilst the New Town Hall Sub-Committee did consider the opening of the LMR for the final scene of the twelve murals by Ford Madox Brown featured inside the Hall (painted from 1878 until 1893),\footnote{Manchester Archive M79/1/10: Manchester Town Hall, papers of Joseph Thompson (1864 – 1895), letter from Joseph Thompson to the chairman of the Town Hall Sub-Committee, 8 Oct 1878.} John Dalton collecting marsh-fire gas was ultimately
selected. This reinforced Dalton’s position as Manchester’s hero of science, which was established during his lifetime; for example, with Sir Francis Chantrey’s marble statue of Dalton commissioned in 1838. This statue, initially for the Royal Manchester Institution, was transferred to a prominent position in the New Town Hall’s entrance lobby.\textsuperscript{61} The Bridgewater Canal opening, in the more distant past of the eighteenth century, exemplified the industrial revolution in the murals. The LMR was absent, not only in artistic representations of the City’s history, but also from celebrations. The opening of the Town Hall was celebrated over three days in September 1877; a trades procession on the 15 September coincided with the exact LMR anniversary. Officials were either unaware of this connection or did not recognise the significance.\textsuperscript{62}

Surviving infrastructure, including Liverpool Road Station and its Liverpool counterpart, Crown Street, did not figure in commemorative activity on the fiftieth anniversary of the LMR in 1880. Whilst regional newspapers in Liverpool and Manchester ran editorials on the significance of the railway, neither cities nor the LNWR commemorated the jubilee.\textsuperscript{63} The trade journal, \textit{Engineering}, remarked upon this missed occasion: ‘in an age, when jubilees, fêtes, and celebrations are held on comparatively trivial grounds, one of the most important events of this century should have passed comparatively unnoticed’.\textsuperscript{64} \textit{The Engineer} also lamented: ‘there is to be no public commemoration of the event... nothing like the Stockton and Darlington Jubilee in 1875.’\textsuperscript{65} In September 1875, the North Eastern Railway [NER] staged a two-day Jubilee celebration of S&D Railway opening at Darlington, including the unveiling of a statue Joseph Pease, proponent of the railway and local politician. The S&D Jubilee featured tours of local works, anniversary dinners for police and railwaymen, a lantern procession through the town and a firework display.\textsuperscript{66} Ben Roberts has shown that this was not a civic occasion, even with the nominal involvement of Darlington’s Corporation, rather it was ‘a marketing and promotional exercise for the [NER]
Company’. Whilst the S&D Jubilee was largely a railway initiative, the town did develop its official history as bound with the railway, as Roberts notes, the 1867 Darlington Borough Coat of Arms featured ‘Locomotion No. 1’.

Centenary commemoration of George Stephenson’s birth in 1881 also neglected to include LMR sites or structures. On 9 June 1881, mass celebrations took place in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, close to Stephenson’s birthplace, including exhibitions and fireworks displays. Celebrations also took place in Chesterfield, where Stephenson was buried. Birthplaces, homes and death sites were common locations for anniversary events; however, there were also celebrations to honour engineers and scientists at places associated with their working lives as the centrality of Stephenson to the Darlington narrative demonstrates.

During the LMR Jubilee year, trade journal articles show nascent recognition of the importance of place to the narrative; Liverpool Road Station was noted as a relic. Along with an editorial on the Jubilee, *Engineering* printed an image of Liverpool Road Station [Figure 6] with the caption: ‘the old Manchester Station’, emphasising the significance of the surviving building. Both this engraving and an etching by W. Pownall from 1884, captioned ‘oldest railway station and arch in the world’ [Figure 7], show the Georgian, stucco fronted Station Building along Liverpool Road. This phrasing (minus the arch) was widely circulated by the nascent enthusiasts’ publication *Railway Magazine* in 1902. Figures stroll in front of the Station in the *Engineering* illustration, with no railway vehicles in sight; the station appears timeless. Pownall’s work shows the building from street level with no people, yet the ‘Rocket’ style locomotive travelling over Water Street Bridge with its two rows of Doric-style stone columns is suggestive of the 1830s passenger period. These 1880s illustrations present the Station as an historic, pre-Victorian building, remote from the industry is was integral to (only the 1830 Warehouse’s can be discerned in the

---


68 Ibid., p.167.


70 For example, Scholars at Trinity College in Cambridge swiftly established the college as site of remembrance for Sir Isaac Newton in the eighteenth century: Fara, ‘Isaac Newton lived here: sites of memory and scientific heritage’, pp.410-413.


*Engineering* engraving). In 1887, a recreation of ‘Old Manchester and Salford’ at the Royal Jubilee Exhibition provided over four million visitors with a pre-industrial spectacle of the twin cities. Arguably, these views of Liverpool Road, which focus on the Georgian neoclassical frontage stripped of industrial fabric, allowed for similar nostalgia.

Figure 6. Illustration of Liverpool Road Station, which appeared alongside an editorial on the Jubilee of the LMR in *Engineering*, 17 Sept 1880 (Digitised by Grace’s Guide).

Figure 7. ‘The Oldest Railway Station and Arch in the World’ etching by W. Pownall, 1884. (Manchester Galleries collection).

---


In 1904, when demolition threatened an 1830 aspect of Liverpool Road, the historic importance of the Station was recognised by Manchester Corporation’s City Surveyor, de Courcy Meade, who worked under Manchester’s first City Architect, Henry Price. In 1882 and 1891 a replacement for the Water Street Bridge was planned after the failure of two other cast girder bridges; however, it was not dismantled until the Corporation’s street widening scheme in 1904. In September 1904, de Courcy Meade wrote to LNWR requesting the columns and stonework for the City: ‘to be retained as a public monument of one of the oldest railway bridges.’ The Manchester Courier also cited the bridge as the ‘oldest railway bridge in Manchester’, in contrast with its ‘modern steel successor’. Councillor Plummer wished to see the bridge preserved as a relic of ‘old Manchester’. The Parks and Cemeteries Committee assigned importance to the bridge as a piece of Manchester history, rather than an example of George Stephenson’s engineering work, as neither the engineer nor makers were named in discussions.

Stephenson’s role as engineer was highlighted in the local press once the demolition process began in August 1904. The Manchester Evening News emphasised that the bridge ‘was designed by that great pioneer of railway engineering, George Stephenson.’ The newspaper presented an anecdote of Stephenson’s negotiations for the railway, followed by reminiscences of the opening day (15 September 1830) including the Duke of Wellington’s carriage and the fatal accident of William Huskisson. The journalist recounted the familiar narrative of the LMR, yet by relating the Water Street Bridge with this story highlighted the tangible railway heritage at Liverpool Road Station to local readers.

---

78 Manchester Courier (31 Dec 1904), p.4.
Although highly unusual in the context of turn-of-the-century heritage activity focused on ‘Olde England’, particularly the Elizabethan period,\(^{81}\) there was precedent for preserving a railway bridge for its historic significance. In 1903, NER took down the ‘first iron railway bridge’, an S&D cast and wrought iron truss bridge over the River Gaundless at West Auckland. Whilst Manchester Corporation planned to preserve the Water Street Bridge stonework as a reminder of neo-classical early railway architecture, the S&D bridge exemplified the more explicitly industrial past with its cast and wrought iron engineering. The attribution of the Gaundless Bridge to George Stephenson bolstered the preservation of this structure.\(^{82}\) This was retained by NER’s successors, the London North Eastern Railway (LNER), and was later displayed at the Railway Museum in York from 1929.\(^{83}\) It is unsurprising that Manchester intended to preserve the Water Street Bridge shortly after the NER’s North-East railway bridge as regional rivalry for the title of ‘first’ or ‘oldest’ railway developed across the century. However, in this instance, the LNWR were not engaged in a spur of company rivalry and did little to support the Corporation’s plan; LNWR were willing to sell them Water Street Bridge for £60, yet crucially offered no assistance for its removal, the high cost of which (estimated at £650) led to the abandonment of the scheme.\(^{84}\) According to the notebook of chief bridge inspector, William Wilson, remnants of Water Street Bridge were deposited on land in Levenshulme, with the expectation that they would later be re-used for a park monument.\(^{85}\)

The Doric columns were to be re-erected as a civic monument, as the Parks and Cemeteries Committee proposed moving the stonework from Water Street Bridge to Heaton Park.\(^{86}\) The notion of re-erecting neo-classical columns in one of the City’s parks had been circulating prior to the Water Street Bridge demolition. On 11 September 1903, George

---


\(^{82}\) The earliest reference uncovered on the significance of the Gaundless Bridge appears in *The Engineer* (1875) p.214. The illustration was reprinted in the *North Eastern Magazine* vol. 13, no. 150 (Jun 1923) captioned as ‘the oldest iron railway bridge’; NRM Object History file 1878-7189: The bridge was transferred to the Queen Street Railway Museum circa 1925 and re-built outside NRM in 1975.


\(^{85}\) William Wilson, Chief Bridge Inspector’s notebook, digitised by David Boardman: <http://manchesterhistory.net/manchester/bridges/waterstreet.html> [accessed 20 Jan 2016].

Meek proposed that the colonnade of ‘the old reference library’ be re-erected at Boggart Hole Clough ‘as a relic of the first Town Hall of Manchester’.\textsuperscript{87} Correspondence during 1904 indicates that it was the initiative of the City Architects department to attempt to save the stonework from the Water Street Bridge for the same purpose. Both the Town Hall columns (which were later erected in Heaton Park in 1912) and stonework from Stephenson’s bridge were in a Grecian style.\textsuperscript{88} This suggests the City Architects were concerned with the preservation of a particular Georgian aesthetic, removing the columns from the city and into the rural setting of the new public park at Heaton Hall.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{water_street_bridge_postcard}
\caption{LNWR postcard showing Water Street Bridge prior to the removal of the original colonnade in 1904 (SIM: 1983.9.2.62 Dendy Marshall Collection)}
\end{figure}

A pertinent example of the commodification of history for publicity purposes, in January 1905 LNWR circulated ‘Railways in the Thirties’, a series of collectable postcards. These presented contemporary photographs mirroring the 1831 Ackerman series. Figure 8 shows Water Street Bridge before the demolition of the original masonry and iron girder in August

\textsuperscript{87} Manchester Archive: GB127.Council Minutes, Parks and Cemeteries Committee vol. 23 (May 1903 – May 1904) 11 Dec 1903.

\textsuperscript{88} Clare Hartwell, \textit{Manchester} p.334.
By the time the postcards were in circulation, the structure was no longer extant. This promotion of by-gone railways reached a large audience, with LNWR’s picture postcards series reaching sales of 4 million by 1906. Whilst the Company’s publicity used LMR structures to create a narrative of continuity between the 1830s and 1900s, they did little to preserve the remnants of the demolished bridge.

Section 3: The Liverpool and Manchester Railway Centenary

In this section, I demonstrate how the 1930 Centenary of the LMR created a strong association between the history of the line and Railway’s stations and infrastructure hitherto unseen on such a scale. Memorialisation of the Railway occurred in multiple ways, performed simultaneously by different groups. In Section 3.1, I briefly explore how the S&D Centenary in 1925 influenced the nature of the LMR Centenary, focussing on the role of London and North Eastern Railway Company (LNER) as organisers of events held in Darlington. I also include an outline of alternative celebrations produced ‘by railwaymen for railwaymen’ in Manchester, which established a significant connection between the 1925 and 1930 centenaries. In Section 3.2, I show how the narratives of railway history and Liverpool city history were brought together at LMR Centenary events held at Wavertree Playground from 13 to 20 September 1930. This was largely due to the London Midland Scottish (LMS) Railway Company’s publicity agenda and the use of the Centenary by Liverpool Council in lieu of a Civic Week. Civic Weeks were exhibitions devised as an economic stimulant for the regions as a part of the British Empire Exhibition; after 1924, numerous councils continued to showcase their past achievements and present prospects annually. Manchester was on the fringe of celebrations, yet Liverpool Road Station did receive unprecedented commemorative attention with the unveiling of a plaque by local dignitaries. In Section 3.3, I demonstrate how press reports on the Manchester ceremony presented the Liverpool Road as authentic and historic. In the concluding Section 3.4, I analyse the legacy of the Centenary, particularly how the press coverage of the ‘original

89 SIM 1983.9.2.62: Dendy Marshall Collection, three LNWR postcards showing the same views as plates 3, 6 and 12 of the Ackermann prints (noted by collector Dendy Marshall) and 1983.9.2.44: Dendy Marshall Collection, four LNWR postcards from the series ‘Railways in the Thirties’ c.1904-05.
90 TNA RAIL 410/723: LNWR Canvassers Conference 1886 – 1906, minutes of canvassers conference 29 Mar 1906.
91 Thomas Hulme, ‘A Nation of Town Criers’, p.270.
station’ led to further fame for Liverpool Road locally and nationally. The Station began to be conceptualised as a ‘site of memory’ by groups, particularly railway enthusiasts and local actors by the outbreak of the Second World War.

3.1 The influence of the Stockton and Darlington Anniversary

After the First World War, the 1920s marked a revival in anniversary celebrations. Pageantry (popularised in the Edwardian period) became a common form of historical celebration with municipal authorities, many of which had charter celebrations or centenaries of incorporation to mark. Ayako Yoshino has suggested that inter-war period pageants bore similar characteristics to Edwardian pageantry, with a ‘much more historical and spectacular treatment’. In 1923, the rationalisation of the railways into the ‘Big Four’ groupings created vast railway systems. LMS was the largest of the four, which incorporated the LNWR lines in the North West of England and London as well as some Welsh and Scottish railways and the Midland Railway. Like their predecessors, who took historic locomotives to world fairs and used their images as marketing tools, the ‘Big Four’ acted swiftly to establish a longer history by celebrating the heritage of their subsidiary lines. For both municipal authorities and businesses like the ‘Big Four’ railway companies, investment in public celebrations and pageantry was essentially an exercise in publicity.
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92 Ibid., p.274.
95 For example, in NRM: Collection, LNWR Ledger of Models, LNWR displayed an 1842 London and Birmingham Railway carriage – Queen Adelaide’s Saloon, along with a turn of the century ‘Diamond Jubilee’ class engine at the 1910 Japan-British Exhibition.
The London and North Eastern Railway Company (LNER), which succeeded the NER in 1923, emulated the events of the 1875 S&D Jubilee for the Centenary on a grander scale. Familiar tropes of progress, imperial dominance through technology and George Stephenson mythology were prominent. The celebrations began on 1 July 1925 with the Duke of York’s royal visit to Darlington. Events took place in July, earlier than the exact anniversary, to allow for visitors from the International Railway Congress in London. The international audience highlights the role of the Centenary in trade and place promotion. The main event was a cavalcade of historic and contemporary locomotives with ‘Locomotion No. 1’ as the finale. The procession featured six tableaux showing the development of the railways [Figure 9], firmly entrenched with an imperial view of innovation, and to some extent the democratisation of travel by Stephenson as the railway is contrasted with travel facilitated by enslaved people. The sequence began with a ‘symbolic wheel’ devised by early astrologers, followed by ‘the first wheel’, Pharaohs drawn by slaves on wheeled platforms,

---


the abandonment of the wheel for the Sedan chair, then George Stephenson inventing a locomotive in the fifth tableau, with the global adoption of railways completing the sequence. In *Modern Transport*, ‘Stephenson explains the workings of ‘Rocket’’ captioned the image of the fifth scene, although the actor playing George Stephenson is stood in front of his S&D engine, ‘Locomotion No. 1’ - this mistake exemplifies the prominence of the Robert Stephenson’s ‘Rocket’ in Stephenson mythology.

The S&D Centenary was an important moment in the collective memories of railway workers and enthusiasts, as well as those of Stockton and Darlington residents, and, rather surprisingly, Mancunians. A committee of railway workers and ‘railwaymen’s wives’ planned a ‘Railway Man’s Pageant’ to take place on 27 September 1925, the precise centenary of the S&D Railway. The inclusion of ‘railwaymen’s wives’ in the organisation reflects the imagined community of the ‘railway family’. Yet, not all railway workers were men – there women were employed on ‘female pay grades’ (like cooks, clerical workers, carriage cleaners) and a small number remained on ‘male grades’ in roles taken up during the First World War. *The Manchester Guardian* credited a ‘shunter of Edge Hill, Liverpool’ as instigating the event. *Modern Transport* championed the success of railway workers as organisers and performers in the Pageant of Transport, whilst *The Manchester Guardian* applauded the unions for setting aside rivalries ‘to meet in the name of George Stephenson and pay a common tribute to his greatness’.

The Pageant took place at Belle Vue in Manchester, a site used for mass entertainment from zoological gardens to mazes and fairground rides, far from the places associated with the S&D in the North-East. The pageant received support from the three largest railways unions, LMS, LNER (with the loan of ‘Locomotion No. 1’ for the display) and Lancashire politicians including the Mayors of Manchester and Liverpool. However, unlike the events in Stockton and Darlington, aimed at elite spectators and International Railway Congress
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delegates, the Belle Vue pageant was presented as a democratic event for railway workers. The event sold out, with fifty thousand spectators and ‘a ticketless crowd outside’. The Manchester link to the S&D Centenary was highlighted by references to the forthcoming LMR Centenary and Stephenson’s most ‘notable invention’, ‘Rocket’. The legendary status afforded by ‘Rocket’ was never far from rhetoric surrounding the Liverpool and Manchester Railway. The Railway Man’s Pageant created a new tradition; from 1925, Belle Vue hosted an annual railwayman’s carnival and the crowning of the national Railway Queen until 1975.

The S&D Centenary was also significant in bringing the early railway story into the historical consciousness amongst thousands of volunteers and through press attention both locally and nationally. Trade publication Modern Transport reflected on the emerging tradition of railway celebrations in editorials throughout the summer of 1925. Shortly after the official opening of the Darlington celebration, an editorial examined the ‘many interesting stories of earlier times in the history of the British Railways… given publicity in recent weeks’. Counter narratives emerged, written by authors keen to cite their preferred location as the site of the ‘first railway’. For example, in the column ‘Railway Centenary Echo’, the author suggested that Swansea should have played host to celebrations in 1904 to commemorate Richard Trevithick’s locomotive, first run at Merthyr Tydfil in 1804. Debates surrounding which innovations deserve public celebrations and recognition resonate today in the realm of railway enthusiast publications.

These celebrations influenced those staged for the LMR Centenary in 1930, I suggest in three ways: firstly, the scale of public events, exhibition and the cavalcade set a standard for the rival railway company (LNWR) to follow. Secondly, the centrality of the story of George Stephenson’s ingenuity and the development of locomotives, especially ‘Rocket’, drew a common line between the centenaries. Thirdly, the mass appeal of the S&D

104 Manchester Guardian (28 Sept 1925), p.11.
celebrations, including the pageant held at Belle Vue in Manchester, firmly established the narrative of railway progress in the popular imagination.

3.2 Liverpool & Manchester Railway Centenary: a celebration of Liverpool

The Liverpool & Manchester Railway Centenary was a Liverpool civic initiative, although LMS were the main funders of the venture, providing £30,000,109 a marked contrast to LNWR’s omission of a Jubilee celebration in 1880. Liverpool Council granted £2700 for street decorations, which included a decorative archway at Liverpool Lime Street Station, the terminus at the city’s municipal centre.110 As Charlotte Wildman has shown, the dominant narrative of interwar Northern industrial decline has overshadowed the ‘level of dynamism and innovation shown by local rulers in Liverpool and Manchester.’111 Celebrations held from 13 to 20 September 1930 were planned by an Organising Committee appointed by the Liverpool Organisation, a group established by Councils of Merseyside (Liverpool, Birkenhead) to promote the trade interests of the district. The Organising Committee were based at the Royal Liver Building, where numerous staff reportedly coordinated four thousand volunteers.112 Liverpool Council fully embraced the Centenary celebrations in lieu of their annual Civic Week.113

In 1926, Manchester and Liverpool had engaged in a ‘spur of rivalry’ over their respective Civic Week celebrations.114 Co-operation between Liverpool and Manchester in civic events was unusual; in 1930 this was the result of pressure exhorted upon Manchester by prominent engineering professionals, to whom both George and Robert Stephenson were


112 Liverpool Archive: Corporation of Liverpool Town Hall Department file 291, Railway Centenary Celebrations file; The Liverpool Echo (27 Aug 1930) suggests four thousand pageant participants included 3500 performers.


established figureheads. On 2 May 1930, Manchester Council received a letter from Beyer Peacock’s Metallurgical Engineer, Ernest F. Lang. Lang cited discussions on commemorating the centenary between ‘various Engineering and other Technical Institutions’, enquiring whether Manchester had any official civic plans. Manchester Town Hall Committee swiftly approached LMS and Liverpool Council to join plans for the Centenary Celebrations. Prior to Lang’s enquiry, Councillors did not raise the Centenary, suggesting the letter from the eminent engineer influenced their participation.

The inclusion of Manchester in the weeklong celebrations was due to the good will of the Organising Committee, who offered to make the Mayor of Manchester a co-president alongside Liverpool’s. The Honorary Secretary of the Committee wrote ‘we desire to associate Manchester in a most intimate fashion’, admitting that thus far the plans were jointly made between Liverpool Council and LMS. By mid-July 1930, a trip along the original line and the inclusion of a visit to Manchester with a stop at ‘the original Manchester Station’ was agreed. Manchester Councillors commissioned a commemorative plaque for Liverpool Road Station, which LMS allowed to be unveiled at the Station during the mayoral visit. The absence of maritime achievements marked a further departure from Liverpool’s 1926 Civic Week celebration. A Pageant of Transport was the highlight of the LMR Centenary, yet this only featured land and rail transportation; the Daily Dispatch ran the headline ‘Cutting the Sea out of Its [Liverpool’s] Pageantry’.

The Centenary marked a rare moment of inter-city co-operation and a break with tradition.
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115 See R.A. Buchanan, ‘Gentleman Engineers’; MacLeod, Heroes of Invention, chapter 11.
118 Liverpool Archive: file 291, Agenda of Centenary Celebrations Executive Committee meeting at the Adelphi Hotel, Liverpool 19 May 1930.
119 Liverpool Archive: file 291, copy of letter sent from the Honorary Secretary of the Railway Centenary Committee to Councillor R. Norton Barclay, Mayor of Manchester 22 May 1930.
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for Liverpool where maritime heritage, rather than railway history, was bound with its imperial port city image.\footnote{See Tony Lane, \textit{Liverpool: City of the Sea} (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997), chapter 1 on sea and ships in local memory.}

The head of the Liverpool Organisation and secretary of the Joint Civic Committee was Matthew Anderson, a former journalist and self-styled publicity expert; Anderson authored Manchester Council’s first annual publicity handbook, \textit{How Manchester is Managed}.\footnote{Hulme, ‘A Nation of Town Criers’, pp.281.} Anderson made a clear statement of purpose: the Organising Committee sought ‘a world-wide advertisement for Merseyside’. Ahead of the Centenary, Anderson emphasised that over £35,000 was being spent in Merseyside ‘at a time of trade depression’.\footnote{Liverpool Archive: Hf 385.2CEN Centenary Cuttings: \textit{The Daily Post and Mercury} (Liverpool) (4 Sept 1930).} There were expectations of economic benefits for both Liverpool and the railway network. LMS funded the event despite a reduction in freight revenue attributed to the effects of road haulage competition and stoppages in the Lancashire cotton industry.\footnote{TNA: RAIL 1030/156 Map of the London Midland & Scottish Railway and its connections, 1939.} Whilst the advantages to the region were clear, it is less obvious why LMS invested so much in celebrating this relatively small area of their line, which spanned from Southend on Sea to Thurso in Scotland.\footnote{O. S. Nock, \textit{A History of the LMS} volume 1: The First Years, 1923–1930 (Leicester: Guild Publishing, 1985), p.61.} The focus on LMR heritage was contrary to the ethos of ‘think LMS’ (over its constituent lines) fostered by Chairman, Sir Josiah Stamp.\footnote{TNA: RAIL 425/7 LMSR Advertising and Publicity department, copies of minutes and reports (1923-1929). Report to the Board on Advertising, May 1929, compares the publicity methods of LMS with LNER p.14.} However, there is evidence that the Advertising and Publicity Department of LMS borrowed ideas from the LNER Company,\footnote{TNA: RAIL 418/1 LMSR Minutes of Proceedings of the Court of Proprietors 1926 – 1931, 9th Annual General Meeting 27 Feb 1931, pp.13-19, p.26.} whose S&D anniversary events provided a promotional template and a national narrative to exploit. This inter-Company rivalry could account for the enthusiasm for the Centenary expressed publicly by Stamp.\footnote{Liverpool Archive Hf 385.2CEN Centenary Cuttings, \textit{Liverpool Echo} (20 Sept 1930).}

The largest event at the Centenary was the Pageant of Transport held at Wavertree Playground throughout the week, with over 3500 voluntary performers. The script was written by Anderson, who produced a narrative of ‘transport down the ages’, beginning

\footnote{\textcopyright 2023 John Doe. All rights reserved.}
with prehistoric ‘cave’ people, then the ancients with the ‘crude’ wheeled carriage driven by slaves in Egypt [Figure 10], Chinese handbarrows, Egyptian chariots, then a scene in Spain featuring Don Quixote on horseback. Anderson clearly built upon the milestones in transport history presented in the S&D Centenary tableaux, particularly the ‘crude’ wheel and Egyptian scenes. Anderson’s pageant also bore remarkable similarities with the Pageant of Transport held at Belle Vue in September 1925, with British and colonial modes of transport represented in a progressive chronological order. Even Belle Vue Zoo’s elephants had a starring role demonstrating ‘Indian Transport’. The three performances presented the railway as a triumph of British ingenuity, advancing global transport methods, appealing to contemporary imperial sentiments. The re-use of the scenes from 1925 further entrenched the progressive narrative of transport technology in the imagination of railway workers and their families.

Figure 10. A scene of slave driving from the Pageant of Transport, intended to represent early land transport in the narrative of technological progress devised by Anderson (SIM: Beyer Peacock Quarterly Review (Manchester), Oct 1930, p.30).

132 Liverpool Archive: Hf 385.2CEN Centenary Cuttings contains a bound copy of the script for ‘Pageant of Transport by Matthew Anderson’.
The second act of Anderson’s Pageant bound his contrasting technological epochs of past and present with class distinction and Northern identity. Opening with ‘Lancashire in the pre-railway period’, a folklore vision of Lancashire witches on broomsticks emphasised the region’s remoteness. This was followed by ‘the fight against progress’, a debate scene between two groups. The ‘stagnation group’ were described in late eighteenth and early nineteenth century costume and given simian traits ‘from the waist downwards the body is like that of an ape with a pre-historic tail’. In Anderson’s draft script, this group explicitly comprised Oxford academics and Etonians who rejected advances in transport from stagecoaches to the railway. Actors in the ‘progress group’ were younger and dressed in contemporary sports attire in contrast to the formality of the ‘stagnation group’. The distinction between the Southern, academic elite and the youthful cosmopolitans was daring, considering guests invited to the performance included the local landed elite, national statesmen and international ambassadors. Anderson appealed to Northern tradition and dialect, as the ‘progress group’ sang ‘d’ye ken John Peel?’ [do you know John Peel] in Cumbrian dialect at the Etonians.\(^\text{135}\) This intriguing scene places social and technological progress firmly in the North.

3.3 At Liverpool Road

Amidst the theatrics of the Centenary, elsewhere, a desire to uphold historical authenticity marked a shift in commemorative activity. Like the 1925 Belle Vue Pageant before it, the 1930 event would be held on the exact anniversary date; it would also, the organisers determined, take place on a relevant site.\(^\text{136}\) In March 1930, officials visited Crown Street - the Liverpool terminus, and explored the Station still in use at Edge Hill.\(^\text{137}\) Crown Street [Figure 13] was in a poor state of repair, re-used as goods and coal yard, the 1830 passenger buildings were incomplete.\(^\text{138}\) In contrast, at Liverpool Road the re-use of passenger facilities for freight offices and storerooms ensured the Georgian building was

\(^{135}\) Liverpool Archive Hf 385.2CEN Centenary Cuttings, ‘Pageant of Transport by Matthew Anderson’ draft script.

\(^{136}\) Manchester Guardian (11 Aug 1925), p.11.

\(^{137}\) Liverpool Archive Hf 385.2CEN Centenary Cuttings, The Liverpool Echo (Liverpool) showed photographs of the visit by officials, (31 Mar 1930).

preserved. On 19 May 1930, exhibition organiser, Robert Gladstone, questioned the absence of the Crown Street in celebrations, stating: ‘something should be done to mark the original terminus’.139 The authenticity of LMR sites and infrastructure was important to the Centenary organisers who welcomed the suggestion of an excursion ‘on the actual line’ to Manchester by Mayor Robert Barclay.140 On 15 September 1930, Liverpool Road Station was briefly at the centre of events marking the one hundredth anniversary of the LMR. Through its survival, the Manchester terminus became the focus of memorialisation.

![The Centenary plaque unveiled at Liverpool Road Station on 15 September 1930 (SIM Collection)](image)

**Figure 11.** The Centenary plaque unveiled at Liverpool Road Station on 15 September 1930 (SIM Collection)

The visit to Liverpool Road Station by the Mayors of Liverpool and Manchester, along with municipal and railway officials, attracted ample press coverage in the North West [Figure 12], as well as national newspapers like *The Times*.141 Reports provide an insight into how the buildings were presented and perceived. As the Station had not received passengers
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139 Liverpool Archive: file 291 LMR Centenary Celebrations minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee, held in the Adelphi Hotel, Liverpool, 19 May 1930.

140 Liverpool Archive: file 291 Correspondence from Lord Mayor of Manchester, R. N. Barclay to the Lord Mayor of Liverpool, 19 June 1930.

since May 1844, the party travelled along the original line but then diverted at the Ordsall Junction to arrive at Victoria Station. From there, a procession of cars travelled across the city to Liverpool Road Station, which was adorned with bunting and union jacks. The commemorative plaque [Figure 11] was ceremonially mounted to the Station’s street level façade. The Liverpool Echo indicated that a large crowd witnessed the unveiling, whilst the Manchester Guardian presented a more subdued, ‘brief’ affair. Employees of the Station, interviewed in 1980, recalled it was ‘regarded as an ordinary working day’, although office staff were permitted to view the unveiling. According to the Liverpool Post & Mercury, the dignitaries entered the Station from the original entrance and ‘by way of a flight of stairs reached the level of the original line, and saw the actual station’. The visitors also explored the 1830 Warehouse described as the ‘old banqueting hall’ in reports, based on its use during the LMR opening ceremony. The Warehouse’s continuous use for goods was unknown to the reporter who declared the ‘banqueting hall’ was ‘now used as a warehouse for timber.’ The specificity of place and the emphasis on using the ‘actual’ line and ‘original’ building in various accounts highlights a growing awareness of urban memory and a desire for authentic historical re-enactment.

142 Liverpool Archive: Hf 385.2CEN Newspaper Cuttings, Liverpool Echo, (15 Sept 1930).
145 Liverpool Archive: Hf 385.2CEN Newspaper Cuttings, Post & Mercury (Liverpool) (16 Sept 1930)
146 Liverpool Archive: Hf 385.2CEN Newspaper Cuttings, Evening Express (Liverpool), (15 Sept 1930).
The Mayors at the unveiling ceremony contrastingly emphasised the present economic situation and past glories. Lawrence Holt, Mayor of Liverpool, used boosterist rhetoric to encourage global investors, whilst Robert Barclay, Mayor of Manchester, presented an historic sense of place at the Station. Holt’s speech connected the 1830 venture to the contemporary LMS system as ‘an example of railway progress to the rest of the world,’ whilst Barclay focussed on the Station.147 Barclay stated that ‘although the building wasn’t

147 Evening Express, (15 Sept 1930).
much to look at, they were very proud to think that it was the first railway station’.\footnote{Manchester Guardian, (16 Sept 1930), p.14.} Whilst dismissive of the aesthetics, Barclay highlighted the significance assigned to the materiality of the Station, declaring:

> It is only fitting in this celebration that we should take the opportunity of placing on the walls of this building – the first railway station in Manchester – a tablet which will be a reminder to all of this unique occasion.\footnote{Liverpool Archive: Hf 385.2CEN Newspaper Cuttings: Evening Express (Liverpool, England) (15 Sept 1930).}

The framing of the Station as the first in Manchester is intriguing, as it had been declared ‘oldest in the world’ in engineering trade literature since about 1880; local newspapers also reported on the unveiling as being at the ‘first railway station.’\footnote{Ibid., Daily Dispatch (Manchester, England) (16 Sept 1930); Manchester Guardian (16 Sept 1930), p.14.} There was a subtext of modesty in Barclay’s speech, in which he emphasised the role of Liverpool in the foundation of the Railway. Yet, the long-term effect of this event displaced Liverpool’s prominence in LMR commemoration, with the ‘first’ and ‘oldest’ station title widely known by the 150th anniversary (see Chapter 5 Section 1.1).

As well as the familiar account of progress espoused by Holt, Barclay invoked an image of George Stephenson, the ‘erstwhile poor Northumbrian miner who drove the first train’, during the unveiling.\footnote{Ibid., Evening Express (15 Sept 1930).} Regional newspapers reported Stephenson’s humble beginnings, whilst his role as civil engineer of the line (as opposed to a mechanical engineer associated with ‘Rocket’) is largely absent.\footnote{Ibid., Post & Mercury (16 Sept 1930); Evening Express (15 Sept 1930); Manchester Guardian (16 Sept 1930), p.14.} In the ample Centenary coverage, Stephenson was upheld as a hero not only of invention, but also of democracy, with Liverpool’s Post & Mercury focussing on the mass movement of people enabled by the railway system.\footnote{Ibid., Post & Mercury (28 Jun 1930) and (1 Sept 1930).} The association of technological progress with political change was exemplified in Anderson’s ‘fight against progress’ scene in the Pageant of Transport. As railway technology was presented as a force for democracy, events like the Railwayman’s Pageant and Railway Queen Ceremonies at Belle Vue were, rather pertinently, at the fore of the democratisation of history. This public history had a significant audience of workers and enthusiasts – who
became the body Raphael Samuel presented as the archetypal group in the
democratisation of history in the 1950s: the railway preservation movement.\textsuperscript{154}

![A Former Liverpool Landmark](image)

**Figure 13.** The remnants of the passenger station at Crown Street were further damaged by enemy action in May 1941. Photo in *Railway Magazine* (March 1950) vol. 96, no. 587, p.155.

3.4 The legacy of the 1930 Centenary

Across Section 3, I have illustrated how the Centenary celebrations brought the narrative of the LMR and Stephenson to local audiences. These events left impressions on Liverpool and Manchester; for example, in a material sense, the commemorative plaque remained on Liverpool Road until the 1970s. Beyond local memory and that of railway specialists, the Centenary brought the LMR story to national audiences, especially boys framed as scientists and engineers of the future. For example, *Meccano Magazine* explicitly for ‘boys of all ages’, reached over 70,000 readers by the close of the decade, a larger audience than comparative adult popular science magazines.\textsuperscript{155} Figure 14 shows the brightly coloured front cover depicting a re-imagined view of the Moorish Arch from the T.T. Bury series in honour of Centenary.\textsuperscript{156} As was typical, the front cover related to a ‘real world’ topic


\textsuperscript{155} Peter J. Bowler, ‘*Meccano Magazine*: boys’ toys and the popularization of science in early twentieth century Britain’, *BJHS Themes* vol.3 (2018), (pp.129–146), p.134.

covered in editorials rather than Meccano models advertised.\textsuperscript{157} In London, the Science Museum held a Centenary exhibition (as with the S&D Centenary in 1925) that furthered the salient points of LMR narrative in a national forum. Displays combined the surviving locomotives of Rainhill – ‘Rocket’, ‘San Pareil’ and a model of ‘Novelty’ with artworks, plans and ephemera in the now familiar motif of railway interpretation.\textsuperscript{158}

\textsuperscript{157} Bowler, ‘Meccano Magazine’, p.134.

Figure 14. Front cover of *Meccano Magazine* vol. 15, no. 9 September 1930. Illustration of the first journey along the Liverpool and Manchester Railway through the Moorish Arch at Edge Hill [NRM: W/15R].

Commemoration of the LMR maintained momentum during the 1930s. In 1935, yet another replica of ‘Rocket’ was commissioned, whilst ‘Lion’, recently restored for the Centenary, was filmed for ‘Victoria the Great’, a biopic of Queen Victoria released in
Other ‘relics’ such as the 1831 Ackermann prints continued to be circulated by collectors. 1937 to 1938 marked the one-hundredth anniversary of the London & Birmingham Railway (L&BR), which had ultimately linked London to Manchester via the Grand Junction Railway that connected with the LMR at Warrington. During the L&BR Centenary year, ‘the oldest station’ reappeared in the local press. In December 1937, The Liverpool Echo printed a photograph of a woman holding the ‘relic’ of Liverpool Road’s 1833 sundial. As with the LMR Centenary, LMS loaned the Science Museum objects for an exhibition of pictures, drawings and documents relating to the railway. The collection of ‘treasures’ amassed by LMS was extensive, with documents, guidebooks and artworks from the Liverpool and Manchester Railway usually displayed in the Directors Smoke Room at Euston Station (until to the Second World War). LMS continued to use commemorative memorabilia to attract publicity, with the striking of a bronze medallion for L&BR Centenary. Unlike LMR Centenary iconography, dominated by Stephenson and ‘Rocket’, the architectural feature of the Euston Arch represented the achievements of the L&BR.

Two years later, on 12 January 1939, a Pathé newsreel showed the ‘oldest station in the world’ to the nation. Whilst the newsreel showed wide-angle shots of the Georgian façade and close-ups of original features, there were no visuals of the contemporaneous freight operations. The ‘oldest’ or ‘first’ label, associated with the passenger narrative, maintained public interest in Liverpool Road Station prior to the Second World War.

---


161 Liverpool Archive: Hf 385.2CEN Newspaper Cuttings: Liverpool Echo (1 Dec 1937).

162 TNA ZSPC 11/555/2: Hayward Collection cuttings, Locomotive Magazine (Jul 1937)

163 TNA RAIL 425/1: LMSR portraits, drawings and other relics removal from Euston for safe custody with National Gallery, Bangor Dec 1940-March 1941.

Conclusion

Commemoration of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway reflects the expansion of heritage practices from the mid-nineteenth century to the twentieth century. Liverpool Road Station became a site of memory in the early twentieth century. This was largely due to new memory practices and the commercialisation of heritage by Railway Companies and local governments, but also reflects the perpetuation of LMR history in the collective memories of certain groups. From the 1880s to 1900s, articles in trade publications and artistic representations of the Station circulated the notion that Liverpool Road was the ‘oldest station in the world’. An historical consciousness emerged from publications by and for railwaymen and engineering professionals; both groups fostered a collective memory of the LMR, which influenced later heritage activities as I will discuss in chapters 4 and 5. The Water Street Bridge demolition in 1904 provoked Manchester local government and journalistic responses to the Station’s established significance in railway literature. During the demolition, local newspapers recounted the 1830 opening and the genius of George Stephenson. LMR history was explicitly linked with the surviving Station, endowing it with monumental status long before the emergence of industrial heritage.

With their shared heroic inventors and status, it is important to consider how LMR histories circulated alongside those of the Stockton and Darlington Railway, and their combined role in embedding new memory practices. Like Robert Stephenson’s ‘Rocket’ preserved at the Patent Museum in 1862, George Stephenson’s ‘Locomotion No. 1’ became a symbol of the S&D when it was permanently displayed on a plinth in Darlington in 1857. Ben Roberts has shown the NER and later the LNER Companies exploited S&D history as a marketing tool. Company Directors were often council officials, thus railway heritage was bound with nascent civic identity. Like the 1875 S&D Jubilee celebrations, the 50th anniversary of the LMR received attention from local and national newspapers; however, unlike the S&D, neither railway nor civic celebrations were held in 1880. As Engineering and The Engineer lamented the absence of ceremony, they suggested the original buildings at Liverpool Road were a fitting place for commemoration. This focus on the Station itself was a relatively radical suggestion, as sites in living memory were not considered heritage spaces, which were largely non-urban and rooted in rustic ‘Olde England’ in the late nineteenth century.

---

Further comparisons have been drawn between commemoration of the LMR in Liverpool and Manchester, prompting the question why didn’t Liverpool go on a develop a railway heritage site? Of the two cities, initially Liverpool developed a stronger association with LMR history as proponents of the Railway perpetuated their own version of events. In 1854, the ritual unveiling of George Stephenson’s statue inside St George’s Hall, a great civic monument in Liverpool, created a site of memory – an action that was simultaneously material, symbolic and functional. By the 1930 Centenary, the Liverpool Organisation used LMR heritage to boost Liverpool’s civic image whilst the LMS Railway Company capitalised on it for promotional purposes. Whilst Liverpool’s original Crown Street terminus was in a state of disrepair, other Liverpool sites like Edge Hill Station could have been selected for commemoration. Yet, the Liverpool Road Station site was chosen as an ‘authentic’ place to memorialise the one-hundredth anniversary, shifting LMR railway heritage to Manchester.

On 15 September 1930, a pilgrimage of local government and railway grandees travelled along the original route (as far as they could) to Liverpool Road, where a plaque was unveiled: ‘affixed to the first railway station in Manchester.’ This permanent memorial was the legacy of the Centenary; the site attracted further local and national attention as ‘oldest in the world’ in the later 1930s. The Station’s story - fixed as an LMR passenger station of the LMR– was too much of a determining influence on the urban memory of the site, which was transformed into a space for heritage within these parameters. Its role as a freight station for over 150 years is largely forgotten, through the following two chapters I aim to redress the historiographical imbalance.
Chapter 2

Beyond the passenger story:

Liverpool Road Station as a centre for Manchester goods

*Within 15 years its [the Liverpool Road site’s] role as a passenger station had been taken over by other, more conveniently sited stations with more up-to-date facilities, and it was reduced to the status of a goods depot.*

– Andrew Davison

Introduction

By the Centenary of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway (LMR), civic actors locally and railway enthusiasts globally memorialised Liverpool Road as ‘the oldest station in the world’. A significant limitation of this invented tradition was the absence of freight. Whilst engineering achievements are elevated, the ‘oldest’ grand narrative largely encompasses the movement of people and the genius of the individual: George Stephenson. I propose that goods, including animals, figure far less owing to the relatability of the passenger story and appeal of inventor-hero narratives (outlined in Chapter 1). The focus of this chapter is what can be gained by exploring the freight uses of the Station from the 1840s until the 1910s. Historic England’s principal inspector of ancient monuments in the North-West, Andrew Davison, defended the Station’s significance during the public enquiry into the Ordsall Chord railway that ultimately severed the mainline rail link to Liverpool Road in 2017. Davison’s comments reflect the popular understanding: the Station was ‘reduced’ to a goods station after just fourteen years as a passenger station.¹ Indeed, in contemporary sources, this change is presented as a demotion for Liverpool Road, as the new passenger terminus, Victoria Station, was applauded as ‘magnificent’ ²

---


² ‘Railway Intelligence’ in The Standard (London) and syndicated in other national newspapers, 1 Jan 1844.
The rhetorical focus of commemoration on the passenger period obscures that, for contemporaries, it was the rapid movement of freight that affected their everyday lives. The passenger period was highly exclusive—a point often overlooked in popular historiography as a picture of inevitability leads readers from the LMR to later moves to democratise transport. Freight, however, transported on the railway from December 1830 until April 1975, was primarily materials available to all. Unsurprisingly, cotton was a large proportion of freight transported to Manchester; this raw material was processed across the region, providing mass employment. Manchester was compared to a spider at the centre of a web as railway lines extended to Lancashire’s cotton towns. Other goods entering Liverpool Road fed the City, from coal for fuel to fresh food and livestock. Roger Scola highlighted the success of LMR pig traffic, as the railway transported the bulk of Irish pigs imported via Liverpool docks. Not all livestock entered Liverpool Road, cattle were unloaded at Cross Lane close to a cattle market and later uncoupled at Ordsall Lane, along with hay and straw. Understanding nuances of the freight network provides an insight into the geographies of infrastructure essential to the burgeoning population of Victorian Manchester.

---

3 In popular history, a linear story casts the LMR as sowing the seeds of later developments in third class and suburban travel. For example: Simon Bradley, *The Railways: Nation, Network, People* (London: Profile Books, 2015) p.73.

4 *The Manchester Guardian* (Manchester, England) 11 Dec 1830, p.2; TNA AN169/207: BR Property Board, Buildings of historical or architectural interest: Liverpool Road Station 1974 – 5, copy of correspondence to BR Public Relations states that Blue Circles Aggregate Ltd. continued to use the Station on a ‘week by week’ basis, 18 Apr 1975.


6 Roger Scola, *Feeding the Victorian City: The food supply of Manchester, 1770-1870* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992), p.52; p.112. Scola refers to W.A. Graham’s 1846 statistical enquiry that demonstrates the LMR was one of the most significant railways for pig traffic.

7 RAIL 946/9: LNWR Northern Division timetables, July 1882.
Figure 1. Sketch of Liverpool Road Station by the engineer, James Nasmyth, circa 1840. An omnibus can be seen (bottom right) transferring passengers on Liverpool Road. The original Down Goods (or ‘shipping’) Shed is illustrated (top right) and is the only depiction of this discovered. Carts, cranes and hoists are shown moving goods around the station. Nasmyth has omitted the series of turntables and the rail connection in-between the 1830 buildings, which can be seen on later maps. SIM Collection: YA 2002.28.

James Nasmyth’s illustration [Figure 1] provides a sense of movement at the Station where engines shunted freight, wagons ran along tracks and rotated on turntables, cranes and hoists lifted loads, rails went into a Downs Goods Shed with platforms for transhipment, and clusters of warehousing loomed over the urban topography. Unlike the palace-like constructions in Manchester’s warehouse district, the early railway warehouses did not appeal to the consumer, rather operated as sites of storage and transition. Liverpool Road Station was an experimental space: the passenger buildings followed stagecoach conventions and the first railway warehouse borrowed from canal warehouse design. It was one of numerous 1830s to 1840s stations originally used for passengers and goods adapted to provide railway companies with freight hubs near urban centres. As Jack Simmons summarised, these early stations were inadequate for steadily growing traffic,

railway companies added to existing buildings ‘until each held a disorderly clutch’.\textsuperscript{9} Whilst passenger stations were re-built in the latest steel and glass fashions, freight buildings were altered and adapted to meet the demands of the expanding network. Additions to old buildings and the adoption of new technologies alongside older forms at Liverpool Road typify the commercial evolution of freight stations, in contrast with the well-documented prototype nature of the passenger buildings.

The historiographic marginalisation of freight stations and warehousing is curious, as these structures lends themselves to Manchester’s image as ‘warehouse city’. By the 1840s, Manchester was characterised as the ‘shock city’ of the industrial age,\textsuperscript{10} a narrative materially represented in history by cotton mills and increasingly ‘warehouses of the world’.\textsuperscript{11} The LMR’s original purpose was to transport goods between Liverpool and Manchester; from December 1830 it became a major supply-line for Lancashire’s cotton industry. Whilst industrial archaeologists and architectural historians have applauded 1830s freight innovations,\textsuperscript{12} the prominence of the ‘oldest’ trope in directing research (see Literature Review: Section 7) has led to the omission of decades of subsequent adaptations and continuities that enable us to better comprehend the role of the Station across its lifetime. The persistence of this skew in coverage demonstrates the power of the passenger focussed urban memory of the Station and raises questions of the visibility of freight infrastructure in the City. Railway stations, warehouses, bridges and viaducts were vast, yet received little commentary from contemporaries.

The pervading decline narrative of the area generated from the mid-nineteenth century onwards has contributed to the negative rhetoric surrounding Liverpool Road Station as a space for freight traffic. As highlighted in the literature review, historians and geographers

\textsuperscript{9} Jack Simmons, \textit{The Victorian Railway} (London: Thames & Hudson, 1991) p.43.


\textsuperscript{12} Jack Simmons, \textit{Victorian Railway}, p.43.
of Castlefield remark that the later nineteenth century was the start of inevitable decline, yet, in this Chapter, I present evidence of improvements and expansion to the Station despite fluctuations in Manchester’s economy. Commentators from the railway trade and national press began to be refer to Liverpool Road as ‘the former station’ ‘the old station’ and its role described as ‘solely goods’ in 1844.\textsuperscript{13} Yet, there is an issue surrounding the visibility of freight in responses to the site; compared with the lived-experience of passenger travel, goods traffic was not relatable and rarely commented upon. Expansion, continuities and the adoption of new technologies figured here present complexities and fluctuations rather than a lengthy or inevitable decline in North-West industry. Through studying freight uses, allowing for economic fluctuations, continual adaptions and innovations present a resilient Station at the start of the twentieth century rather than one in decline.

In Section 1, I present the Station in transition, from a combined passenger and goods operation to purely freight from May 1844. This includes the uses of buildings, and the effects of this change in purpose upon working and social spaces. I also map the effects of a partnership with the Grand Junction Railway (GJR) upon working spaces. Preparations to facilitate more freight, such as a new pig station, present the end of the passenger service as a business opportunity; optimism contrary to the simplistic post-passenger decline narrative. Section 2 illuminates the Station’s expansion from 1854 to 1882, which was influenced by both decisive plans and external factors. The destruction of warehouses by fire on 23 May 1866 enabled a series of planned changes and provides a rare insight into perceptions of the Station, as freight so rarely appears in commentary. Further influences of Company partnerships are highlighted, as the Great Western Railway (GWR) possessed running powers (access along the line) that led to both the expansion of facilities and significant delays in warehouse construction. In Section 3, I explore power transformations at the Station up to the twentieth century. Working spaces were shaped by highly visible haulage machinery and by utilities and power networks hidden from view. For example, a hydraulic power system installed in the 1860s enabled the manipulation of heavier lifting equipment like capstans, re-shaping outside operations. Whilst significant changes to the layout and buildings ceased after 1889, the Station was updated and adapted with new technologies in power and lighting. Although perceptions during this period are difficult to

\textsuperscript{13} Railway Record (London), 11 May 1844, p.113; Railway Chronicle 11 May 1844.
gauge from the source base, it is still possible to enhance our understanding of place with the details of everyday life at Liverpool Road.

Section 1: Liverpool Road Station re-defined

In this section, I outline passenger and goods operations from 1830 to 1844, considering uses of buildings and spaces; the visibility of freight is clear despite scant mention in contemporary responses to the railway. In section 1.1, coverage includes the no longer extant arrival station, a forgotten warehouse and booking office re-organisation that shows passenger class distinction ceased to influence Station arrangements after just seven years. In section 1.2, I assess the impact of the disappearance of passengers from the scene, from closures of facilities for people to the expansion of infrastructure for animals. Liverpool Road’s role as a node in Manchester’s freight network is the focus of 1.3, against the rapid expansion of the network. In the 1850s, Liverpool Road with sister station, Ordsall Lane, were modernised to facilitate more traffic. Whilst London Road Station (Store Street before 1847), run jointly between LNWR and the Manchester, Sheffield and Lincolnshire Railway Company, outgrew Liverpool Road to become the area’s principal freight station, the expansion of the oldest station steadily continued.\(^\text{14}\) The significant freight role performed by the Station is disguised by accounts of the ‘old station’ as the passenger period began to be historicised.

1.1 Passengers and goods

Although freight was the impetus for constructing the railway, the LMR prioritised its pioneering passenger service. This began on 15 September 1830, whilst freight trains were not trialled until 4 December 1830.\(^\text{15}\) The delay in freight was attributed to the lack of engines, according the *Liverpool Mercury*, only nine operated in November with George


\(^{15}\) *The Manchester Guardian* (11 Dec 1830), p.2.
Stephenson aiming for five more to haul goods by 1831. The transportation of the first Royal Mail coaches began slightly earlier on 30 November 1830, marking the first conveyance of mail by railway. The 1831 Sketch of Carriages by W. Crane [Figure 2], a Chester based engraver of industrial scenes, presents how the trains were organised: the first class with a Royal Mail carriage, second class with a wheeled carriage behind, and the goods and cattle train carrying livestock, coke, wood and bales of cotton. The railway’s rules and regulations dictated that freight should be moved onto sidings to allow passenger trains priority. As freight was not initially set to a specific timetable, it is unclear how often goods trains might have been encountered by passengers. A rare insight is provided by American journalist, George Putman, who noted on a journey in 1838 that of eight or ten trains his passed some carried coal or cotton. This indicates a degree of visibility of freight to the passenger, which is difficult to ascertain from accounts of the early railway focused on the novelty of people travel, the taming of nature and engineering feats.

---


17 RAIL 1134/221 Rules and Regulations of L&MR, 1840, indicate the priority for the schedule of passenger trains. Freight trains were ideally set off half an hour before (cited in Donaghy, Liverpool & Manchester Railway Operations pp.104-105.)

18 George Palmer Putnam, The Tourist in Europe or a concise summary of the various routes, objects of interest in Great Britain, France, Switzerland, Italy, Germany, Belgium, and Holland (Wiley & Putnam New York, 1838), p.81.

19 Responses to the LMR centre on the experience of travel, one of the most quoted was actress Fanny Kemble’s account, who rode ‘Rocket’ in an experimental trip with Stephenson and recounted events in her memoir: Frances Ann Kemble, Records of a Girlhood (Henry Holt &Co. New York 1879).
The Station was arranged with both freight and passengers in mind, and although 1830 railway operations have been studied in detail, there remain mysteries surrounding the original layout. The planned location of the Station changed twice prior to construction, with the LMR finally receiving parliamentary powers to terminate at Liverpool Road on 14 May 1829. Little is known of the planning of the Manchester terminus as minutes of the carrying committee do not survive. The approval of the location indicates that the buildings were planned and constructed in less than one year. The 1830 Warehouse was constructed in less than six months, as Fitzgerald, Greene and McNeil have demonstrated: this was based on the layout of contemporary canal warehousing. Fitzgerald has suggested that David Bellhouse, the building firm contracted for the warehouse, were also

---


21 Fitzgerald, *Liverpool Road Station*, p.52.

contracted for the carriers’ office adjacent to the Station. The architect of the passenger building is unknown, although Fitzgerald signposts either Thomas Haigh of Liverpool (who conducted later site works) or simply the LMR design office.  

The booking offices at Liverpool Road (the ‘Station Building’) had no precedent on the early railways; bookings for the Stockton and Darlington Railway were made at inns, with an 1830 ticket office constructed in Stockton comparable to a canal toll house rather than distinguishable as a station. As the warehouse design borrowed from canal transhipment, the Station Building was based on stagecoach and canal company offices; yet, the division of space inside is believed to be innovative. Whilst canal and coach traffic might divide passengers between ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ passengers, Liverpool Road Station presents the earliest use of ‘first’ and ‘second’ class passengers based on affordability.  

A colourful illustration of the Liverpool terminus at Crown Street appears in an 1831 series engraved by H Pyall, after Thomas Talbot Bury [Figure 3]. The Manchester Station illustration from the same series (see Chapter 3, Figure 3) depicts the bridge over Water Street, therefore the booking offices cannot be directly compared. However, the Crown Street print shows a close approximation of how Liverpool Road Station appeared, with tracks and a series of turntables in the foreground for moving wagons and carriages between the two lines. At Liverpool Road, the canopy of the carriage shed survives, visible in a circa 1840 sketch of the station by James Nasmyth [Figure 1]. This was where carriages could be uncoupled and stored at rail level adjacent to the waiting room exits. The greatest difference between the two stations was the proximity of the Liverpool Road passengers to the goods warehouse that stood directly opposite the waiting room exits. Passengers travelling to Liverpool were immediately confronted by the motion, noise and smells of freight.

---

23 Fitzgerald, *Liverpool Road Station*, pp.36-7; However, an earlier paper on railway station architecture by David Lloyd and Donald Install suggests John Forster the Younger of Liverpool was the architect: David Lloyd & Donald Insall, *Railway Station Architecture* (David & Charles Publications, Newton Abbot, 1978), p.2.


Whilst original plans for Liverpool Road Station do not survive,\textsuperscript{26} a sense of the layout and how buildings and spaces were used during the 1830s can be inferred from commentaries on the railway and guidebooks to the area. For example, little is known of the coal drop and yard, which are no longer extant. James Scott Walker, assistant editor of the *Liverpool Mercury* and *Kaleidoscope*, wrote a detailed pamphlet on the LMR for circulation at the opening. Walker explains that the tracks were carried beyond the Station Buildings to the coal depot behind: ‘at this final point of the line, the rails are supported on wood and the coals will be dropped down by the wagons to the depot beneath’.\textsuperscript{27} A later railway companion, published by J. Everett in 1834, suggests that the line to the coal depot ‘originally terminated at the extreme end of the shops... but it has since been extended to the west of New Street’. The shops Everett refers to were constructed along Liverpool Road.

\textsuperscript{26} Public record offices have been exhausted on this front; however, there may be plans in private collections or those of Network Rail (who did not respond to enquiries).

\textsuperscript{27} James Scott Walker, *An accurate description of the Liverpool and Manchester Rail-way: the tunnels, the bridges and other works throughout the line* (1830) (reprinted by Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society, 1968) p.43.
(at street level) in 1831. The 1836 Pigot’s Trade Directory Map [Figure 4] and the 1848 Slater’s Trade Directory Map [Figure 5] are almost identical, but show additions made at the Station in the intervening years. Although the coal yard is not marked on either map, it is represented by the space between the Down Goods Shed and New Street.

By 1831, owing to the success of the freight operations, Liverpool architect and surveyor, Thomas Haigh was commissioned to extend goods accommodation. The two warehouses he designed were named Cotton Warehouse 1 and Cotton Warehouse 2 in later sources. Engineer Francis Whishaw, who surveyed the Manchester and Leeds Railway for George Stephenson in 1835, wrote a comprehensive description of the railways in 1840. Whishaw explains that the warehouses were interconnected and linked to the 1830 Warehouse. This circuit was complete in 1830, when Cotton Warehouse 1 was connected with Bay 3 of the 1830 Warehouse. The 1850 Ordnance Survey Map [Figure 6] shows how they were connected by bridges and rails. The creation of the link bridges enabled the movement of goods on trucks across the expanded Station, a further experiment in railway haulage adapted from earlier tramways.

---

28 Fitzgerald, Liverpool Road Station, pp.58-9: notes the carrying trade provisions and these additions were an afterthought, with one shop open by July 1831, a further nine premises stood empty.

29 TNA RAIL 371.2: LMR Company minute book 1830-1833, 16 May 1831.


32 The Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit, The 1830 Warehouse, Liverpool Road Station, Manchester survey report (GMAU, 1991), Section 7.2 (not paginated).
Figure 4. Pigot’s Trade Directory ‘A Plan of Manchester and Salford with their Vicinities, embracing every Improvement, from Actual Survey’, 1836. (Manchester Historical Maps, https://manchester.publicprofiler.org/beta/)

Figure 5. Slater’s Trade Directory ‘A Plan of Manchester and Salford with their Vicinities, embracing every Improvement, from Actual Survey’, 1848. (Manchester Historical Maps, https://manchester.publicprofiler.org/beta/).
Figure 6 Ordnance Survey Map of Manchester sheet 32, scale five feet to one mile, surveyed in 1848 and published in 1850. Note the bridge and rail connections between the three original warehouses.  

---

Between 1836 and 1837, the Station was enlarged to improve facilities for passengers arriving from Liverpool, including the provision of new stables that also benefitted haulage. Operating bilaterally, with one line for outbound traffic served by the Station Building, travellers inbound from Liverpool left their trains on the Irwell Bridge and negotiated a sloping path down to Water Street.34 As the LMR Directors planned a new station for Liverpool at Lime Street, the need for ‘commodious’ accommodation for passengers entering Liverpool Road was raised.35 Whilst neither the arrival station nor its plans survive, contemporary terminal buildings were often plain, wooden structures with a small roof for shelter; connecting platforms within terminal buildings developed later, with the expansion of the railway network in the 1840s.36 In 1841, Whishaw describes a canopy over the rails supported by cast iron columns at thirteen feet intervals (of 156 feet in length), fronting an open arrival shed. Partially below the arrival station, new stables were also constructed on Water Street. Stables were essential for railway operations, as horses were used for cartage on site and beyond. Whishaw records stalls for sixty-one horses: three employed for tracking at the station, four or five for parcel vans, a collector’s horse, and the rest for the carrying department to transport goods into Manchester.37

Whilst the LMR’s success led expansion, their partnership the Grand Junction Railway (GJR), shaped how the Station operated between 1837 and 1844. In 1833, Parliament had authorised a scheme to connect the emerging north-western rail network to Birmingham, and eventually London, via a north-south route developed by the GJR. Opened on the 4 July 1837, the GJR line connected with the L&MR at Newton Junction, some 20 miles to the west of Manchester.38 GJR used Liverpool Road as their Manchester terminus, with GJR employees working alongside the LMR staff. Joseph Green acted as principal agent for the LMR, whilst George Baker took on the role for the GJR.39 As well as sharing accommodation at the station, the companies shared a central Manchester booking office at 57 Market

34 TNA RAIL 371/8: LMR Management Committee meeting minutes 1831 – 1833, 27 Jul 1831.
38 The Observer, 10 Jul 1837, ‘Opening of Grand Junction Railway’, p.4.
The GJR also used a warehouse on the north side of the Station’s coal depot. Whishaw makes clear it was a separate operation to the LMR’s three warehouses and ‘loading warehouse’ (shipping shed). Cooperation between the two railways is unsurprising, as LMR directors and shareholders were involved in the GJR venture. The *Manchester Guardian* reported that the First Class booking office at Liverpool Road ‘is now appropriated solely to the use of the Grand Junction Company... the only booking office for passengers and parcels by all their trains.’ According to this, by 1837 the LMR no longer used the separate offices to segregate first and second class customers, but for distinguishing the Company spaces. It is unclear if this was due to lack of room (although the 1831 extension offered business space) or if the division of passengers by these means had proved unpopular. This change in use of the passenger space does not figure in the standard ‘oldest’ narrative, which is wedded to the LMR history, and, as set out in Chapter 1, temporally embedded in the opening day of 15 September 1830. The influence of partnership working on the use of space is explored further in Section 2.

1.2 The end of an era

The opening of a new, larger railway station at Hunts Bank led to the removal of passengers from the world’s first passenger station. In 1838, the LMR Directors entered negotiations with the Manchester & Leeds Company’s (M&L) for the construction of a junction line to connect the LMR with a proposed station at Hunt’s Bank. This would ultimately divert passenger traffic to the new accommodation, leaving freight to continue onto Liverpool Road. The location of the new station was disputed, with LMR Directors favouring Store Street (later chosen by the Manchester & Birmingham Railway for their station) and the M&L preferring Hunt’s Bank, which they cited was closer to the commercial centre of the

---

40 *Pigot’s and Slater’s general and classified directory of Manchester and Salford 1841* (Manchester, 1841) p.85 & p.147.
43 *The Manchester Guardian* 5 July 1837, p.3.
city: the Exchange. The ambitions of the railways companies to draw closer to the centre and the consequential perception of Liverpool Road as peripheral are discussed in Chapter 3. Once the point was settled, the M&L & LMR agreed to proceed with joint ownership of Hunt’s Bank and that Liverpool passenger traffic would depart from here upon the opening of the junction line. Hunt’s Bank, renamed Victoria Station, opened on 1 January 1844 for traffic from Leeds, with the junction line operational (thus connecting with Liverpool) from 4 May. This date came to bookend accounts of the railway, consolidating the Station’s story as ‘oldest in the world’ to a fourteen year period.

This change in function shifted Liverpool Road into the past tense in contemporary reports, referred to as: ‘the former station’ and the ‘old station’. The status of the Station had altered from Manchester’s premier terminus to one replaced and stripped of its passengers. In contrast, the new Victoria Station was described as a ‘magnificent work’ and widely acclaimed as ‘the largest and handsomest in England’. The Roman Doric architectural style at Victoria Station, shown in Arthur Fitzwilliam Tait’s illustration [Figure 7], drew upon the Georgian neoclassical façade of Liverpool Road, albeit on a much larger scale. Yet, behind the frontage, a grand iron roof spanned over the tracks, characteristic of mid-century stations. Victoria presents a mid-way point in station architecture as, like Liverpool Road, it was bilateral with one long platform served by turntables. Yet, how Liverpool Road Station was viewed beyond newspapers applauding Victoria’s modernity is unclear, due to the lack of sources that consider goods operations. Freight, though clearly visible throughout the city, is paradoxically invisible in most surviving commentary – except for dramatic reports of a vast fire explored in Section 2.2.

44 NRM 1943-217: Proceedings of annual general meeting of the Liverpool & Manchester Railway, 26 Jan 1842.
45 Donaghy, Liverpool & Manchester Railway Operations, pp.160-62. L&MR raise several issues, delaying construction of the line, which was openly criticised by M&L.
46 ‘Railway Intelligence’ in The Standard (London, England) and other national newspapers, (1 Jan 1844); Railway Chronicle, (11 May 1844), p.92.
47 Railway Record, (11 May 1844), p.113; Railway Chronicle (11 May 1844) p.92.
Whist railway companies competitively invested in more commodious passenger stations; original termini were often re-configured for freight use. Liverpool Road was not unique in its position in 1840s Manchester. Upon the opening of Victoria, the M&L Company’s 1841 passenger and goods station at Oldham Road retained goods and cattle.\textsuperscript{48} 1830s passenger and freight stations in the North-West adapted for entirely goods set an example, as London stations remodelled later in the 1850s and 1860s. Oldham Road’s position within Manchester was like Liverpool Road: it was not central enough for passengers to conveniently walk to Manchester’s commercial centre (a perception explored further in Chapter 3). \textit{The Manchester Guardian} stated that ‘there is amply convenience and accommodation... for storing large quantities of goods... the arches below the line are admirably adapted for warehousing purposes.’\textsuperscript{49} The re-use of railway arches at Oldham Road supports the general claim by Jack Simmons that existing structures were adapted and companies did not replace outgrown buildings with any ‘wholly new installations’.\textsuperscript{50}

The pending change in function at Liverpool Road led to investment in livestock infrastructure. Although the early 1840s were not profitable for LMR, in part owing to the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{48} \textit{The Manchester Times and Gazette} (23 Dec 1843), p.8.
\item \textsuperscript{49} \textit{The Manchester Guardian} (3 Jan 1844), p.6.
\item \textsuperscript{50} Simmons, \textit{The Victorian Railway}, p.43.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
wider economic depression, Directors were confident goods traffic would increase with the new junction line.51 In January 1843, plans for a Pig Station along Charles Street were prepared in anticipation of this increase, as traffic in livestock outgrew accommodation at Salford.52 At the beginning of 1844, further warehouse room was sought in Manchester ‘for the future’, whilst the LMR’s partners sought to acquire the Bonding Warehouse Company premises.53 Whilst public attention was shifting away from the Station, LMR pragmatically prepared Liverpool Road for further freight capacity, confirming its integral role in the network.

1.3 The Station after 1844

The end of the passenger service brought changes to the function of buildings and spaces around the site. Demand for hospitality facilities around Liverpool Road dropped abruptly. In September 1843, Station superintendent, Joseph Green attempted to gain a liquor license; he assured the Borough committee that business would continue as usual, in spite of their concerns for the mooted end to the passenger service.54 After the opening of the junction line to Victoria on 4 May 1844, Green placed advertisements informing passengers the service had moved to Hunt’s Bank and reassured traders that the goods station was operating as usual.55 By 19 June 1844, one hotel: The Railway and Commercial Inn, two shops, and three dwellings opposite the station were offered to let at ‘considerably reduced rates.’ 56 Traders and workers around the site for goods traffic were evidently not patrons of the hotel or nearby shops.

Joseph Green’s household was one of the first railway families living in accommodation leased by a Railway Company. Green was appointed before September 1830 and occupied the Station Master’s House, an 1808 building (originally home to John Rothwell of the

51 The Railway Record (27 Jul 1844), p.380.
52 TNA RAIL 371/6 L&MR Directors Meeting, 23 Jan 1843.
53 Ibid., 16 Jan 1844; TNA RAIL 220/10 GJR Works Committee Meeting minutes, 3 Oct 1845.
54 Manchester Times and Gazette, (16 Sept 1843) ‘Adjourned Licensing Day’.
56 Ibid., 19 June 1844, p.8.
Rothwell Harrison dyeworks), adjacent to the passenger booking halls. By 1841, Hamlet Harrison, the GJR goods office manager, resided at 121 Water Street with his wife and young family. Railway families as an ‘imagined community’ were promoted by paternalistic railway companies as the network grew. Green’s family are one of the earliest to experience life alongside an urban station. Census evidence shows Green, aged 65, living with three children: two daughters – Francis and Elizabeth, and his son, William, listed as an engineman. Whilst Joseph Green provided continuity during the closure of the passenger operations, he retired in September 1847. This effected the organisation of residential space at the Station, as Green’s replacement did not inherit the entire Station Master’s House, which was divided to accommodate more tenants. This indicates a reduction in the superintendent’s status, who would no longer received the comfort of a gentleman’s household despite their seniority. The removal of the incumbent family and servants and the division of the house marked a change in the Station’s community going into the 1850s.

In 1845, the GJR and the LMR were consolidated with a formal merger. Liverpool Road was already node in a larger network of goods depots as the GJR line connected Manchester with Birmingham, and by 1838 it was possible (via Warrington) to travel from Liverpool Road to Euston Station in London. The junction line to Victoria Station resulted in goods from Liverpool to Yorkshire being carried through Victoria, whilst Liverpool Road continued to receive all inbound Manchester traffic. In 1846, the amalgamation of LMR, GJR and the London and Birmingham Company (L&B) into the London and North Western Railway (LNWR) was perceived as ‘fruitful’ for improving merchandise traffic. The LNWR modernised Liverpool Road in response to the expanding network; by 1849, Henry Booth

57 TNA RAIL 371/2: LMR Board meeting minutes, 1830 – 1833; Whishaw, The Railways of Great Britain, p.199.


59 Census of England and Wales 1841, Borough of Manchester, Township of Manchester, enumeration schedule 27, p.7.

60 TNA RAIL 220/6: GJR Committee Meeting minutes, Liverpool Board, 15 July 1848.


encouraged the Company to improve facilities at Manchester and Ordsall Lane to prepare for connection with the new Manchester South Junction and Altrincham Railway (MSJ&AR). From 1842 to 1850, freight tonnage increased sevenfold nationally – a swifter increase than passenger receipts, which tripled over the same period. The MSJ&AR is notable as one of the first suburban passenger railways, yet, is lesser known for its role in expanding North-West freight infrastructure. Booth’s suggestion indicates that although livestock provisions were improved in 1843, elsewhere Liverpool Road and Ordsall Lane required updating. For example, Liverpool Road’s steam engine and boilers as both were in an ‘imperfect state’ and could no longer be repaired. The rapid expansion in freight meant that Liverpool Road Station required constant updating across the century.

The goods stations of the LNWR did not operate independently, rather as hubs for networks of engine yards, locomotive works and smaller goods yards. Communication was essential for these networks within the wider railway. A depot in Longsight provided engineering and maintenance support for Store Street goods station, whilst Ordsall Lane Station, across the Irwell in Salford, fulfilled a similar role for Liverpool Road. Although the new communication technology of the telegraph was installed along the railway lines in 1847, the stations remained unconnected, this concerned staff. In 1849, the Locomotive Committee (who discussed enginemen and firemen’s concerns), recommended the installation of a telegraph line between Manchester’s stations, including Ordsall Lane. This bid was seemingly unsuccessful, as the LNWR General Manager, Mark Huish, also recommended London Road be connected to Ordsall Lane and Liverpool Road be connected to Victoria via telegraph several years later, in 1854. The desire to connect the stations demonstrates that local staff actively sought to improve operations and perceived the telegraph as essential infrastructure for the rapidly growing network.
Section 2: Liverpool Road Station re-formed

Buildings, yards and tracks at Liverpool Road Station were expanded in several phases from 1854 to 1890. These works re-shaped the original layout, eroding the material footprint of the 1830 site and replacing it with a typical, mid-century freight complex. In Section 2.1, I outline how goods operations were gradually improved, culminating in a new Shipping Shed by 1856. During the early 1860s, the North-West textiles industry was affected by the ‘cotton famine’, when raw cotton supplies from the United States were disrupted by the American Civil War (1861-1865).\(^{70}\) Despite a decrease in LNWR’s Manchester, Staffordshire, Yorkshire and London traffic, the Company invested in Manchester stations, commissioning enlargements at London Road, Ordsall Lane and Liverpool Road during the downturn.\(^{71}\) In Section 2.2, I demonstrate how a major fire in the two Cotton Warehouses hastened this planned re-arrangement, drastically altering Liverpool Road Station. The new buildings, explored in Section 2.3, reflected demands for different kinds of warehousing and shared use. In 1868, a timber yard and Pig Station were removed for the construction of new railway lines, opening the north end of the Station for goods. Contemporaneously, a bonded store for goods requiring excise duty (particularly imported alcohol) was erected. The Station held goods traded to a broad stratum of North-West society, reflecting consumer habits from the pigs popular with labourers to wine predominately drunk by middle and upper classes.\(^{72}\) The next phase of new building works, the New Warehouse completed in 1882, was shaped by the Great Western Railway Company’s (GWR) requirements, who shared access to Liverpool Road. In this section, I shed light on consumer goods and commercial tensions, providing nuance to the general ‘demotion’ narrative that overshadows the significance of freight in Victorian Manchester.

---

\(^{70}\) Wyke ‘Rise and Decline of Cottonopolis’, pp.90-1.

\(^{71}\) TNA RAIL 410/3: LNWR Court of Proprietors minute book (1860-1864), Report of the Directors to the Proprietors at the half yearly general meeting 23 Aug 1861 & Extracts from the Engineer’s Report, 13 Aug 1862.

2.1 Expansion: co-operations and tensions

The Downs Goods Shed depicted by Nasmyth [Figure 1] was replaced with a larger Shipping Shed in response to the growing market for fresh vegetables on the railway. During the 1830s, the LMR had done little to secure regular traffic in vegetables, for example, the Bridgewater Canal and the Mersey and Irwell Navigation transported the bulk of potato traffic. In contrast, by the 1840s, Oldham Road Station flourished as a produce centre with an influx of potatoes from South Yorkshire on the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway routes. By 1850, the LNWR carried more potatoes and root vegetables from Scotland, this, combined with the establishment Manchester and Altrincham South Junction Railway, led to expansion at Liverpool Road. In early 1854, a new shed was planned to replace the smaller 1830s building. Across the period there was great variation in goods shed design, although most were single story; both the 1830 shed illustrated by Nasmyth and its replacement had tracks terminating inside and alongside the building. LNWR gained permission from Manchester Corporation [Figure 8] to build on a larger footprint than the previous building, as part of a collaborative scheme for a produce market.

Figure 8. Plan attached to an agreement between Manchester Corporation and the LNWR for land at Camp Field, 20 April 1854 [TNA RAIL 791/118]. The red area (right) shows where a platform, track and turntables were to be constructed on the Field.

---

73 Scola, *Feeding the Victorian City*, p.108.
74 TNA RAIL 220/10: GJR Works Committee (a contingent of LNWR), Works Sub-committee, 19 Jan 1854.
Whilst railway companies faced little opposition to urban expansion, the logistics of erecting new structures on densely populated land required negotiation and co-operation with municipal authorities. Manchester Corporation’s New Streets Act of 1853, included provision for the intended communications from Liverpool Road Station to Wellington Place, Camp Field.\textsuperscript{76} In April 1854, the Corporation agreed to purchase the land and tenements for re-sale to LNWR, in turn LNWR would extend railway lines, construct several turntables and create a six-foot platform on the Camp Field (marked in red on Figure 8).\textsuperscript{77} The Camp Field was an open space used for regular outdoor markets and political meetings (discussed further in Chapter 3). The planned enclosed agricultural market did not come to fruition. The Corporation pressed the LNWR for plans in February 1855, however, Richard Norris, engineer of the Northern Division, was preoccupied with London Road.\textsuperscript{78} LNWR stalled, then abandoned the rail link altogether, citing problematic differences in levels between the Station and Camp Field.\textsuperscript{79} In April 1855, the Corporation Markets Committee was approached by the Birkenhead, Lancashire and Cheshire Railway, interested in the Camp Field for a new goods station.\textsuperscript{80} Fortunately for Liverpool Road Station, the Corporation did not agree; although the mooted goods station demonstrates the desirability of the area for accessing Manchester’s markets. Whilst the market-link did not materialise, LNWR erected the Shipping Shed by 1856. Houses along Sage Street, Back Sage Street, and part of New Street and Wellington Place were demolished for the construction (outlined in green on Figure 8).\textsuperscript{81} The compulsory purchase of land by the Corporation for transfer to LNWR was repeated in 1867, for the removal of the remaining residences.


\textsuperscript{77} TNA RAIL 791/118: Memorandum of agreement between Manchester Corporation and the LNWR for Corporation to purchase land at Camp Field, 20/4/1854.

\textsuperscript{78} TNA RAIL 220/10: GJR Works Committee minutes (Aug 1845 – Mar 1856), 2 Feb 1855.

\textsuperscript{79} Manchester Archive M901/14574: Manchester Markets Committee Proceedings Vol 4 (20 Jul 1855- 16 Dec 1859), minutes of special meeting, 27 Sept 1855, cites the LNWR raised the levels issue, Norris was due to inspect. A later Chairman’s Report, 28 July 1857, show a fee of £2000 to LNWR the lapse of the rail agreement, paid by the 28 Aug 1857 Markets Committee meeting.

\textsuperscript{80} Manchester Archive M901/14573: Markets Committee Vol. 3, 13 April 1855, p.909. When the prospect of a vegetable market was first discussed on 20 Aug 1852, the Birkenhead, Lancashire and Cheshire Railway Company were referred to as well as LNWR. Both companies may have approached the Corporation simultaneously.

\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., Markets Committee Proceedings Vol. 3 (6 Aug 1852- 6 Jul 1855) 13 Oct 1854, Annual Report indicates the houses were removed.
between the Station and Lower Byrom Street.\textsuperscript{82} The resulting displacements and effect upon the neighbourhood are discussed further in Chapter 3.

Shortly after the erection of the Shipping Shed a partnership with railway rivals, the GWR, led to further expansions, although it is unclear how spaces were shared at the Station. In 1858, the GWR made an agreement to operate from LNWR’s Manchester stations for seven years. GWR passenger trains would run from the LNWR’s section of Victoria Station and Liverpool Road Station was selected for goods operations; Manchester became the GWR’s most northerly outpost. The LNWR agreed to provide railways sidings, sheds or a warehouse with porters for moving the trucks and forming trains, and offices for GWR clerks.\textsuperscript{83} GWR clerks may have occupied the Station Building and the adjoining former shop units alongside the LNWR employees (as GJR officers had alongside LMR staff in 1837).\textsuperscript{84} In about 1860, a block of staff offices was constructed, named the Freight or Goods Office on plans, this provided more room for administration.\textsuperscript{85} It is likely this was in response to the increased demand for office space from GWR. Later, a small fire in the 1830 Warehouse was blamed on GWR staff ‘improperly’ using a stove, demonstrating they shared workspace here in 1870.\textsuperscript{86}

2.2 Radical re-organisation

In 1861, LNWR’s Manchester, Staffordshire, Yorkshire and London traffic decreased owing to the depressed state of cotton trade, yet, investment in Manchester continued.\textsuperscript{87} In 1865, the LNWR improved Ordsall Lane, where bridges were widened for a system of new

\textsuperscript{82} TNA RAIL 791/271: Memorandum from the Mayor of Manchester to the LNWR regarding the enlargement of Liverpool Road Station, 1 May 1867.

\textsuperscript{83} TNA RAIL 252/164: Memorandum of agreement between LNWR and GWR allow GWR access to Manchester Station, 5 Nov 1858.

\textsuperscript{84} Manchester Guardian, 5 Jul 1837, p.3.

\textsuperscript{85} Kathryn Sather & Associates Heritage Conservation Consultants, MSI Liverpool Road Station: Conservation Management Plan (unpublished report, 2007) pp. 16-17, suggests the Freight Office was built between 1860 and 1865.

\textsuperscript{86} RAIL 410/95: LNWR Special Committee vol.17, 6 Apr 1870.

sidings. The Chief Engineer, William Baker, also planned to rearrange Liverpool Road, with a change in route, widening of the bridge and an overall ‘enlargement’ (suggesting increased warehouse accommodation). The catalyst for the swift adoption of this plan was a major fire on 23 May 1866. Local newspapers dramatically conveyed the scale of the fire as ‘one of the largest that has ever occurred in the city’. The area affected was at the centre of operations: the two Cotton Warehouses opposite and adjacent to the 1830 Warehouse. The Manchester Courier noted that LNWR had recently discussed whether two Cotton Warehouses should be pulled down and declared: ‘this fire has settled that point’.

The susceptibility of these buildings to fire was foreseen by Joseph Green, who banned oil and turpentine from the Cotton Warehouses in 1843. Neglected in intervening years, explosions during the fire were attributed to flammable materials stored in Cotton Warehouse 2 including oil, turpentine, soap and soda-ash. Other reports added that Warehouse 1 contained cotton, as well as madder belonging to Messrs J.C. Harter & Co. Warehouse 3 (1830 Warehouse) was described as ‘being the depot for goods coming from Liverpool’ and the contents included: butter, lard, tallow, flour and grain. Whilst the warehouses were named Cotton Warehouse 1 and 2 in some official records, clearly both housed a range of goods, including the highly combustible goods that fuelled the fire.

Thomas Haigh’s 1831 Cotton Warehouses were timber framed; cast iron was only beginning to be adopted as a fireproofing measure by the 1830s, largely in warehouses where timbers were likely to become sodden with water. Hence cast iron was used in the basement level of Bellhouse’s 1830 Warehouse, which Fitzgerald suggests was to mitigate flood risks as in the nearby New Botany Warehouse. Yet, it is unclear if this technique was

89 TNA RAIL 410/88: LNWR Special Committee minutes & reports 1865-66, 4 Jan 1866; 12 Apr 1866.
90 Manchester Courier (23 May 1866); p.3; Manchester Guardian (24 May 1866), p.2.
91 Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser (Manchester, England) (24 May 1866) p.3.
93 The Leeds Mercury (24 May 1866); ‘J.C. Harter & Co.’ wrote to the Manchester Courier (24 May 1866) p.2, to state their madder was insured.
94 Manchester Guardian (24 May 1866) p.2.
96 Fitzgerald, Liverpool Road Station, p.42.
repeated by Haigh the Cotton Warehouses. As outlined in section 1, the three warehouses were connected by tramway bridges: these allowed the fire to spread with ease. According to newspaper reports, Cotton Warehouse 2 caught fire first, followed by Cotton Warehouse 1. Superintendent Tozer of Manchester’s chief fire station at Jackson’s Row, about half a mile from Liverpool Road, used the telegraph network to summon fire brigades from the surrounding area for assistance. These firemen attached sixteen water jets to the mains water supply at the Station. Reports highlight that the wooden frame of the building was deliberately dampened by firemen. The Broughton and Pendleton volunteers and the Salford Fire Brigade apparently made ‘a gallant stand’ at the bridge between No. 3 and the Western end of Warehouse 1. This widely reported act saved the building and highlights the element of chance in the survival of the oldest railway warehouse.

Reports on the fire provide a rare insight into 1860s knowledge of the buildings. The LMR Station Building along Liverpool Road was unaffected by the fire. Several newspapers identified the age and significance of surviving structures, citing them as part of the ‘original’ Liverpool and Manchester Railway terminal. The Manchester Courier also remarked upon the age of the warehouses, adding that ‘the station was originally used for the accommodation of passengers travelling by the old Liverpool and Manchester line; but for many years has been exclusively devoted to goods traffic’. This use of language, ‘exclusively devoted’, does not bear the negative connotations of the 1844 descriptions of this change in function. Yet, elsewhere reports omit the passenger buildings altogether, describing them as merely a range of offices. This suggests that the Station was yet to be conceptualised as one of the ‘first’ or ‘oldest’ in the world. Whilst the earliest structures

---

97 TNA RAIL 371.2: LMR Board Meeting minutes, 1830 – 1833, 6 Jun 1831; 4, 11, 18 & 28 Jul 1831; 1 Aug 1831 indicate Samuel Buxton and Son built the range, with architects Haigh and Franklin acting as structural consultants. In July 1831, Earle of the LMR suggested a further floor should be added above the railway level floor, which Buxton & Son added. Detail on construction materials is scant, cast iron is not cited nor costed; discussions regarding insurance against fire following a report on the warehouse’s brickwork by Franklin suggests the warehouses were identified as vulnerable (26 Sept 1831; 17 Oct 1831).

98 The Manchester Guardian (24 May 1866), p.2;

99 Sheffield & Rotherham Independent (24 May 1866), p.3; Manchester Courier (24 May 1866), p.3.

100 Manchester Courier (24 May 1866), p.3.


102 Manchester Courier (26 May 1866), p.3.

were historicised in some newspapers, commemorative discourse evident later in the century (as discussed in Chapter 1) was absent.

2.3 A modern station

![Figure 9. LNWR New Works and Additional Powers plans and section, 1867: Bridge over River Irwell and Water Street in Parish of Manchester County of Lancaster. Lancashire Record Office.](image)

Plans to rebuild the portion of the Station damaged by fire were swiftly instigated, with a tender for the construction of bridges and arches advertised in September 1866. 104 By February 1867, the LNWR allocated £77,145 for the task. This was almost twice as much as contemporaneous works at Wapping Station in Liverpool, which was assigned £40,000 for warehousing. 105 The LNWR New Works and Additional Powers Act 1867 [Figure 9] shows the area (inside the dotted lines) where additional arching was required below both the Irwell Bridge and the Water Street boundary of Liverpool Road Station Plans. 106 A warehouse specifically for bonded goods was also built; the ‘Charles Street’ or ‘Grape Street’ warehouse (later known as the ‘Bonded Warehouse’) occupied the position of the

104 *Manchester Guardian* (11 Sept 1866), p.3
105 RAIL 410/4: Court of Proprietors, Report of the Directors to the Proprietors at the half yearly general meeting, 22 Feb 1867.
former Pig Station and could be reached by rail along the new viaduct. The Italianate decoration along the Bonded Warehouse roof [Figure 10] gives a sense of the grander, palazzi style edifices in the commercial district of Portland, Princess and Mosley Street. The 1867 plan does not include the upper portion of what became known as the ‘Pineapple Line’ (the viaduct over Water Street stables and into the Station), which was further extended in 1879 to serve the Station’s final warehouse. The new layout meant that there were tracks either side of the 1830 Warehouse, though the new viaduct didn’t abut this warehouse as the lower yard in-between the structures was essential for road haulage access to Water Street [see Figures 11 and 15].

The Bonded Warehouse receipts reveal the wide range of consumers served by the LNWR. In December 1870, LNWR sought permission from the government for bonded stores in Manchester, for Liverpool traffic, presumably during the interim the warehouse was used for general stores. Marked as ‘Cotton Warehouse’ on a 1875 plan [Figure 11], it may have held different goods in different spaces or housed largely cotton at some stage. In May 1871, the Inland Revenue Board approved of stores for wines and spirits, whilst the Board of Customs declined to allow tobacco under bond at the Manchester site. Conversely, whilst Brian Harrison asserts that the railways ‘did more for the temperance movement… than the Temperance Society’, bonded goods warehouses highlight the role of railway infrastructure in importing alcohol into urban centres. A typical statement for the stores, such as 31 September 1874, shows 129 casks of wine, eighteen casks of brandy, fifteen of whiskey and two casks of rum (in total - for numerous merchants). This list is

107 Manchester Guardian, (10 Oct 1866) p.1. Tender for a ‘goods warehouse’ - not named as a bonded store. RAIL 410/4 Court of Proprietors minute book (1865-1870), Report of the Directors 23 Feb 1869, records the warehouse was complete.

108 This viaduct is known colloquially as the ‘Pineapple Line’ as it ran directly above the location of the Pine Apple Inn, a Georgian pub that survived until 1986 when it was burnt down by Granada television for an episode of Coronation Street (Manchester Evening News (Manchester, England), ‘Burning of the Rovers’, 31 May 1986).

109 TNA RAIL 410/6: LNWR Court of Proprietors minutes and reports, 1876-1880, half yearly general meetings (Feb and Aug), 1879.

110 TNA RAIL 410/97: LNWR Special Committee minutes and reports vol.17, 1870, 1 Dec 1870.

111 TNA RAIL 1033/175: Plan of Liverpool Road Goods Station, Manchester - 88ft to 1 inch, 1875.

112 TNA RAIL 410/98: LNWR Special Committee minutes and reports vol.20, 1871, 19 May 1871.

113 Brian Harrison, Drink and the Victorians: the Temperance Question in England 1815 – 1872 (Staffordshire: Keele university Press, 1994) quotation from p.323, see Chapter 14 for the role of railways.

114 Manchester Courier (10 Oct 1874), p.3.
typical of the mid-1870s receipts, although quantities vary, wine, brandy and whisky comprise the majority of goods under bond.\textsuperscript{115} Wine, for example, rose in popularity in the 1860s after William Gladstone’s (as Chancellor) Wine and Refreshment House Act; the consumption of beer and spirits also rose in this period. Perceived as a moralising venture, Gladstone’s Bill allowed shopkeepers to apply for licences to sell wine (and by extension, restaurants), providing the working classes access to respectable drinking habits.\textsuperscript{116}

\textbf{Figure 10.} Photograph of the extant Bonded Warehouse, erected in 1868 and fully operational in 1869, storing goods under bond from 1871 (image by author, 2015).

\textsuperscript{115} From a sample of receipts published in \textit{Manchester Courier} (10 Aug 1874, 14 Mar 1877, 7 Jun 1877) all show wine/brandy/whisky and small quantities of rum, mystery ‘sprits’ and a singular listing of gin.

\textsuperscript{116} Nicholls, \textit{The Politics of Alcohol}, p.122.
The Pig Landing Station on Charles Street, a major node in Manchester’s livestock supply, was removed entirely as a result of the viaduct and bonded stores construction. During the fire the ‘swine evacuation’ provided an ‘additional element of excitement’, suggesting the piggery was close to the blaze. The Station rearrangement led to its removal, although a replacement was not given due consideration. On 7 June 1866, the LNWR Special Committee received a letter from concerned pig salesmen. Roger Scola outlines the rather small share of the Manchester meat market that pigs made up, yet also indicates it was the most accessible food for the working classes – who were criticised by sanitary reformers for keeping live swine. The railway was essential in supplying this lower-class commodity. General goods manager, George Findlay, sought a solution and was charged with consulting the pig salesmen, Messrs Kay and Salmon. By August 1866, the Committee decided that pigs could be housed under the arches of the Southern Junction and Liverpool Road. This new home for the Pig Station [Figure 12], which also operated as a market, was in use on

Figure 11. Plan of Liverpool Road Goods Station, Manchester 88ft to 1inch, 1875. It is unclear if this represents the site in 1875 or is a plan for future buildings (particularly the warehouse top right). TNA RAIL 1033/175

117 Birmingham Daily Post (Birmingham, England), (24 May 1866); Manchester Courier (24 May 1866) p.3.

118 Scola, Feeding the Victorian City, p.40.

Water Street by 1870. Water Street was subsequently selected for a new Meat Market and Slaughterhouse. In June 1872, the Town Clerk reported that in the previous twelve months 96,000 pigs entered, with 76,000 sold on the premises. The venture was deemed a success: due to the significant traffic, the Markets Committee waivered tolls for the LNWR and requested an annual rent instead of £175.121

![Figure 12. Plans for the Pig Market adjoining the new Pig Station on Water Street by William Baker, 29 Oct 1866. An iron roof was erected over the market place, here you can see that it was built next to the surviving livestock ramp (part of the original 1830 layout). SIM: 2014-3006.](image)

Providing staff and storage space for the GWR complicated the Station rearrangement. In April 1870, William Baker was asked to gather what accommodation the GWR required, as compulsory purchase powers were due to cease in July.122 The previous year, the LNWR and GWR Joint Committee suggested that GWR’s Chester and Holyhead traffic be handed

---

120 Manchester Archive: GB127.32675 Manchester Markets Committee minute book (Dec 1870-Oct 1873), 16 June 1870 – the committee give notice to LNWR of a toll on the Pig Market.

121 Ibid., 14 Jun 1872.

122 RAIL 410/95: LNWR Special Committee vol.17, 6 April 1870.
over at Liverpool Road. Yet, it is unclear from surviving records how the GWR used the Station. The compulsory powers indeed lapsed, with streets allocated for demolition in 1867 (Dunbar Street, New Street and Ashton Street) visited in the 1871 census. On a 1875 LNWR plan [Figure 11], a small warehouse is shown where the New Warehouse would stand, about half the length of the later building with the streets scheduled for demolition running alongside it. This plan may represent constructions in 1875, as it resembles the small goods warehouse on Slater’s Trade Directory maps from the 1840s [Figures 5 & 6] and the 1850 OS Map [Figure 7], presumably the warehouse used by the GJR on the North side of the coal drop Whishaw described in 1842. Alternatively, it may reflect an interim plan for stores for the GWR (although no Engineer’s Reports support this). The absence of this building from literature on railway operations highlights what can be lost by focussing too narrowly on the passenger era, concerned only with the oldest 1830s structures.

---

123 TNA RAIL 404/173: LNWR and GWR Joint Committee secretarial papers, matters in dispute between the LNWR and GWR 1869-1870, memorandum of meeting at Westminster (date omitted).
124 Census of England and Wales 1871, Borough of Manchester, Township of Manchester, Municipal Ward: St John’s, pp.70-81.
125 Whishaw, Railways of Great Britain, p. 201.
126 TNA RAIL 410/5: LNWR Court of Proprietors minutes and reports, 1870-1876. This volume was checked for reference to the warehouse adjacent to Wellington Place/Lower Byrom St as set out in TNA RAIL 791/271 memorandum from the Mayor of Manchester to LNWR; the only mention of a new warehouse structure was a memo 10 February 1876 regarding a vote to enlarge Liverpool Road.
The ‘New’ (or ‘Byrom Street’) Warehouse was eventually constructed between 1879 and 1882, replacing workers housing. Overseen by Company engineer, Francis Stevenson, records suggest this was an LNWR venture, with space likely leased to GWR afterwards.\textsuperscript{127} Street clearances mysteriously left a public house intact. The Roebuck Inn on the corner of Lower Byrom Street with Ashton Street was retained and abutted the New Warehouse. It is unclear why the pub was not demolished with adjacent housing, as the LNWR acquired land belonging to James Berry Prescot [Figure 13], including 2 Ashton Street (the Roebuck)

\textsuperscript{127} TNA RAIL 410/6: LNWR Court of Proprietors minutes and reports, 1876-1880 & RAIL 410/7: LNWR Court of Proprietors minutes and reports, 1881-1887: Partially operational from June, Stevenson reported the warehouse was almost complete on 19 Aug 1882.
in December 1880. George Wright Gregory held a fourteen year lease for the Roebuck in 1880; he had been a tenant since at least 1871, appearing on the census aged fifty as a licenced victualler. This case is curious as incumbent tenants didn’t usually dissuade Railway Companies from evictions. Across the period the public houses shaped the Station and neighbourhood (see Chapter 3.1.1 on the passenger period). For example, the pre-railway era Pine Apple Inn on Water Street was so affectionately known that oral tradition provides the name of the 1869 viaduct as the ‘pineapple line’. The Roebuck Inn was not only retained, but altered the design of the New Warehouse; tangible evidence of the role of alcohol consumption and working class leisure in the Station’s history.

The New Warehouse’s main traffic was raw cotton, which was both stored and transhipped here. The intact nature of the Station allows for direct comparison of transformations in transhipments. The railway line from the viaduct into the New Warehouse brought freight directly to an unloading platform. This aspect of the New Warehouse is more akin to a goods shed, which rails ran into. John Minnis notes that many sheds in Northern manufacturing towns had extra stories for warehousing. However, the ornate appearance and scale of the New Warehouse sets it apart from a shipping shed; it is also quite different to the transhipment methods employed in the 1830 Warehouse, where trucks were uncoupled and shunted through loading bay doors using a series of turntables. Cotton was a significant merchandise at Liverpool Road in the 1880s, when 6000 bales on average were stored here. D.H.F. Meacock later described the ‘quite peculiar’ regional traffic: ‘thousands of bundles of cloth from the mills arrive here every week, consigned to

128 SIM Archive (corporate archive): M444 Liverpool Road Station Deeds, Indenture 1 Dec 1880 between James Berry Prescott, William Tyler and the LNWR.
129 Census of England and Wales 1871, Borough of Manchester, Township of Manchester, Municipal Ward: St John’s, pp.70-81.
130 The viaduct has been termed the ‘pineapple line’ by Museum staff since anyone can recall, as many members of the Liverpool Road Station Society – who became the Friends of the Museum in 1983 – worked at the Station before 1975, it is plausible that this oral tradition may originate with Station staff.
131 TNA RAIL 410/199: LNWR Goods Traffic Committee minute book, 1891 no.1, 10 Aug 1892. Notes the weighting machine in the New Warehouse was specifically for bale traffic.
133 TNA RAIL: 1124/109 Railway rates and the Manchester ship canal, House of Lords session 1894, Manchester Ship Canal Bill, proof of George Findlay (General Manager LNWR),
the large Manchester merchants’. Liverpool Road was adapted and continued to act as a central node in the ‘warehouse city’ across the nineteenth century.

Figure 14. Architectural drawing of the proposed new goods warehouse Liverpool Road, Manchester. Undated, this design accompanied the 1866 Pig Station plan into the Archive. It shows the ornate Italianate decoration along the roof which adorns the 1869 Bonded Warehouse, although the configuration of the windows is that of the New Warehouse. This plan may have been drawn-up in the 1860s, but not fully realised due to the delay in construction. SIM: 2014-3006.

Section 3: Changing technologies at Liverpool Road

In the Station’s early history, the site represents the latest developments in 1830s haulage. Over the lifetime of the Station, new methods were used concurrently with existing technologies. Although the 1830 uses are most studied and memorialised, surviving structures from the latter nineteenth century comprise most of the extant Station. Large-scale structural changes to Liverpool Road Station ceased after 1889, however, haulage techniques continued to be modernised, altering both inside and outside spaces. New technologies such as a hydraulic power, and utilities, from water supply to gas, were extended or installed. In turn, working practices and everyday life at the Station adjusted alongside these developments, which made haulage easier throughout day and night, whilst presenting new dangers and boundaries to be negotiated. The Station reflects wider trends in the haphazard overlap of technologies, rather than a neat succession of developments; an insight that can only be gleamed through studying the full lifecycle of the Station, rather than restricting research to the ‘oldest in the world’ period.

In section 3.1, I chart transformations in power technologies, revealing the early installation of hydraulic power at Liverpool Road, some twenty years prior to Manchester Corporation’s city initiative. This is significant, as the Corporation’s network has been memorialised, overshadowing the Station story in local technology narratives (this is addressed further in Chapter 5). The concurrent use of haulage technologies with different power sources is the subject of 3.2; from cranes to capstans to carts. How these technologies influenced working spaces is highlighted, revealing, for example, dangers posed to staff. In 3.3, I present continuities in freight operations over the turn-of-the-century. Despite challenges, including the opening of the Manchester Ship Canal, Liverpool Road continued to operate as a major gateway to westward seaports.
3.1 Power transitions

Throughout the period, both existing and emergent methods and forms of power were adopted to move goods into warehouses, and ultimately tranship them in and out of Manchester. Archaeologists have highlighted that the 1830 Warehouse architect borrowed from canal transhipment, with internal rails entering the warehouse as canal arms entered waterside warehouses for unloading [Figure 16].\(^{135}\) Similarly, technologies used for moving goods were adapted from existing systems. This task was initially tackled by manpower and horses but swiftly aided by steam power in 1831, when a May, Thompson, Swift and Cole of Bolton steam engine was erected in an engine house at the western end of the 1830 Warehouse. This powered a flywheel linked to a vertical line shaft that powered apparatus on the top floor of the warehouse.\(^{136}\) The Greater Manchester Archaeology Unit (GMAU) identified evidence of twenty-four gravity assisted manual hoists in the warehouse, these moved goods up and down into loading bays. Of these, the archaeologists found eleven were most likely to have been converted to steam power.\(^{137}\) This demonstrates that although steam power provided significant impetus on site, much machinery continued to be hand driven. A combination of man and horsepower were the primary means of hauling

---


\(^{136}\) Fitzgerald in Liverpool Road Station, p.48; Greater Manchester Archaeology Unit, ‘The 1830 Warehouse Liverpool Road Station, Manchester, Survey Report’ (GMAU, Manchester, 1991).

\(^{137}\) Ibid., unpaginated. See section 5 on machinery.
goods around the outside spaces. Goods unloaded at the Station were transported from wagons at rail level, transferred through the warehouse (and after 1831, the two Cotton Warehouses) and unloaded onto carts at yard level.

![Figure 16. An artist’s impression of the 1830 Warehouse haulage apparatus (created for exterior signage circa 2000), showing gravity hoists and the internal railway (SIM).](image)

By the 1860s, hydraulic power was adopted alongside earlier power technologies, a relatively early railway application outside of London stations. Hydraulic power was introduced at docks and railway stations during the 1850s, after the accumulator tower was developed for Grimsby Docks by William George Armstrong between 1849 and 1851. The accumulator was essentially a large cast iron plunger in a vertical cylinder, which was pumped with power from a pumping (steam) engine to give pressure to water pushed into a cylinder. Steam power was not superseded by the hydraulic system, rather it operated concurrently with the new technology as a steam engine provided power for the pumping of water. As the GMAU noted, ‘the three types of power represented [hand, steam and hydraulic] cannot be said to have replaced one another... it is possible all three were in contemporary use in the late nineteenth century’. At GWR’s Paddington Station, Isambard Kingdom Brunel applied hydraulic power to operate turntables, traversers, cranes


and capstans.\textsuperscript{140} Locally, at LNWR’s London Road Station (enlarged just prior to Liverpool Road) a hydraulic system powered cranes to lift wagons from level to level at this two stored station.\textsuperscript{141} These systems pre-dated Manchester Corporation’s 1894 project: the Manchester Hydraulic Power Company, although Derek Brumhead has noted that the Corporation was relatively slow to develop the system compared with London, Liverpool and Hull.\textsuperscript{142}

\begin{figure}[h!]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image}
\caption{Jib crane, in situ in the 1830 warehouse. Installed about 1870 and powered by the hydraulic system at Liverpool Road Station (Image: SIM).}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{140} Steven Brindle, \textit{Paddington Station, its History and architecture} (Swinton: English Heritage, 2004), p.73.

\textsuperscript{141} Simmons, \textit{Victorian Railway}, p.43. notes a steam powered crane was used to lift wagons between levels at London Road.

The hydraulic system installed between 1867 and 1869 re-shaped spaces at Liverpool Road both above and below ground, with visible apparatus and discreet networks. In October 1868, an accumulator was acquired from Armstrong.\textsuperscript{143} Accumulators were contained within brick-built towers: a plan of the Station from 1884 [Figure 15] shows two accumulator towers, one (extant) on Charles Street, with another on Water Street next to a boiler house and engine house. Subterranean high-pressure water pipes were networked across the Station to power equipment like the jib crane that survives in the 1830 Warehouse [Figure 18].\textsuperscript{144} The system was extended during the New Warehouse construction, when new machinery was purchased between 1882 and 1883,\textsuperscript{145} probably for the second accumulator. A mains water supply served Liverpool Road from at least 1838, this fed the stationary steam engine boilers.\textsuperscript{146} In 1866, firefighters were able to draw water from the mains supply to combat the Cotton Warehouse fire.\textsuperscript{147} Electricity ultimately replaced the steam engines that powered the hydraulic system’s apparatus, although steam power continued into the twentieth century at Liverpool Road, for example, the gantry was powered by steam in 1907.\textsuperscript{148} At London Road and Mayfield Station, however, electricity powered hydraulic pumps as early as 1909, drawn from Manchester Corporation’s electricity supply.\textsuperscript{149}

The integration of gas lighting enabled freight operations to continue day and night, both inside and outside. For example, the New Warehouse was furnished with gas fittings during its construction between 1881-2.\textsuperscript{150} By 1889, there were 1076 gas lamps around the

\textsuperscript{143} Chester Archive NPR 1/9/1-3: LNWR Correspondence and Papers, Equipment and Buildings 1858-c.1900, list of machinery at Liverpool Road, 2 Aug 1889.

\textsuperscript{144} GMAU, ‘The 1830 Warehouse, Survey Report’, 5.4 on hydraulic machinery.

\textsuperscript{145} Chester Archive NPR 1/19: LNWR Capital Accounts 1876-1885, New Works Accounts half year ended 30 Nov 1882 & 30 Nov 1883.

\textsuperscript{146} TNA RAIL 371/16: Agreement with Manchester & Salford Waterworks Company for water supply to stations at Water Street and Oldfield Road, Salford.

\textsuperscript{147} The Lancaster Gazette and General Advertiser for Lancashire, Westmorland and Yorkshire (Lancaster, England) (26 May 1866) p.3.

\textsuperscript{148} TNA RAIL 410/131: LNWR Index to Board & Special Committee minutes, 1900 – 1910, indicates Special Committee discussed Liverpool Road steam gantry crane, 1907. Unfortunately, the full meeting minutes are missing (RAIL 410/765 cross-checked).

\textsuperscript{149} Chester NPR: 1/3/4 LNWR Electrical Arrangements c.1890-1915, record of correspondence re. London Road electric power for hydraulic pumps, Aug & Sept 1909.

\textsuperscript{150} Chester NPR: 1/19 LNWR New Works, Capital Accounts 1876-1885, New works half yearly accounts, 30 Nov 1882.
Station, extending to the ‘old cattle ramp’. Even the travelling crane was illuminated by three flame lamps in 1893. Gas lighting provided relatively stable illumination (as opposed the ephemerality of candle light or oil lamps) for the unloading and loading of goods. In 1882, for example, goods received during the night included fast goods at 2.45am, a GWR goods train at 3.50am and mineral traffic at 4am. LNWR began experiments with electric arc-lamps locally at London Road between 1896 and 1897, unsurprisingly passenger stations were prioritised for this prestigious innovation. In terms of warehousing, LNWR first illuminated their Leicester warehouse in 1903, in response the use of arc lamps for the Midland Company’s warehouse and sidings. Electric lighting was not introduced throughout warehouses at Liverpool Road, however, the office areas were illuminated with electricity in 1902. A later supply agreement shows gas continued to fuel ‘lighting, heating, cooking and power’ in 1914. Established and emerging illumination technologies were used concurrently, with staff areas prioritised for trials in electricity.
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151 Chester NPR: 1/9/1-3 List of lamps, Gas Department, Northern Division LNWR, 26 Nov 1889.
152 TNA RAIL: 410/199 LNWR Goods Traffic Committee, 19 July 1893
153 TNA RAIL: 946/9 LNWR timetables, July 1882, p.49.
154 TNA RAIL: 410/493 LNWR Chairman’s Consultative Committee, 1891-1907, Chairman’s Committee Meeting 14 Feb 1894; Chester NPR: 1/3/4 LNWR Electrical Arrangements c.1890-1915, pp.43-45 & 171.
156 TNA RAIL 410/131: LNWR Index to Board & Special Committee minutes, 1900 – 1910, indicates Special Committee provided Liverpool Road Offices with electric lighting, 1902. Unfortunately, the full meeting minutes are missing (RAIL 410/122 cross-checked).
157 TNA RAIL: 791/494 Agreement between Corporation of Manchester and LNWR for gas supply, Sept 1914.
3.2 Power and haulage

As power networks evolved at the Station, so too did the technologies of haulage. Apparatus to move heavy goods developed with the modernisation of the warehouses and Shipping Shed. This advanced the capacity of the Station to handle heavier loads in larger quantities - but also affected workers, who operated more dangerous and complex machinery. Cranes were an important component of the transhipment system at Liverpool Road, both inside and outside of warehouse structures. A sense of the scale of operations can be gleaned from the ninety-three cranes in operation by 1912; these were a combination of steam, hydraulic and hand-powered. In October 1882, Sampson, Moore and Company erected an overhead cord travelling crane with ten ton lifting capability. It is likely that this is the crane marked ‘10 Ton Crane’ to the left of the Shipping Shed (named Goods Shed) on the 1884 Plan of Liverpool Road [Figure 15]. Inside the Shipping Shed were cranes either side of the platform to load and unload wagons for transhipment on vans (initially horse driven and later motor vehicles) into the city. These were powered by

---

159 Chester Archive NPR 1/9/1-3: LNWR Correspondence, memorandum to Mr Macrae of Crewe Locomotive Works, 27 Nov 1889 & table of Liverpool Road terminal expenses, 2 Aug 1889.
hydraulic power; the final operative of the cranes recalls the risk to life when the high-pressure water jets burst out of the system.\textsuperscript{160}

The largest capacity cranes were enhanced in 1889, when a gantry was constructed and fitted to the exterior of the Shipping Shed. This cast iron frame of columns and girders supported a travelling crane. In 1912, D.H.F. Meacock surveyed the Station and found two overhead steam-powered travelling transporter cranes, with ten-ton capacities, could be connected using a steel bar to increase lifting capacity to twenty tons.\textsuperscript{161} The outline of the gantry can be seen on the LNWR 1884 plan [Figure 15] and suspending former worker, Edwards Partington in Figure 19. Whilst a steam engine originally powered the gantry’s cranes, it was later electrified.\textsuperscript{162} Electricity is not cited as a power source in Meacock’s survey, indeed, the Shipping Shed’s internal cranes were still powered by the hydraulic system in the 1960s, further demonstrating the coexistence of power technologies.\textsuperscript{163}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure19.jpg}
\caption{Station messenger, Edward Partington, illicitly hanging from the gantry, 28 Sept 1961. Partington recalls that hydraulic power continued to be used for the Shipping Shed’s internal cranes, which he operated himself as he progressed at Liverpool Road.}
\end{figure}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{160} Edward Partington, Oral History Interview for the Liverpool Road Station Project, recorded by Erin Beeston, 8 Dec 2015. Edward personally operated one of two hydraulic powered cranes for loading and unloading wagons inside the Shipping Shed during the 1960s.


\textsuperscript{162} Physical evidence such as warning signs on the shipping shed indicate that the gantry crane was electrified in the twentieth century.

\textsuperscript{163} Partington, Oral History Interview, 8 Dec 2015.
\end{flushleft}
Capstans were devices used to haul trucks, which shaped working spaces outside. Connected to the hydraulic power network, capstans were operated by pulling or depressing a lever to move a wheel on a vertical axle, this would quickly revolve and wind a chain attached to a goods wagon. Like the wider hydraulic system, capstans show the influence of maritime haulage techniques as these were developed on ships and in dock yards. Nineteen capstans were ‘all but one’ fixed when the New Warehouse was erected. An accident report provides a description of a capstan operated by foot treadles which were in use at Liverpool Road. On 15 August 1906 at 8.45pm Herbart Withington was injured on the leg:

This capstan is fitted with two treadles, and Withington was using the treadle on the west side of the capstan. When he removed his foot from the treadle it failed to return to the normal position and the drum continued to revolve, with the result that the hook on the capstan rope struck Withington on the right leg, causing a fleshwound.

This accident report highlights one of the many dangers staff operating machinery, but also demonstrates how men worked with mechanised haulage systems. Extant signage provides a sense of the geography of outside machinery, marking the location of capstans alongside the warehouses and Shipping Shed [Figure 20].

Figure 20. Extant signs on the 1830 Warehouse show the location of two of the hydraulic powered capstans (Image: SIM).

164 Maritime capstans were introduced for weighting anchors on vessels in the early modern period, described as an innovation by Walter Raleigh: “capstan, n.” (OED Online: Oxford University Press, September 2019), <www.oed.com/view/Entry/27600> [accessed 10 Nov 2019].

165 Chester Archive NPR 1/9/1-3: LNWR Correspondence, Table of terminal expenses, Liverpool Road, 2 Aug 1889.

166 TNA RAIL 1053/95/185: Returns of Railway Accidents and Casualties as Reported to the Board of Trade during the three months ending 30 Sept 1906 (HMSO, 1907) p.142.
Figure 21. Walter Bowman of the cartage department (above) with a draught horse in front of the stables beneath the ‘pineapple line’ viaduct, taken between 1916 and 1923. Below, Walter stands alongside a Karrier LMS delivery van in 1926. These images were sent to the Liverpool Road Station Society after Walter, who was briefly a member, died on 1 August 1979. SIM: YA1996.1539.
Whilst apparatus like cranes lifted and lowered goods and capstans were employed for shunting, horses were used for pulling cart loads around the Station and beyond. The scale of the nineteenth century cartage department is difficult to discern from LNWR records, yet, clearly the department expanded around the period of the gantry installation. In October 1892, seven additional carters and five carboys were recruited, space for more horses was required by January 1893, when an additional railway arch at Charles Street was adapted for the purpose. By the early twentieth century, Meacock presents a large cartage department. A photograph of Walter Bowman [Figure 21], who worked in the department from 1916 to about 1963, shows him proudly presenting his draught horse. According to a note on the reverse, the harness has LNWR livery, placing it before 1923. An accompanying image from 1926 shows Walter with an early London Midland and Scottish Railway (LMS) motor vehicle – the Karrier delivery van. Framed in the terminology of the cartage department, the ‘stabling’ of the Manchester district’s motor vehicles is referred to as early as 1917. As with the earlier power and haulage technologies explored in this Chapter, motor transport did not supersedes horses entirely, as cart horses were employed for deliveries as late as 1950.

3.3 Resilience

The final phase of large-scale developments at Liverpool Road coincides with the expansion of stations Manchester wide. A significant context for this was the threat of competition from the Manchester Ship Canal in 1894. The ‘big ditch’ enabled large, seafaring vessels into Salford and Manchester via Runcorn. This new terminus threatened the Port of Liverpool rail links and existing waterways into Manchester. Following the passing of the Ship Canal Bill in 1885, rival railway companies, despite their strong opposition to the
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167 TNA RAIL 410/1837: LNWR Register of salaried permanent officers in the Goods Department including clerks, goods managers, inspectors, superintendents, timekeepers, accountants, foremen, agents, canvassers and collectors 1845-1878. The carrying department records remain elusive.


169 RAIL 410/765: Extracts from minutes of Locomotive, Permanent Way, Stores, Special and other committees, 1896 – 1929, minutes of the Locomotive and Engineering Committee 15 Jun 1917. Motor vehicles ‘stabled’ at Mayfield Station, serving the entire Manchester area.

170 TNA Work 25/222: Festival of Britain photographs 1950-51, image of the City Exhibition Hall shows draught horses pulling British Railways Wagons outside the Shipping Shed.

project, gained commissions to construct rail links to the new infrastructure. LNWR built stations at Latchford and Runcorn Docks, and along with GWR at Ellesmere Port and Walton Old Junction.\textsuperscript{172} Liverpool Road was linked to the Ship Canal through its connection to Weaste Station, which was operational by 1896.\textsuperscript{173} Despite attempts by LNWR to integrate their rival into the railway network, a decrease in receipts at Liverpool Road was reported by March 1899.\textsuperscript{174} By June 1905, LNWR reduced the cost of shipping traffic through Liverpool in response to competition from the Ship Canal.\textsuperscript{175}

The LNWR maintained its connection between Manchester and the West coast seaports via Liverpool Road Station. Two stock books discovered inside the 1830 Warehouse in the early 1990s demonstrate the variety of West coast routes entering the Station.\textsuperscript{176} The ‘Old Warehouse Stock Book’ contains a ledger for the period of March 1905 until October 1905. This shows where goods came from, who owned them and what type of consignment it was. Whilst in some cases conveyance was by rail from a town, many goods came from ports, frequently, Alexandra Dock and Canada Dock at Port of Liverpool, as well as Garston Dock and Widnes Dock. Garston had established links with Lancashire’s collieries since the 1850s, the Ship Canal Company’s rival dock for coal traffic at Partington struggled to compete with the railway.\textsuperscript{177} Meacock gives an indication of frequency of consignments from the Station out to Liverpool, which were dispatched daily at 2.06pm for shipment the same day, with a special goods train on heavy shipment days.\textsuperscript{178}

Continuities in the spatial organisation of freight is evident in later sources. The 1914 gas supply agreement with Manchester Corporation provides an official record of the names and uses of the buildings:

- Butter warehouse, Water Street
- Stables and Piggeries, Water Street
- Shipping Shed, Liverpool Road
- Warehouse, Grape Street

\textsuperscript{172} Bosdin Leech, \textit{History of the Manchester Ship Canal, from its inception to its completion with personal reminiscences by Sir Bosdin Leech} Volume 2 (Manchester: Sherratt & Hughes, 1907), p.307.

\textsuperscript{173} TNA RAIL 410/9: LNWR Court of Proprietors minutes and reports, 1894-1899, Francis Stevenson, Engineer’s Reports on Progress of Works, in half-yearly reports 1894-1896.

\textsuperscript{174} TNA RAIL 410/723 LNWR Canvassers Conference minutes (1896-1906), 9 Mar 1899.

\textsuperscript{175} Ibid.,

\textsuperscript{176} SIM Archive 1996.2531: London & North Western Railway Stock Books (x2).


The 1830 Warehouse appears as the ‘Butter Warehouse’, which suggests long-term storage use of this space for dairy as the 1850 Ordnance Survey Map also shows butter in the west-end bay [Figure 7]. An 1926 advertisement for Manchester depots by LMS, which superseded the LNWR in 1923, demonstrates continuity in types of goods handled and where on site particular traffic was received. Aimed at haulage companies, the advert outlines the uses of different areas. For example, the ‘commodious and convenient Bonded Store Warehousing’ for the storage of wines and spirits. The proximity of the Pig Market to the abattoir on Water Street was highlighted and the provision for dead meat traffic for the Manchester Meat Market was presented as advantageous. Here, the prominent marketing of the bonded stores and livestock capacity in particular at Liverpool Road demonstrates the long-term success of Baker’s 1860s rearrangement of the Station.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have brought details of buildings, technologies, things, animals and people out of obscurity by focussing on freight uses of Liverpool Road Station. Despite comprising imposing infrastructure and buildings, there are few responses to freight at the Station after 1844. Owing to the shape of the source base, aspects remain obscure, for example, there is little on the GJR Warehouse that stood on a smaller plot of land to the New Warehouse between the 1840s and 1870s. Yet, research into other former buildings, like the Cotton Warehouses, provides details from the flammable materials stored there to perceptions of the ‘greatest’ fire Manchester had reportedly seen. Accounts of the fire provide a rare insight into 1860s views of the Station, when the age and function of the earliest building was known, albeit not their significance. As stated in Chapter 1, it was not until the LNWR’s omission of jubilee in 1880 that the Station Building began to signify LMR history.

179 RAIL: 791/494 Agreement between Manchester Corporation and LNWR for gas supply, Sept 1914.
180 TNA: RAIL 421/199 Handbook of towns and places to and from which goods traffic is conveyed: Manchester stations, 1926.
What is gained by considering the longer freight history is a window into both visible technologies and discreet networks that supplied Manchester. Connectivity across the Liverpool Road has been gleaned from maps, plans and records of utility and power networks. Hydraulic power, mains water and gas supplies are also examples of technologies at Liverpool Road with limited visibility: the output may have been clear, yet, there were subterranean and discreet networks at play. In the earlier period, workers recognised a lag in the adoption of new technology; whilst the telegraph ran along the LMR lines from 1847, staff demanded connectivity with the partner stations in 1849, a request initially ignored. Focussing on freight technologies also enhances our understanding of the ‘in-between’ spaces outside, for example, how the capstans were distributed and interacted with by station staff.

Types of goods moved in and out of Liverpool Road present some surprising commodities alongside the obvious cotton and coal. For example, the Bonded Warehouse receipts provides a window into the imported alcohol brought into 1870s Manchester. The prominence of wine in receipts reflects drinking trends influenced by Gladstone’s Wine and Refreshment House Bill. Beyond aspirational drinking habits, all levels of society benefitted from the commodities brought into the city here, like the pigs essential to feeding Manchester’s workers. The demand for pig traffic was such it re-shaped the area, following the removal of the Charles Street Pig Station after the fire, immediately pig salesman petitioned the Railway Company for new premises before the Water Street location was selected.

Freight research also helps to uncover social stories, from the change in living arrangements for the Station’s first railway family to transformations in staff spaces as a result of Railway Company partnerships. Tensions also appear, such as GWR delays halting the expansion of warehousing at Liverpool Road. Relations with Manchester Corporation during the construction of the Shipping Shed were strained after the LNWR failed to deliver the Camp Field extension line. Contestation over civic space, Corporation market space and Station space is further untangled in Chapter 3. Only through considering the technical and social dynamics of the Station can we begin to grasp Liverpool Road’s role in the City, a theme taken up in the following chapter.
Chapter 3
The Station and the Camp Field:
At the threshold of the Victorian City

The immediate approach to Manchester, by the Railway, is through a portion of Salford, as little interesting as can well be imagined. Over the River Irwell the Railway is carried by a very handsome stone bridge, and then over a series of arches, into the Company’s station in Water-street and Liverpool-road, Manchester; from which the traveller whose object is pleasure rather than business, will probably make his way, without loss of time, to the more genial attractions of the Albion Hotel, or New Bridgewater Arms.’

– Henry Booth

Introduction

In this chapter, Liverpool Road Station will be considered in its geographical and social context of the Campfield neighbourhood, which took its name from the Camp Field open space along Liverpool Road. Residents and workers were affected by the sights, sounds and smells, and the movement of people and things to and from the Station. Sites of home, work and leisure overlapped considerably in this small area of Manchester from the Southern end of Deansgate to Water Street along the River Irwell. Here, I will demonstrate how the Station influenced these spaces, and, in turn, consider key moments in the district that shaped the uses and perceptions of the Station. The relationship between civic space, created by Manchester Corporation, and the industrial space of Liverpool Road Station reveals a complex series of interventions in urban life, not previously addressed in area histories.

The Station and surrounding area were considered by key actors, including railway officials and local councillors, as at the edge of the Victorian town. Perceptions of the area as on the periphery, and therefore inconvenient for travellers, influenced the transfer of the passenger service to Victoria Station in May 1844. Wolfgang Schivelbusch observed how swiftly hopes that railway stations would be attractive zones for city dwellers were quashed.
as the ‘immediately adjoining parts of the city were soon stigmatised as being industrial and proletarian’. ¹ In this case, the industrial character of Campfield was well established, with the Bridgewater Canal terminus at Castlefield basin and the docks of the Mersey and Irwell Navigation pre-dating the railway; the area was commonly regarded by contemporaries as working class and prone to ‘nuisance’. ² Henry Booth’s suggestion that the traveller for pleasure would leave the district ‘without loss of time’ is indicative of wider perceptions. ³ These influenced discourses on distance amongst Railway Company Directors and municipal officials. Victoria Station was closer to the Exchange, the commercial centre of Manchester, whilst Liverpool Road was beyond the Quay Street ‘boundary’ of the business district; J.R. Kellet characterised Liverpool Road Station as the hampering the district’s expansion. ⁴

Liverpool Road Station is situated on a natural boundary alongside the River Irwell, Figure 1 shows the Station area in 1848 with the business district located to the north beyond Quay Street. Before 1806, Liverpool Road was a narrower thoroughfare named Priestnor Street, renamed when the road was expanded, and a bridge was constructed over the River. ⁵ The centre-periphery dichotomy becomes more complex when the area is studied in detail. Richard Cobden, Anti-Corn Law League founder and key figure of the ‘Manchester School’ of liberalism lived in the former Byrom residence on Quay Street from 1836, which became the first location of Owens College in 1851. This re-use of Cobden’s House for the City’s nascent university encouraged a variety of social groups to interact. ⁶ St John’s Ward, the municipal area of the Station, also contained large Georgian housing owned by medical
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⁴ There were competing ideas of centrality in mid-nineteenth century Manchester. As discussed in Chapter 2, Section 1.2, at the start of the 1840s the LMR Company preferred Store Street (now Piccadilly) for a passenger terminus over Victoria, which was favoured by the Manchester and Leeds Company; J. R. Kellet, *Railways and Victorian Cities* (London: Routledge, re-print 1979), p.155.


professionals. By 1855, St Mary's Hospital and Dispensary for Women and Children moved into Quay Street premises.

Figure 1. Section showing Liverpool Road Station from Slater’s Trade Directory Map of Manchester 1848 (Manchester Historical Maps, https://manchester.publicprofiler.org/beta/).

Schivelbusch, argued in his seminal work The Railway Journey that railway stations acted as a ‘gateway’ connecting two realms: the urban traffic space and the railroad. He suggested that the traveller experienced the station as an intermediary of industrial space, in preparation for their journey in ‘actual’ industrial space on the railroad. The gateway analogy is useful concept to explore the passenger movement around and through Liverpool Road Station. Although Schivelbusch was largely concerned with mid-nineteenth century stations constructed of ‘steel and glass’, Liverpool Road bore the characteristics of a ‘gateway’ station with an archetypal stucco fronted Grecian-style building facing the street, passengers were then processed through booking halls and waiting rooms to an industrial zone: the platform facing a warehouse with hoists, turntables and cranes. In this

chapter, I show how the industrial space influenced and spilled out into the surrounding area, particularly after the passenger service ceased in 1844.

Campfield has received uneven coverage from historians, whose spatial understanding of Manchester is often framed by the ‘shock city’ commentators, especially Friedrich Engels, and evidence of notorious public health crises. Martin Hewitt outlines the more mixed pattern of social structures in the areas of Manchester contemporaries characterised as working class.8 Studies of institutions, including the Free Public Library and the Hall of Science within Chartist histories provide insights into Campfield’s complex milieu.9 Whilst Engels did visit Campfield, it was not a focal point for descriptions in The Condition of the Working Class in England. Contemporary perceptions of the area by Manchester’s burgeoning middle class and civic authorities present Campfield as dangerous, with slums housing, a radical meeting hall and illicit working class recreations. Yet, the social make-up of the area evident in the census, trade directories and municipal records show a more mixed social space. By presenting Campfield as a working-class area ‘ripe for improvement’ the municipal authorities justified moralising interventions. However, to accept the descriptions of people congregated on streets in terms of the ‘otherness’ conjured by writers and politicians disguises the range of social encounters enacted in Campfield.

In Section 1, I explore how people interacted with the Station and surrounding spaces before and after the transfer of the passenger service to Victoria Station in 1844. Evidence of passengers passing immediately through Campfield supports Friedrich Engels belief that Manchester’s wealthiest could move through the town without engaging with (or seeing) poorer citizens.10 Though, this is complicated with the presence of hotels specifically for passengers and other amenities with cross-class appeal. The uses of the area by popular movements and the role of the Railway in facilitating the government’s response to the civil crisis of Chartist agitation are highlighted in Section 2. The Hall of Science, a building for education, meetings and rallies was established adjacent to the Station by the followers
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of Robert Owen. In 1852, Manchester’s first Free Public Library was instated in the defunct Hall to ‘civilise’ the working classes and eradicate socialist ideas. Martin Hewitt has argued that libraries were above all ‘elements of municipalisation’.\(^{11}\) I show that the library was part of a wider strategy of the Corporation to extend their influence in the Campfield. I will highlight the contemporaneous attempt by the Corporation to enclose the Camp Field with a market, planned with the London and North-Western Railway (LNWR, owners of Liverpool Road Station from 1846-1923) whose Station extension re-shaped the area by 1855.

In Section 3, moving to the 1870s to 1890s, I demonstrate that the ‘municipalisation’ of Campfield was not undone when the Free Public Library was moved in 1877. A ban on fairs held and the subsequent enclosure of the Camp Field within long-mooted market halls by the Corporation’s Markets Committee removed an open space for local business and residents. This was a prime example of the severance of the market from the streets and street life of the town, which Patrick Joyce has shown in relation to Manchester’s Smithfield Market.\(^{12}\) Liverpool Road Station again played a part in disrupting street-life in Campfield, as the LNWR demolished more houses opposite the Field in 1879. The governmental influence over the area extended to Liverpool Road, as the Markets Committee challenged the legitimacy of the Station’s Pig Market. By considering growth of municipal controls around the Station, market halls and library, the cultivation of ‘civic seeing’ in Campfield is apparent.\(^{13}\) This chapter demonstrates that even oft studied themes in urban history can be enlivened through considering the role of freight infrastructure, which is regularly omitted from social histories.

Section 1: The Station and its surroundings

Liverpool Road was ideally situated for its role in transporting goods in an area already adapted for warehousing around the canal basin. However, the Station was not considered near the civic or commercial centre of Manchester. In this section, I outline the social make-up of Campfield, highlighting the contrast between those who lived and worked on

---

\(^{11}\) Hewitt, ‘Confronting the modern city’, p.68.


Liverpool Road and the position of passengers passing through the area. In Section 1.1, perceptions present crowds, whilst Engels’ stark characterisation of the area as only for workers is challenged with evidence of variety in local professions and businesses. Section 1.2 explores how the railway facilitated the separation of classes through onwards connections by land and the organisation of space at the Station. Seasonal rhythms and daily routines also highlight the influence of the Station on daily life.

1.1 Negotiating Liverpool Road

The movement of passengers to and from the Station illustrates the negotiation of urban space by different social classes. In 1844, Friedrich Engels, in his anti-capitalist polemic, argued that there were self-imposed class boundaries enacted in Manchester ‘by unconscious tacit agreement, as well as with outspoken conscious determination, the working people’s quarters are sharply separated from the sections of the city reserved for the middle class’.¹⁴ The LMR passengers were unlikely to have travelled to the Station area on foot from the town centre, thus avoiding workers quarters as Engels suggests. The movement of middle and upper class people to and from the centre, passing through but not interacting with the buildings and spaces around the Station, indicates that spatial segregation was facilitated by transport arrangements. However, this is perhaps too simple a dichotomy, and rules out the potential for encounters on the street outside the Station and ignores the eclectic nature of local traders.

The few descriptions of Campfield made by observers of the ‘shock city’ and travel guide authors present a busy, crowded place. Engels, in his commentary on class relations, described the progression along Deansgate from the business district southwards: ‘... less inviting shops, which grow dirtier and more interrupted by beerhouses and gin palaces the farther one goes, until at the southern end the appearance of the shops leaves no doubt that workers and workers only are their customers’.¹⁵ Liverpool Road intersected with Deansgate at the latter section of the thoroughfare; from Engels’ perspective, this area was solely the domain of the working classes. Osborne’s Guide to the Grand Junction Railway described the area in the same year. The author conjured an image of a densely populated working class district: ‘the station is on a considerable eminence, from whence is seen a

¹⁵ Ibid., p.78.
vast mass of buildings, intersecting with innumerable streets, crowded with a busy population.\textsuperscript{16}

Evidence from the 1841 census show a variety of trades and professions were carried out by Liverpool Road residents. People of different incomes and social standing lived alongside each other, with most residents in working class and lower middle class ‘petit bourgeoisie’ professions. As might be expected in the town later termed ‘Cottonopolis’, several households were employed in the textile industry. These range from unskilled factory workers to trades like fustian cutter, silk winder to hatmaker and tailor. Several people are listed as brokers, middlemen between manufacturers and buyers, most likely in working the cotton trade. Small business proprietors included a butcher and shopkeeper, whilst lower skilled workers included watermen, who worked on the canals, and warehousemen, who may have worked for canal or railway companies. A hay dealer lived on Liverpool Road, who most likely exchanged goods at the Camp Field hay market (see Figure 5), and William Smith aged 45 is listed as a porter, a possible employee at the Station.\textsuperscript{17} As outlined in Chapter 2, Station superintendent, Joseph Green occupied the Station Master’s House with his children and servants, whilst Hamlet Harrison, manager of the GJR goods office, resided on the corner of Water Street with his family. Nearby streets also housed railway employees, such as Edward Robinson, a railway guard who lived on Grindle Street from 1834 to 1842.\textsuperscript{18}

New hotels, pubs, shops and businesses opened on Liverpool Road along with the Railway Station (as discussed in Chapter 2, section 1). By 1843, there were several beer retailers and five public houses along Liverpool Road: the White Lion, Oxnoble, Railway and Quay Inn, Queen’s Arms and the Railway Hotel.\textsuperscript{19} These establishments catered for customers who can be loosely grouped as either male dock workers and local labourers or railway travellers. For example, the Oxnoble, named after a type of potato, has been associated with potato wharf and the potato market held at St John’s Market, Camp Field, and as such


\textsuperscript{17} Census of England and Wales, Borough of Manchester, Township of Manchester 1841 enumeration schedule 27.

\textsuperscript{18} Michael R. Bailey, ‘The World’s First Railway Guard’ unpublished manuscript of a biography of Edward Robinson, created 2013, pers. comms. (email) 22 Jul 2014.

\textsuperscript{19} Pigot’s and Slater’s general and classified directory and street register of Manchester and Salford (Pigot & Slater, Manchester, 1843), p.54.
is believed to have been the regular public house for dock workers. Westall’s Railway Hotel, on the other hand, advertised rooms ‘second to none’ for railway travellers, highlighting the regular serving of refreshments throughout the day ‘so essentially necessary to persons travelling by this mode of conveyance’. Demand for the latter service dropped abruptly with the end of the passenger service in May 1844, as highlighted in Chapter 2.

1.2 Passing through Liverpool Road

As Liverpool Road was not deemed a walkable distance to the town centre, passengers were transported through the area by road vehicles. LMR had a passenger booking office at Market Street (Manchester’s main thoroughfare) along with the provision of an omnibus service to transport passengers to Liverpool Road. In 1837, Joseph Green suggested that the Market Street offices should not be used to book passengers as it was ‘inconvenient and prejudicial to the Company’ owing to the unreliability of omnibus service. Although the LMR Directors agreed with Green, ruling that the Market Street offices should only be used for parcels, trade directory and guide book evidence indicates that passenger transfers by omnibus continued into the 1840s. An illustration from Osbourne’s Guide [Figure 2] shows passengers waiting for transportation by horse and carriage under Water Street Bridge. The Doric colonnade beneath the Bridge contrasts with the engine house at the end of the 1830 Warehouse and other industrial structures. The illustration is based on the popular T. T. Bury print [Figure 3] but focusses in on the passengers carried forth below the Bridge, rather than a locomotive or the wider infrastructure evident in Bury’s work. The guide book stated: ‘omnibuses are here waiting to convey passengers to all parts of the town.’ Hackney coaches (hireable horse drawn vehicles) also congregated at Liverpool Road, as the Pigot’s and Slater’s Directory shows,

---

22 In Pigot’s Directory of Manchester and Salford 1838 (p.114) the Company’s offices and agents are listed at both Liverpool Road and 57 Market Street, with a receiving house at Back Mosley Street.
23 TNA RAIL 371/4: L&MR Board Meeting minutes (1836 - 1838), 3 Apr 1837; Pigot’s and Slater’s general and classified directory (1843), p.86. Liverpool Road and 124 Market Street are listed for passengers, and Back Mosley Street and 101 Portland Street for receiving warehouse goods.
coaches waited at St Ann’s Square, Piccadilly, Lower Mosley Street, Railway Office Liverpool Road, Great Ancoats Street, Hunt’s Bank, and streets in Salford.

Figure 2. Illustration of the station from Osborne’s Guide to the Grand Junction Railway, or Birmingham, Liverpool and Manchester Railway, 1844.

Particularly wealthy patrons of the LMR travelled to and from the Station in their own carriages. These were mounted on bogies and transported by train at a charge of 20s for a four wheeled carriage and 15s for a two wheeled carriage (an example is shown on the W. Crane illustration, Chapter 2 Figure 2). Joseph Green stated in a licence hearing at the Borough Court in 1843 that ‘a lady had driven up to the Station in her own carriage… and asked him where she could obtain a glass of Brandy’. This passenger, with her own means of transport, benefitted from a level of autonomy when travelling though Campfield. The continued provision for transporting entire carriages and for providing passenger transport from Market Street during the 1840s demonstrates that the LMR’s system provided travellers with the convenience of railroad to City centre connections. What Engels described as a ‘tacit agreement’ between the classes was profitable for the omnibus service

---

25 Pigot’s and Slater’s Directory of Manchester and Salford (Manchester, 1841) p.147.
and Hackney carriages, which facilitated the separation of wealthy passengers from the street.

![Figure 3. Entrance to Manchester across Water Street aquatint by H Pyall, after Thomas Talbot Bury and published by R Ackermann, London, 1831 (SIM: YA 1983.9/4/6).](image)

Upon arrival at the Station, the separation of the classes moved from perception to physical realisation as first and second class passengers entered separate entrances and were divided into first and second class booking halls and waiting rooms, to then board distinct carriages. The doorways began this spatial separation, with the first class door adorned with more decorative plasterwork. This segregation of space defined as ‘class’ has no known precedent in the transportation of passengers by stage coach or canal boats, although Fitzgerald notes the absence of sources on the nature of these offices makes it difficult to assess. People had been simply divided by ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ categories, which was reflected in the price of tickets. Jeffery Richards and John MacKenzie state that Britain set the pattern for the gradation of terminal facilities across Europe, reducing the

---


likelihood of cross-class social encounters.\textsuperscript{30} Timetable evidence suggests that second class passengers included the servants of the first-class patrons.\textsuperscript{31} Yet, as evidenced in Chapter 2 Section 1, this practice of fully dividing the Station between the two classes ceased after only seven years, when the Grand Junction Railway (GJR) occupied a portion of the offices for their ticket sales. Transportation by any of these means was too expensive for the average worker; most early railways did not offer a third class of carriage until a law introducing them was passed in 1844.\textsuperscript{32} The LMR was not a viable means of regular transport for most local residents and workers, however, special excursion traffic did accommodate the ‘masses’.\textsuperscript{33}

In 1833, A Tourist, the anonymous author of \textit{The Railway Companion}, described ascending the staircase at Liverpool Road Station, moving from the booking office to track level and entering railway space:

There is something singularly striking... in this sudden change in our altitude -- this alteration in our relative position with our fellowmen. But a moment ago we were in the midst, and made a little part of a busy multitude, each of whose features betokened an eager pursuit of some object: anon we find ourselves... translated to another equally sublunary scene from which we discern the self-same beings of our previous companionship still plying the self-same stern activity, but in a world that now lies stretched far beneath us.\textsuperscript{34}

The account introduces to the sensation of being removed from the crowded street and into the railway space at Liverpool Road. The Station is the transformative setting of the ‘gateway’ as Schivelbusch defined. The different levels at the Station provide the author


\textsuperscript{31} NRM G6/89R: Wyld’s \textit{London & Birmingham and Manchester & Liverpool Railway Guide} (London: James Wyld, 1839), p.6, timetable between Birmingham and Manchester and Liverpool shows that First Class travellers going the entire distance received reduced fares (Second Class) for grooms and servants.

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Fifth report from the Select Committee on Railways; together with the minutes of evidence, appendix and Index}, 24 May 1844, p.318: a resolution to extend recommendations of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} report, which had ensured new railway lines supplied third class carriages, to existing lines. The LMR did introduce third class (see \textit{Railway Record}, 8 May 1844, p.89.) by demoting old second class trains to third; this was after the passenger service had moved from Liverpool Road to Hunt’s Bank.


\textsuperscript{34} A. Tourist (pseudonym), \textit{The Railway companion: describing an excursion along the Liverpool line, accompanied with a succinct and popular history of the rise and progress of rail-roads} (1833), pp.28-9, LSE Selected Papers, digitised by Jstor <http://www.jstor.org/stable/60239978?sid=primo> [accessed 25 Oct 17].
with the actual and metaphorical sensation of being lifted above the activity of the city and therefore disconnected from the urban milieu.

As well as bringing a range of travellers to (or through) the area, the Station influenced how busy or quiet Campfield was with weekly, monthly and annual crowds using the railway seasonally. LMR ran additional trains for special excursions and increased capacity for passengers during key holiday periods, for example, extra trains were put on for Whitsuntide in 1842. 

Susan Major in her thesis on early railway excursion crowds noted a 400% increase in traffic for Whit excursions on the LMR between 1845 and 1846, 

Liverpool Road therefore saw only the start of mass passenger travel. The weekly use of the Station by business passengers was increased on Tuesdays when ‘High ‘change’, the peak of transactions at the Exchange, took place. Merchants and agents from Manchester and cotton districts descended upon the commercial centre. ‘A motley assembly’ of attorneys, their clerks, witnesses and defendants on their way to court were seen through the eyes of the lead character in Elizabeth Gaskell’s Mary Barton. Set between 1839 and 1842, Gaskell’s descriptions in Mary Barton were often informed by the experiences of her family and reflects popular expectations of railway travel.

LMR put on an extra train at 7am for the commuters to the Assize court at Liverpool when sessions were held. Liverpool newspapers in December 1843 warned that the Winter Assize, coinciding with Christmas travel, caused disruption, delaying trains by an hour or more.

Railway timetables dictated the times of day passengers travelled and indicate when the Station was busiest. For example, the Grand Junction Railway, which ran trains from Birmingham to join the LMR, began services from Manchester at 6.30am and ceased at 6.30pm, whilst trains arrived from Birmingham as late as 11.30pm. Another table of departures from Liverpool Road for trains on LMR for 1841 shows the earliest train pulled

---

35 TNA RAIL 371/6 L&MR Directors Meeting minutes (1842 - 1845), 9 May 1842, p.21. 5 shilling return tickets to Liverpool were planned for travel on extra trains during Whit week (the final week in May).

36 Major, 'The million go forth', table 6, p.163.


39 The Morning Post (London) 30 December 1843, reporting news from Liverpool papers (unnamed), p.8.

second class carriages, destined for Liverpool at 7.30am (or 7am on Sundays) with the latest, ‘mixed’ trains leaving at 7.15pm.\textsuperscript{41} For the most part, passengers leaving Manchester were in the area during the daytime and early evening, with only arriving passengers entering Manchester on site later. The bye-laws for Hackney Coaches allowed them to wait outside the railway office on Liverpool Road ‘when not actually hired, [they] shall stand, from nine o’clock in the morning until twelve o’clock at night.’\textsuperscript{42} This limited the movement of travellers by carriage, indicating that middle and upper class travellers would not visit the Station area at night. Fears surrounding criminality and the Campfield at night time are explored in Section 3.1, whilst civilising efforts that created space for middle class rational recreation in Campfield is addressed in Section 2.

\textsuperscript{41} ‘Liverpool and Manchester Railway 1840 Times of Departure from Lime Street, Liverpool, and from Liverpool Road, Manchester’ p.64. Mixed trains aren’t defined on this timetable, but according to Freeling’s \textit{Grand Junction Companion} (p.14) mixed trains pull a variety of first and second-class coaches.

\textit{Pigot & Slater’s General and Classified Directory of Manchester and Salford, including the adjacent townships} (Manchester: Pigot & Slater, 1841) p.147.

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., p.145.
Figure 4. Map of Manchester from *Bradshaw's Railway Companion* (London: Bradshaw’s Railway Information Office, 1846). Based on a contemporary Ordnance Survey map. Liverpool Road Station is situated bottom left, Victoria Station top/centre and Store Street/London Road Station bottom right (NRM 2006.7493).

Section 2: Radicals, the railway and the municipalisation of Campfield

In this section, I outline the role of both Manchester’s civic elite and the Railway in the organisation of space in Campfield. A mandate for ‘improvement’ was explicit in the 1853 opening of Manchester’s first Free Public Library in a former Hall of Science, originally built by Owenite subscribers and host to Chartists. Followers of Robert Owen established Halls of Science to extend scientific education, in this period broadly construed as a system of rational enquiry.\(^4\) Engels attended Sunday morning lectures at the Hall between 1842 and 1843 in observation of the socialist movement in England.\(^4\) With the library, Campfield became a key civic area in the urban public sphere;\(^4\) the gaze of the elite shifted to a space


considered peripheral. Visitors to the Campfield Library had little choice but to face slum housing and the adjacent industrial zone. When the Library opened in 1853, sixty-nine dwellings were cleared for the extension of Liverpool Road Station. As civic space supplanted a Hall of politics, Liverpool Road Station encroached upon the living area of its employees. Campfield was besieged simultaneously by civilising efforts and railway demolitions. Taking Schivelbusch’s gateway analogy further, the physical gateway between railway space and the surrounding urban environment became more fluid as the Corporation’s interests spilled over the threshold of the Station.

![Ordnance Survey Map of Manchester sheet 32 and 33, scale five feet to one mile, surveyed in 1848 and published in 1850. The Hall of Science is situated alongside the Camp Field, the Anglican St Matthew’s Church adjoins the Field. Station buildings, including Cotton Warehouse 2 are situated to the west along Liverpool Road. Streets of housing on Wellington Place, between the Camp Field and the Station, were demolished in 1853-4 (UoM Map collection).](image)

2.1 Unruly Campfield

The Manchester Hall of Science materially and intellectually represented working class politics in the area. The Hall was a Doric style building situated on the corner of Tonman Street and Byrom Street, adjacent to the Camp Field and close to the upper yard of Liverpool Road Station [Figure 4]. Robert Owen laid the foundation stone in August 1839, with the building operational by 1840.\(^\text{46}\) The Hall was intended for all societies or

\(^{46}\) *New Moral World or Gazette of the Universal Community Society of Rational Religionists* (Leeds, England) (27 July 1839) p.640, advertisement for laying of the foundation stone.
associations, regardless of religious sect or political party. Uses of the Hall ranged from public meetings, educational lectures, and a Sunday school, to tea parties and concerts. In style, the Hall of Science was designed in the principle of Owen’s theories on architecture, neo-classical yet plainer than other institutions to convey trustworthiness and permanence; Katrina Navickas likens their appearance to contemporary banks.  

‘Sacred to the investigation of truth’ was proclaimed along the side of the building. The 1850 Ordnance Survey Map of Manchester [Figure 5] shows details of the interior of the Hall, including a coffee room in the corner of the building [Figure 6]. This provided a social space for Owenite temperance followers as coffee shops were associated with sober, democratic activity. Whilst James Nicholls has challenged this general perception of coffee shops, its location inside the Hall indicates it was intended for sober entertainments. A large lecture theatre was the main space within the Hall. Robert Buchanan, advocate of Owen, included a lyceum and a library in the Hall ‘to combine the best features of a mechanics institute’ and arranged lectures on the physical sciences.

**Figure 6.** Close-up of the 1848 Ordnance Survey Map of Manchester (sheet 32) showing the internal features of the Hall of Science (UoM Map collection).

---


49 *Supplement to New Moral World* (23 May 1840), pp.1244-45.
Anglican clergymen of the nearby St Matthew’s Church resisted the establishment of the Hall. In November 1839, before the building was in use, Owenite paper *New Moral World* advertised Spencer Walpole’s ‘People Armed Against Priestcraft’ pamphlet in reply to Reverend W.J. Kidd’s tract entitled ‘The People Armed Against Socialism’. Shortly after the official opening of the Hall, Reverend Kidd attempted to have the institution closed down by reporting to magistrates of money taken at the door by stewards on a Sunday, contrary to the law. The proximity of the Hall to St Matthew’s clearly fueled animosity between the Anglicans and Owenites. Radical pamphlets, some of which included lectures given at Carpenter’s Hall and the Hall of Science, were circulated in Manchester by radical publisher (and later politician), Abel Heywood, and sold in his shop on Oldham Street. Several publications engaged in further debate with Kidd. An anonymous Clergyman of St Matthew’s (possibly Kidd or an associate) later claimed that the Mayor, John Potter, had selected the Hall of Science for the library to rescue the ‘socialists’ from bankruptcy, an indication this feud continued.

Evidence of the Hall of Science provides an insight into women’s movement around the area, which is difficult to glean from railway or municipal records. Unlike educational establishments for workers (like the Mechanics Institute), the Hall welcomed women and encouraged attendance with lower ticket prices for events. For example, a ball on 27 November 1841 was cheaper for ladies whose tickets were 9d., whilst men were charged 1s 3d. Reports of a riot on 8 March 1842 at a lecture by Fergus O’Connor on the repeal of the Union between Britain and Ireland highlighted the presence of ‘shrieking females’. O’Connor’s lecture was 1d. to gain entrance to the ‘body of the hall’, 2d. for a view from the gallery or 6d. for the platform, with no separate price for women. The price scales demonstrate a hierarchy was facilitated by the building’s design, distinguishing between

---

50 *New Moral World* no.55. (9 Nov 1839) p.880.
52 TNA HO/44/38/66: Copy of *The Holy Scriptures Analyzed by Robert Cooper*, purchased by McKenny at Carpenters Hall, ‘The Gordian Knot United or the impossibility of the bible being true, being an answer to the Rev. J.W. Kidd of St Matthew’s Church’ by Theodore Hall esq. advertised on the reverse. c. 1840.
55 *Caledonian Mercury* (Edinburgh), (19 March 1842).
56 Ibid., (12 Mar, 1842).
those who could afford to look down on the lectures and those who could only pay enough to stand in the Hall. The mixed use of the Hall of Science created a space for individuals to both see and be seen, in a formal setting apart from the mainstream liberal political culture of 1840s Manchester.

The Owenites allowed Chartists to use the building; indeed, they were amongst the 800 subscribers who raised the funds for its construction.\(^57\) The Chartists movement’s demand for electoral reform was more explicitly a working class movement, associated with sedition. During the Chartist ‘plug riots’ in August 1842, the Hall was the meeting place of a trade union of textiles dyers, who gathered to vote on whether to support striking mill hands on 14 August.\(^58\) Station superintendent, Joseph Green, reported local agitation to the Directors of the Liverpool & Manchester Railway.\(^59\) Liverpool Road Station was not only close to the events at the Hall of Science, but was also used in the government’s response when military force was used for the suppression of disturbances. Edmund and Ruth Frow noted this may be the first time the railways were used to move troops to quash civil unrest, whilst Malcom Chase indicates infantrymen travelled on the Stockton and Darlington Railway in 1839.\(^60\) According to the *Manchester Guardian*, the 58th or Rutlandshire Regiment of Infantry were transported from Dublin and travelled by train into Manchester, leaving Liverpool at 7am on 14 August (the same day textile dyers congregated on the Camp Field).\(^61\) This report suggests that 700 troops entered Manchester directly via Liverpool Road Station.\(^62\) The regiment were later dispersed between Tib Street Barracks near Oldham Street and the Regent Road Barracks in Salford, less than one mile from Liverpool Road. The LMR, owned by private shareholders, provided the means for government force in the Northern counties when fears of outright civil war

---


\(^59\) TNA: Rail 371/6 L&MR Board Meeting minutes (1842 - 1845), 15 Aug 1842.


\(^62\) The *Guardian* report makes clear the time troops travelled by train from Liverpool, during this period the Liverpool-Manchester line was the only railway route into Manchester, and Liverpool Road Station the passenger terminus.
were heightened amongst the elite. The spectre of the Peterloo Massacre of 1819 made Manchester’s authorities particularly fearful of unrest.63

The communal, unregulated space of the Camp Field was incorporated into protest activities at the Hall of Science. The Manchester Guardian reveals how the Field was used with the Hall by trade union members: (at 10.30am) ‘a number of persons were observed congregated in the neighbourhood of and in Camp Field; and shortly afterwards a procession of about a hundred individuals arrived on the field, and entered the Hall of Science.’64 The description illustrates how the outside space was used as a meeting point, before procession entered the Hall en masse. Navickas has noted that whilst denied urban meeting places, radicals and Chartists drew strength from the ‘neighbourhood’ and its countryside.65 The modest, yet significant area of open space of the Camp Field beside the Hall provided this neighbourhood in the city. A Chartist meeting held on 20 October 1850, after the closure of the Hall, was declared a ‘great open air meeting’ by the Northern Star.66 The Camp Field continued to fulfil this role from trade union meetings to women’s temperance demonstrations in the 1860s and 1870s.67 These political uses contributed to elite perceptions of the space as dangerous and influenced later discourse on the enclosure of the Camp Field.

2.2 Civilising Campfield

The Hall of Science stood vacant by 1850, following a decline in Owenism and Chartist activity. With the 1851 Public Libraries Act the building became the focus of fundraising to become Manchester’s first free library, a venture pursued against the backdrop of Manchester’s recent incorporation and drive for city status.68 The opportunity to reform the area and eradicate all traces of socialists from the Camp Field was publicised by those

---


64 Manchester Guardian (17 Aug, 1842), p.2.

65 Navickas, Protest and the Politics of Space and Place, p.249.


67 The Sheffield & Rotherham Independent (Sheffield, England) (7 Jul 1869), p.3; Manchester Courier (13 Apr 1874), p.5.

involved and prominent in local press coverage. The opening speeches by advocate Edward Edwards, the authors Charles Dickens and William Thackeray were circulated [Figure 7]. Dickens welcomed the availability of books to those living in cottages and cellar dwellings as a source of ‘pleasure and improvement’. Hewitt has shown the network involved in the foundation to be based in two strands of Manchester liberalism: predominately from the Unitarian Cross Street Chapel like proponent, John Potter, and Cobdenite radicals, particularly John Watts. Potter, declared at the opening on 2 September 1852: ‘I think it is fortunate for the town that the character of this building has so materially changed; that we shall never again see in this hall any chartist or socialist meetings… none that remember this building in 1842, during the disturbances of that period, will at all regret that it is now the Manchester Free Public Library’. However, the public denunciation of the former uses of the Hall disguises the ties between the two institutions, such as the involvement of Watts – who lectured at the Hall at the height of agitation.

---

72 Pigot’s and Slater’s directory and street register of Manchester and Salford (Pigot & Slater, Manchester, 1843) pp.86-7 shows Watts’ lecture series at the Hall of Science on Sunday evenings at 6.30pm. See Hewitt, ‘Confronting the modern city’, p.67 for further discussion on Watts.
Figure 7. Opening of Manchester Free Public Library, from *The Illustrated London News* (11 September 1852).

The neo-classical design of the Hall of Science [Figure 8] was easily re-invented as a temple to learning and Smilesian self-help in keeping with the liberal values of Manchester’s civic elite. Simon Gunn highlights that public buildings were viewed as a form of ‘moral address’ communicating the ideals of the city to passers-by. The re-use of the Hall was framed as symbolic by key actors at the opening ceremony, thus extending the moralising capacity of the building itself. The establishment of the library instated civic material and intellectual space in the area. Joyce shows the free library concept was central to the creation of a new sort of public, constituted in a civic public sphere. Martin Hewitt argues that libraries

---

73 Simon Gunn, *Public Culture of the Victorian Middle Class*, p 42.

74 *Manchester Guardian*, 4 Sept 1852, p.8

75 Joyce, *Rule of Freedom*, p.129.
were ‘above all elements of municipalisation’ and highlights that library decisions largely resided with Councillors.\textsuperscript{76}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure8.png}
\end{center}

\textbf{Figure 8.} Manchester’s first Free Public Library housed in the former Hall of Science c.1865, (Manchester Library collection).

The Library not only provided a setting for literary culture, it was also a space for ‘civic seeing’ through art with over one hundred engravings adorning the walls of the ground floor lending library. As donors gave art as well as books, such as the artist, R.A. Ward, who presented one of his own watercolours, the library became a nascent civic gallery. Artworks on display included portraits of Queen Victoria, statesmen, ‘savants’ and a chalk portrait of local worthy, the Bishop of Manchester, given by Richmond (presumably George Richmond). This is significant, as the City Art Gallery was established thirty years later in 1882 upon the Corporation’s acquisition of the Royal Manchester Institute; therefore, Manchester did not have a gallery space contemporaneous with the Campfield Library.

Reference is also initially made to a ‘museum room’ in the building housing technical

\textsuperscript{76} Hewitt, ‘Confronting the modern city’, p.68.
models to present the public with the latest inventions in industry. This was possibly inherited from the Owenites, as upon the Hall’s closure, a *Manchester Guardian* reporter described each anteroom including ‘a sort of store room for scientific apparatus’. Mid-century library art and object collections were often the nucleus for later city museums and galleries, for example, collections at Bolton Public Library (opened 1853) were adopted by the Chadwick Museum in the 1880s. Whilst the Campfield Library did not become a formal museum or gallery space, it established exhibitionary culture in Campfield, further addressed in Section 3.

2.3 Displacement

One year after the library opened, another major change was planned for the neighbourhood. Manchester’s New Streets Act of 1853 set out a plan between Manchester Corporation and LNWR to create a railway across Wellington Place to connect Liverpool Road Station with markets on the Camp Field. A new, larger, Shipping Shed was proposed for ‘down goods’ for swiftly transferring goods out of the Station and into the city (as discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.1). A major effect of these plans was the removal of fifty-nine dwellings, shown in green in Chapter 2, Figure 8. Evidence from the Markets Committee shows that these streets: Sage Street, Back Sage Street, and part of New Street and Wellington Place, were demolished by October 1854. The Shipping Shed was erected as planned, however, after a report by Richard Norris, LNWR’s engineer highlighted a problem with street levels the rail connection to the Camp Field was abandoned. Plans for a market there was also postponed, it is notable that so soon after the library opened in 1852, the Corporation planned to eradicate the open space on Camp Field.

---


79 Bolton Museum Collection: Chadwick Museum Accession Register, 1883-1908. Includes objects adopted from the library collected as early as 1852.

80 Manchester Archive M901/14573: Manchester Markets Committee Proceedings Vol 3 (6 August 1852- 6 July 1855) 13 Oct 1854 includes the Committee’s Annual Report, indicating the houses were removed.

81 Manchester Archive M901/14574: Manchester Markets Committee Proceedings Vol 4 (20 Jul 1855- 16 Dec 1859), meeting minutes, 27 Sept 1855, cite letter from LNWR which raises the levels issue Norris was due to inspect. Chairman’s Report, 28 July 1857, shows LNWR were presented with a £2000 fee for the lapse of the rail agreement, paid by the 28 Aug 1857.
Evidence from the 1853 New Streets Act confirms the poor state of dwellings adjacent to the Station. Many of the fifty-nine properties scheduled for demolition to make way for the Shipping Shed were listed as ‘cellar, dwelling, and premises’. This indicated the division of properties between different families living above and below ground. For example, the entry for dwelling 25 owned by William Shatwell lists both Hugh Smith and Thomas Bent as head of household, demonstrating both Smith and Bent lived in the property with their families. This was a common occurrence in the crowded slum areas of mid-nineteenth century Manchester, until the appointment of John Leigh as Medical Officer for Health in 1868, who closed most cellar dwellings by 1872.

Founded in 1852, the Manchester and Salford Sanitary Association’s response to local conditions included a regular lecture series at St Matthew’s Church School on Liverpool Road, aimed at promoting self-help amongst residents in the Deansgate district [Figure 9].

Figure 9. Advertisements for lectures organised by the Manchester and Salford Sanitary Association aimed at ‘the working classes’ in 1854 and 1857 (Manchester Archive: M126/5/1/63 and M126/5/1/26).

---


83 Kidd, Manchester, p.127.
The Manchester Statistical Society, who measured and recorded sanitary and living conditions, later explored railway demolitions in 1871-2. In a report by H. Baker, railway companies were absolved from criticism: ‘now and again complaint is vocal at the so-called ‘wholesale’ eviction of population and demolition of dwellings consequent upon railway enlargement’. Baker defended the ‘so-called’ displacements caused by drawing attention to the ‘scarcely even a passing notice’ taken of the ‘pushing out of the population from central sub-districts by the centric aggregation of trading interests.’

Derek Brumhead in his study of displacements for the construction of the Cheshire Lines Committee’s Central Station in 1877 and Great Northern Railway Warehouse in 1898 found ‘the demolition of inferior housing and its substitution by new commercial buildings brought substantial advantages to the city’s finances’. In the case of the Shipping Shed demolitions, the Corporation supported the expansion of Liverpool Road as the plan provided a route for the proposed markets. Civic space and the industrial railway space would meet in a regulated space on the Camp Field, the demolition of properties to facilitate this did not concern the Corporation.

Section 3: The Camp Field enclosed

A further cycle of upheaval occurred in the 1870s when the Corporation Markets Committee again worked to enclose the Camp Field and with the New Warehouse construction for Liverpool Road Station resulting in further street clearances. Section 3.1 begins with perceptions of the open-air Knott Mill Fair as a source of nuisance amongst urban crowds. In 3.2, the Corporation built upon the Camp Field in an example of what Patrick Joyce has observed as the breaking of the ‘old urban milieu’. The enclosure of the Field extended civic space in the area, maintaining equilibrium as the Library was removed in 1877. Whilst profit was presented as the impetus for the two Corporation Market Halls constructed soon after, the Camp Field was long associated with public disorder and thus the covered buildings enabled a greater degree of surveillance. The Market Committee also

---

86 Joyce, Rule of Freedom, p.85.
extended their powers over the industrial Station space with tighter public health regulations by the 1880s as Railway and municipal interests clashed.

3.1 Space for spectacle

Knott Mill Fair was a regular spectacle on the Camp Field and criticised for the nuisance generated by its crowds. Regarded as the ‘annual resort of the working classes’, the Fair was held for about two weeks every Easter; a later antiquarian suggests it originated with the 1761 opening of the Bridgewater Canal and moved to Liverpool Road (then Priestnor Street) in 1806.87 The Fair attracted criticism in the press, from both journalists and correspondents throughout period.88 Various types of popular entertainments returned annually, including circuses, menageries and pantomimes. As Lynda Nead has observed, visual forms of mass consumption on the city street were perceived as a moral snare.89 This is reflected in responses to the Fair, like those of the Campfield librarians, who described the attraction as ‘evil’ in April 1868. Their complaints focussed on the gathering of crowds around the Free Public Library, which was forced to close.90 The danger of pick-pocketing in the Fair’s crowds was frequently reported, and provides the setting for the author’s slide into criminality in ‘a convict’s story’.91 The emphasis on increased criminality during the Fair is typical of press representation of crime as rising from the 1860s onwards; yet, it was press coverage of crime that increased exponentially, criminal activity is ultimately harder to gauge.92

88 *Manchester Guardian* (18 April 1838), p2; For example, *The Manchester Guardian*, (23 May 1846) p.10. Letter to the editor by John Crowther of Haymarket Inn, Tonman Street, who defended the Fair from criticisms in previous letters from ‘a lover of order’.
90 Manchester Archive M7 40/1/3/1: Camp Field Library Sub Committee 1858-1863 meeting minutes; 27 April 1868 minutes; February 1868 letter from the librarian, Andrea Crestadoro to the Markets Committee complaining of the annual fair and weekly fair.
91 For example, pickpockets were targeted by police: *Manchester Courier* (6 Apr 1850), p. 9; Pickpocket thefts were anecdotally referred to by Councillor Ashton in the motion to abolish the Fair: *Manchester Courier* (15 Apr 1876) p. 2; ‘A Convict’s Story’, *Manchester Times* (4 Feb 1865), p.34.
The artist Frederic Shields, who was based in Salford and associated with the pre-Raphaelite movement, often visited Knott Mill Fair. Shields later recounted the Fair’s visual appeal: ‘my annual sketching festival, rich in character never seen but at those old fêtes, where Wombwell’s Menagerie vied in attraction with the strolling players who strutted upon the platform in paste-board armour and conventional robber costumes’. 93 Shields’ annual pilgrimage conjures the image of Charles Baudelaire’s flâneur: a lone male figure at home in the city’s crowds. 94

Figure 10. Plan of amusements from The Penny Guide to the Sights at Knott Mill Fair, 1868. (Manchester Archive H888/6).

Knott Mill Fair provided opportunities for encounters with performers from around the world as visitors displayed Manchester’s mixed communities, prompting further othering by contemporaries. An 1868 Fair plan [Figure 10] shows the demarcation of amusements either side of St Matthew’s Church, indicating rational order to irrational entertainments. Racial objectification was blatant in the guidebook, describing the ambiguous performance of Senor and Senora Nunez as ‘Aztecs’ and an anonymous woman depicted in grisly terms


and named the ‘Hottentot Venus’ (originally the stage-name of Khoisan performer Sara Baartman, whose life and afterlife from 1815 was widely known). In 1869, the Manchester Courier portrayed visitors as fixed with an ‘idiotic Lancastrian stare’ far removed from John Stuart Mill’s ideal of the working man. In 1870, the weekly illustrated magazine The Graphic featured The Old Clothes Market, Camp Field by Frederic Shields [Figure 11], who later painted the scene, re-named Factory Girls at the Old Clothes Fair, Knott Mill. The rag fair took place every Monday, vendors sold old clothing, workman’s tools, second hand hardware and furniture. The Graphic voyeuristically described this, creating a sense of otherness particular to urban Manchester: ‘in dress manners and speech, the people who frequent that ‘rag fair’ are unlike any gathering of the kind to be met with in any other part of the kingdom’. Manchester’s migrant community is re-created as a spectacle with further descriptions relying on popular racial tropes.

Figure 11. The Old Clothes Market, Camp Field, Manchester, by Frederic Shields from The Graphic December 17, 1870.

96 Manchester Courier (3 Apr 1869), p.2.
In the *Graphic* article, Liverpool Road is presented as ‘dusky brick-built little shops, and low beer-houses and here and there the tawdry flash of a gin-palace lighting up the gloom.’ The Station, only metres from the fair is not described, with freight and warehouses exempt from the exotic depiction of difference and drink houses. Shields’ illustration recreates the street level experience of the rag fair, which shows a dense crowd. In the foreground a woman holds up a second hand dress with the seller sat low to the floor holding up another, behind the women, a street view of Liverpool Road can be glimpsed with St Matthew’s Church on the right-hand side. A sign on one building displays ‘White Lion’, the public house on Liverpool Road. From this landmark, the view is down Liverpool Road, looking towards Water Street. Factory chimneys can be seen in the distance.

The later 1875 painting by Shields (in Manchester Art Gallery) shows the scene re-imagined with the opposite view. Looking up Liverpool Road with the White Lion pub on the right-hand side, this perspective places the artist on Lower Byrom Street in front of the Shipping Shed. This scene visually highlights how close the street life of Campfield was the Station boundary. The route for goods direct into the city from the Shipping Shed, on the corner opposite, would have been affected by the fair’s crowds, impeding the movement of wagons and carts from the Station. Yet, neither of Shields’ work shows the Station, which appears to be beyond the imagination of the area. Like *The Graphic*, an earlier description of streets around Campfield Library also entirely omits the railway space so close by. The lack of response to such a large-scale conspicuous industrial complex demonstrates perceptions were fixed on the character of local people and Campfield’s location within Manchester’s liberal landscape.

Throughout the year, darkness was believed to increase the threat of nuisance behaviour around Campfield. Disruption to the library during the night included the bursting open of a door and librarians recorded that the discontinuance of a street lamp at the corner of the building had led to increase in disturbances. A plan to secure the door with a rail out of library opening hours was suggested for fear of intrusion. The notorious danger of the area at night-time was acknowledged even in the promotional Penny Guide to the Knott Mill Fair in 1868:

Some people will tell you not to go to such a place of levity as Knott Mill Fair. Take no notice of them: they would humgudgeon you... Youth is a time for enjoyment. By them
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99 Manchester Archive M7 40/1/3/1: Camp Field Library Sub Committee 1858-1863 meeting minutes, 25 Mar 1861; 17 Feb 1865.
Knott Mill Fair should be visited – in the day time. Night is a time fraught with danger owing to the roughness of certain gangs of dirty, low and common men.\textsuperscript{100} The reference to gangs may refer to the ‘scutlers’, Manchester and Salford’s territorial youth gangs, which the press presented as a largely new phenomenon in the 1870s.\textsuperscript{101} A desire to close the Fair was discussed over several decades by journalists and correspondents to local newspapers owing to fears of the classes mixing, crowds, dirt, coarse language and the criminal poor.\textsuperscript{102}

Workers in the district moved through the streets during the night, whilst the area was believed to be most dangerous. Liverpool Road Station was attended throughout the night, as the Station was a twenty-four-hour operation (see Chapter 2, Section 3.1). This included the employment of night policeman by LNWR at the neighbouring Ordsall Lane and evidence from 1866 fire in suggests that night watchmen at Liverpool Road were the first to report the fire at 1.30am.\textsuperscript{103} Gunn suggested the middle classes perceived nocturnal Manchester in more benign terms by the 1870s, compared with earlier decades.\textsuperscript{104} The Knott Mill Police Station, on the corner of Great Bridgewater Street and Deansgate (close to the intersection of Liverpool Road with Deansgate), was the closest disciplinary institution, with lock-in cells for criminals. However, petty crime continued to be regularly reported in the 1870s, from book thefts, rows in the passage and brawls in the alleyway alongside the library.\textsuperscript{105} Fears of serious crime at the Fair at night-time were occasionally vindicated, for example, in April 1872 a man was shot in the head with a gun from the shooting gallery at 11.15pm.\textsuperscript{106}


\textsuperscript{102} The Critic (Manchester, England) (14 May 1875), p.355 particularly focuses on nuisance. See footnotes 88 and 91 for a range of articles from the 1830s onwards.

\textsuperscript{103} TNA RAIL 410/1858: London and North-Western Railway Register of Permanent Officers and Servants 1847-1852, p.237; Manchester Courier (24 May 1866), p.3; Manchester Guardian (28 May 1866), p.2.

\textsuperscript{104} Gunn, Public Culture of the Victorian Middle Class, pp. 52-53.

\textsuperscript{105} Manchester Archive M7 40/1/3/3: Camp Field Library Sub Committee 1868-1873 meeting minutes.

\textsuperscript{106} Sheffield Daily Telegraph (Sheffield, England) (3 Apr 1872), p.4.
Despite the ‘civilising’ attempts of the Library, descriptions of Campfield from the later 1860s and 1870s present it as an unfettered part of the city. Municipal officials and journalists frequently employed rhetoric othering residents. Hewitt has noted that by this period the area acquired notoriety as a den of vice. Monica Degan has highlighted the sensory dislocation of the middle classes from Campfield, most evident in the perception of the area as contagious due to the concentration of hospitals in the St John’s area.

3.2 Separation from the street

The widespread association of Knott Mill Fair and Campfield with nuisance fuelled perceptions of the area as peripheral to the central district, which was evident in discussions surrounding the location of the Free Public Library. In an address to the Manchester Literary Club in 1875, former librarian and journalist for the Manchester Guardian, William F. A. Axon, claimed that the reference collection ‘... were virtually valueless to the majority of the literary and professional men of the city...solely on account of the out-of-the-way, inconvenient situation of the library’. Martin Hewitt has demonstrated that by the mid-1860s ‘the vast bulk of the borrowers... did not reside in its environs as all’. Arguments for the removal of the reference library to a more ‘central location’ echo the position of the LMR at the beginning of the 1840s, when the new passenger terminal at Hunt’s Bank was considered in relation to the proximity of passengers to the central business district. The library closed in 1877 after the Hall was declared structurally ‘unsafe’. The reference library was re-located to rooms in the Town Hall on King Street, which was in the process of being replaced with a new neo-gothic Hall in Albert Square. Characterised as the ‘new urban modernity’, the centre redevelopment attempted to distance Manchester from its reputation as the chaotic industrial city.

---

107 Hewitt, The Emergence of Stability, p.60.
108 Monica Monserrat Degan, Sensing cities: regenerating public like in Barcelona and Manchester (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), p.79.
Liverpool Road’s industrial buildings were concealed from the public view from the corner of Deansgate by 1882. A new lending library was built to replace the Campfield Library and ten ‘handsome shops’ with brick and stone dressings concealed other traders, particularly fishmongers who occupied the row behind the frontage along the new Market Hall. The administrative apparatus of the Market Collector’s Office and weighting machine were also concealed by the new street layout. The separation of traders in goods from the ‘handsome shops’ and lending library is reminiscent of the earlier observations of Engels on the concealment of the slum dwellings behind shop fronts. Chris Otter suggests the wider Deansgate improvement scheme, deeply criticised by contemporaries, threatened to magnify this visual disconnection. The shop façade hid commercial space in a similar fashion to the disguise of railway space from street level by the neo-classical frontage of Liverpool Road Station.

Figure 12. Plan attached to memorandum from the Mayor of Manchester to LNWR regarding the enlargement of Liverpool Road Station, 1 May 1867. Streets in brown to be ‘absorbed’ were cleared in 1879-1880 (TNA RAIL 791/271).

112 Manchester Archive M901/28478: Markets Committee Vol. 11., Jan 27 1882.
113 Ibid., 10 June 1880.
In 1879, a further phase of railway demolitions eradicated the remainder of New Street, Garden Court, Dumbar Street and Ashton Street for the construction of LNWR’s ‘New Warehouse’ on Lower Byrom Street, which was fully operational in 1882. After Cotton Warehouse 1 and 2 were destroyed by fire in May 1866, LNWR planned to increase accommodation for goods at the upper level of the Station site (see Chapter 2, Section 2). The area cleared for the New Warehouse is illustrated in Figure 12. This building project took place concurrently with the erection of two market halls by Manchester Corporation over the Camp Field, with one either side of St Matthew’s Church [Figure 14]. The foundation stone for the Lower Campfield Market was laid on 10 May 1877, with stallholders from Smithfield Market relocated to the near-complete hall during August 1878. The Upper Hall was subsequently erected and inspected in November 1881 and in use by 1882. The streets and open spaces of Campfield were simultaneously eroded by local government and laissez-faire railway expansion. Pockets of slum housing beyond the railway clearances, however, remained intact. The Corporation’s Unhealthy Dwellings Committee (1885-1906) failed to intervene in poor housing and sanitary conditions in the area. A later investigation into the Housing Conditions of Manchester and Salford by T.R. Marr [Figure 13] shows back-to-back housing intact in 1904. Houses in the other districts within the railway lines encircling central Manchester had been removed or changed by 1904, presenting Liverpool Road as an anomaly at the edge of reform.
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115 TNA RAIL 410/6: LNWR Court of Proprietors minutes and reports, 1876-1880 & RAIL 410/7: LNWR Court of Proprietors minutes and reports, 1881-1887, Report of the Directors 17 Feb 1883.

116 Manchester Archive M901/28479: Manchester Markets Committee Proceedings (1876-79), minutes of special committee meeting, 10 May 1877; minutes of meeting 30 Aug 1878.

117 Manchester Archive M901/28478: Markets Committee Vol 11 (1880-82), minutes of meeting 18 Nov 1881.
The Markets Committee’s jurisdiction over space on the Camp Field extended to the Pig Market that ran alongside Liverpool Road’s Pig Station. This illustrates the growth of controls, rules and regulations of local government over the day-to-day running of the Station. The hierarchical political culture in Manchester was exceptional at this time, when each Committee Chair ‘acted as a virtually autonomous dictator’ according to Harold Platt. From 1843 until 1866 the sale of pigs took place at the Pig Landing Station on Charles Street, where a toll was paid per pig sold. In 1871 the Market’s Committee noticed LNWR’s new pig market on Water Street and by 1872 the Committee suspected the LNWR were reporting fewer pigs than were carried with a discrepancy of 20,000 pigs. The Railway Company’s right to trade on Water Street was contested, with the LNWR accused
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119 Manchester Archive M901/32675: Manchester Markets Committee Proceedings (1870-1873), 14 June 1872.
of infringing manorial rights to hold a market.\textsuperscript{120} Arrangements were again investigated between 1883 and 1884 to determine a regular toll appropriate to the pig traffic.\textsuperscript{121} Market Committee powers extended into Station land in other instances, including the monitoring of weighing machines by the inspector forWeights and Measures. The Pig Station was closed during periods of swine flu and foot and mouth disease detected by public health officials, which extended to halting the entire goods operation at Liverpool Road under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act in April 1882.\textsuperscript{122}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure14.png}
\caption{Illustration of the covered Lower and Upper Campfield Market Halls by architects Mangnall and Littlewoods from \textit{The British Architect and Northern Engineer}, March 1877.\textsuperscript{123}}
\end{figure}

The choice of Campfield for the new markets was praised for its proximity to railway stations and routes for agricultural trade.\textsuperscript{124} However, contemporary criticism of the market halls highlighted the awkwardness of location for the consumer. In May 1879, a letter to the editor of \textit{The Manchester Guardian} reflected upon the street widening of Deansgate and the construction of new tramways impeding entry: ‘unless the new market in Campfield is to keep up its reputation as a Rag Fair some easy mode of access to it will

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{120} TNA RAIL 410/199: LNWR minutes and reports of the Special Committee vol. 21 (1871-1872)
\textsuperscript{121} Manchester Archive M901/28477: Manchester Markets Committee Proceedings vol. 12 (1882-1884) various meetings, 22 Sept 1882 to 30 Jan 1883.
\textsuperscript{122} Manchester Archive M901/28478: Markets Committee vol. 11, minutes 21 Apr 1882; 30 Jun 1882.
\textsuperscript{123} \textit{The British Architect and Northern Engineer} (Manchester) vol. 7. Issue 11 (16 March 1877)
\textsuperscript{124} \textit{Manchester Guardian} (9 August 1879), p.9, ‘An outside observer’ noted the markets were on the ‘main cart line’ to Cheshire and close to numerous stations (including the new Central Station).
\end{flushleft}
have to be provided.’\textsuperscript{125} Prior to the opening of the Upper Hall, William Fair, a shopkeeper on Great Bridgewater Street formed a petition with 127 local businessmen to the Markets Committee. The petitioners lamented the loss of the Knott Mill attractions: ‘since closing the market our receipts for sales has decreased, more than one half in consequence of the attractions of a public market having ceased, which was of material assistance to us’. The traders complained that ‘the high prices asked as Market rents have driven would be tenants to other markets distant from this district’.\textsuperscript{126} Committee records show that areas of the Halls lay empty, and the markets were not as profitable as Smithfield.\textsuperscript{127} By October 1882, LNWR opportunistically proposed renting the entire Lower Campfield Hall, though this proposal was taken no further.\textsuperscript{128}

By the time the Upper Market Hall was complete, its swift re-use as an exhibition hall indicates that trade was failing in Campfield. For the first exhibition, the Markets Committee even waived fees due to anxieties surrounding its success.\textsuperscript{129} Held from January to May 1882, ‘The Smoke Abatement Exhibition’ was a touring display, previously hosted in South Kensington. The Committee hoped it would ‘attract people to the spot’ and thus encourage traders to rent empty shops on Deansgate and use the market halls afterwards.\textsuperscript{130} Though substantially a product of London exhibitionary culture, the exhibition was tailored to the local audience; for example lectures included one on ‘the domestic application of heat’ by Rev. C. J. K. Gillespie, curate of the adjacent St. Matthews Church, whilst J. West, gas engineer to Manchester Corporation, gave a talk on domestic uses for gas. The audience largely comprised specialist traders such as The Manchester District Union of Gas Engineers.\textsuperscript{131} The exhibition also suited the contemporaneous efforts of the Nuisance Committee, with new smoke laws included in the \textit{Manchester Corporation Act}\textsuperscript{126}

\textsuperscript{125} \textit{Manchester Guardian} (2 May 1879), ‘Deansgate’ letter to the editor from ‘Look-ahead’, p.6.

\textsuperscript{126} Manchester Archive M901/28478: Markets Committee vol. 11, minutes of meeting 20 Jun 1882.

\textsuperscript{127} Manchester Archive M901/28477: Markets Committee vol. 12, minutes of meeting 29 June 1883 for example show that Smithfield brought in £1184.12.3d whilst the combined income of the Campfield market halls was only £41.8.10d.

\textsuperscript{128} Ibid., meeting minutes 20 Oct 1882.

\textsuperscript{129} Manchester Archive M901/28478: Markets Committee vol. 11., minutes of meetings 16 Dec 1881, 27 Jan 1882 & 20 May 1882; Fred Scott, Secretary of the Smoke Abatement exhibition, letter 3 Feb 1882.

\textsuperscript{130} Ibid., meeting minutes 16 Dec 1881.

\textsuperscript{131} \textit{Manchester Guardian} (17 Apr 1882), p.8.
Act later that year. 132 This alternative use for the Upper Hall was possible owing to the similarity between market stalls and trade exhibits for the consumer; in a period when department store and public museum became dominant forms, here we see the overlap between shopping and educational display within the same space.

The failure of the Campfield Market Halls was clear: by September 1882 the Committee offered free rent of stalls to displaced Smithfield Market stallholders for twelve months at Campfield.133 A petition was made in 1884 by the former Smithfield stallholders pleading to return to their former residence.134 This raises the question, why were the market halls erected at the Campfield if there was not the demand for a Corporation Market in the area? Given the long-term complaints of nuisance on the Camp Field, the enclosure of site used for fairs and meetings indicates it was the control of the space that was ultimately the motivation for these buildings. Patrick Joyce has suggested that ‘this type [of market] was predicated upon severing the market from the streets and street life from the town’.135 As Robert Poole noted in his thesis on fairs, of the markets annual revenue of £949, £914 was from the amusements at Knott Mill. Markets Committee Report of 1876, however, claimed the fair was financially redundant. Joyce argues that the market halls ‘represented a massive wave of moral intervention in economic life.’136 Whilst the Campfield Market Halls immediately struggled to raise revenue and were far less profitable than the established Smithfield Market, the Committee achieved their goals of dispelling people from the street and regulating trade.137

Ultimately, by 1909, the Lower Campfield Market Hall was transformed into the permanent City Exhibition Hall, with the Higher Hall returning its original purpose as a cheese and vegetable market.138 An advertisement declared the City Hall was the ‘largest, best lighted and heated and most excellently adapted covered, enclosed and balconied building in the
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132 Catherine Bowler & Peter Brimblecombe, ‘Control of Air Pollution in Manchester prior to the Public Health Act, 1875’, *Environment and History*, vol. 6, no. 1 (Feb 2000), pp. 71-98, p.93.


134 Ibid., minutes of meeting 9 Mar 1884.


137 Manchester Archive M901/28477: Markets Committee Proceedings vol. 12, receipts reported across 1883 and 1884 show the Campfield Halls yielded considerably less than Smithfield.

138 Arthur Redford, *The History of Local Government in Manchester, volume III, the last half century* (Green and Co., London, 1940), p.60; Manchester Archive GB127.m79133: Photograph showing ‘The first cheese fair at Campfield Market’ 17 Aug 1926.
kingdom. The Hall was largely used by trade shows, such as the regular Manchester Motor Exhibition by the Trades Motor Association. Yet, the profitability of working class entertainment on the Camp Field continued, as the successor of Bostock’s menagerie (a regular amusement at Knott Mill Fair) – the large scale exhibition ‘Bostock’s Jungle’ visited the venue between December 1909 and February 1910. Proximity to Liverpool Road Station continued to serve the Halls and indeed the entertainments, as Figure 15 shows animals transported for Bostock’s menagerie.

Figure 15. Illustration from Railway Magazine volume 30 (Jan-June 1912) showing the conveyance of animals for Bostock’s Menagerie, held at the City Exhibition Hall.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have seen Frederic Shields turn his back on the Shipping Shed to capture the rag fair and the noisy Station mute in reports on unruly Campfield, an area characterised by neighbourhood nuisance rather than vast freight structures. Yet, the

140 Ibid., (19 Feb 1910), P.11.
Station substantially re-shaped the space around it across this period. Only through recognising the role of freight operations can the Corporation’s intervention in the area (particularly the enclosure of the Camp Field) be fully understood. This study has thrown issues of governmentality into sharp relief; by considering the role of Liverpool Road Station, Campfield’s municipalisation moves beyond the affects upon citizens in public spaces to attempts to regulate the largely unfettered transport infrastructure. The LNWR attempted twice to expand their freight operations to encompass the Camp Field (first with a connecting railway, the second as tenants of the Lower Market Hall) and in the 1850s and 1870s enlarged the Station displacing hundreds of residents. I have shown the periodic clash of interests of the Corporation and the LNWR. Whilst Manchester Corporation’s \textit{laissez-faire} attitude towards demolitions is evident, measures enforced by the Markets Committee show intervention in both public life and the Railway.

From a place through which the middle and upper classes passed through using transport to separate themselves from the street in the 1830s and early 1840s, to a site of spectacle, Campfield was a contentious space of working class expression, middling consumption and elite (at times ineffectual) authority. Manchester’s first Free Public Library was intended to civilise and attract a cross-section of society. Reponses to Owenite and Chartist activity and the Knott Mill Fair demonstrate continuities in the language of class and the presentation of street life by the civic elite. The complete failure of the Campfield Markets (and the overlooked profitability of the Fair) is an indication that enclosing the Camp Field owed more to ingrained attitudes about the area than it did trading. For the LNWR, however, profit was the main impetus to expand, as storage and transhipment were Liverpool Road Station’s business.

Despite the establishment of spaces for civic seeing in the second half of the nineteenth century, consumer demand for ‘irrational’ entertainment prevailed. Alongside the Station, as illustrated by Marr’s Housing Map and the survival of the Roebuck Inn, remnants of the slum housing continued at the threshold of the industrial city space. In the twentieth century, explored in Chapter 4, the Station becomes a space for simultaneous industrial and exhibitionary uses as the railway-tourist gaze reaches Liverpool Road.
Chapter 4

The politics of preservation:

establishing a science museum in post-war Manchester

*Manchester needs such a museum. The Science Museum in Kensington has many exhibits of historical items made in the area and they should be on show here.*

– Vivian Bowden

Introduction

---

*Figure 1.* The North Western Museum of Science and Industry at the corner of Grosvenor Street and Upper Brook Street, close to Manchester’s ‘education corridor’ c.1979 (SIM collection).

On 20 October 1969, the Manchester Museum of Science and Technology opened on Grosvenor Street, at a midway point between the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology (UMIST) and Victoria University campuses [Figure 1]. A temporary location, this university institution was the physical realisation of hopes to integrate ‘town
and gown’, enticing the general public and school groups to the campus area. Academics at UMIST strove to preserve swiftly disappearing regional industries and to create an educational science museum ‘to rival South Kensington’. By 1971, it was re-named the North Western Museum of Science and Industry (NWMSI) to reflect its regional role.

How, then, did this museum develop? And why did Liverpool Road Station, the ‘oldest’ and near derelict freight station far from Manchester’s universities come to be selected as the permanent home for this institution?

Sophie Forgan has emphasised the transformative potential of museum buildings and the power of place: ‘the particular location of a museum could materially affect its standing and its outlook’. UMIST academics, museum staff and key partners including city councillors were acutely aware of the importance of place for the new museum. Numerous locations were discussed, debated and investigated from 1966 to 1975. In the context of rapid de-industrialisation, all but one proposal involved repurposing a defunct industrial building; schemes combined ‘saving’ part of Manchester’s urban landscape with beginning a new phase of contemporary science and engineering education for the city. The selection of Liverpool Road Station was not a certainty until a major change in the governance of the museum in 1975. Nor was the site favoured by academic staff. As John Pickstone later noted, ‘the museum’s growth has been so spectacular, and its brief is now so large, that it is rarely thought of as a 'University' foundation’. In this chapter, I address this omission by focussing on the influence of UMIST as an institution newly elevated to the status of a university and the ambitions its Principal, Vivian Bowden, alongside Professor of the History of Technology, Donald Cardwell, and his researcher Richard Hills, for the wider dissemination of scientific and technical knowledge.

As well as a university institution, the Museum also constituted civic space, as the City Council were major funders from 1966. It was also civic in outlook; the museum’s Working Party were greatly concerned with developing a vision of Manchester beyond a formerly great industrial city to a contemporary rival to the capital in cultural and educational terms,
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framed in the familiar rhetoric of civic boosterism. This rhetoric of place-promotion fulfilling economic, social and cultural goals is strongly associated with nineteenth and early twentieth century projects from sanitary improvement schemes to the founding of museums and art galleries. Recently, historians have highlighted continuities in the expression of civic pride, albeit in new forms such as the city plan, promotional films and literature in the post-war period. A distinction between early expressions of the civic pride and post-war endeavours was not only how this was articulated, but by whom. The new structures of post-war, welfare state urban governance replaced the traditional urban elite drawn from middle class landowners with the city councillor, the planner and the technocrat as mediators of civic pride. In the history of the NWMSI, academics were also agents of civic pride: the museum was to represent the achievements of Manchester and its environs. In this respect it came to mirror the arrangement of the Manchester Museum, the Victoria University’s museum on Oxford Road which Samuel Alberti has shown acted as an interface between ‘town and gown’. The campus expansion was also a key context for the development of the NWMSI, which intended to bring the public to the ‘education corridor’ of Oxford Road.

In this chapter, I first set out the prehistory of the museum, beginning in 1955 with plans for a salvage mission for the region’s industrial artefacts by Victoria University academics and nascent plans for a science museum in 1959 in collaboration with the television company Granada. After the failure of these projects, I argue that the transformation of the College of Technology into the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology was crucial to the foundation of the NWMSI. Discussions between Vivian Bowden and Donald Cardwell during the foundational years show that the Museum would not solely focus on the past. Planned as ‘a museum not a mausoleum’; rhetoric was aspirational in the drive to develop future scientists for the area. I assert that rather than
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‘looking backwards’, the UMIST proposals for the museum bore the hallmarks of post-war civic boosterism and the rhetoric of aspiration.

In the second section, I consider contemporaneous perceptions of Liverpool Road Station as a unique Manchester ‘first’ increasingly associated with civic history during the 1950s. The 1950s to mid-1960s marked a period of uncertainty, but also optimism that Liverpool Road might fulfil an important role in freight modernisation plans. Tourists visited the Station and British Transport Commission staff mooted a museum whilst the freight infrastructure was still in use. Preservation rhetoric from this period and during the gradual withdrawal of rail services from Liverpool Road centred on the extant 1830 passenger building. As demonstrated in Chapter 1, the 1830 Station was firmly established as a lieu de memoire by 1930; the later nineteenth century structures, however, did not figure in heritage discourse. The absence of urban memory of the entire site, comprised of freight buildings from different periods, made the Station unappealing to the academics who investigated it for the NWMSI in 1968.

In the third and final section, I survey the potential sites considered as permanent homes for the Museum. Tensions appeared between the drive to preserve the past, ‘old Manchester’, which was being rapidly demolished for new road schemes and campus expansion, and the opportunity to create a purpose-built facility as part of the Education Precinct. Other proposed sites, especially Central Station, demonstrate Cardwell’s intention to relate the museum collections directly to the history of the industrial building, conceptualising the museum building as an object. A shift in funding for the museum, brought about by a change in local governance: the foundation of the Greater Manchester County Council (GMC) in 1974, created conflict with the academics involved with NWMSI since the early 1960s. Hopes that the Science Museum might contribute to the ‘university city’ were halted abruptly when the GMC set their goal to combine the new museum site with the preservation of the endangered Liverpool Road Station, which attracted support from campaigners as the ‘oldest railway station in the world’. The chapter closes with the establishment of a dedicated campaign group, the Liverpool Road Station Society (LRSS). Their role in the preservation and re-making of the Station as a space for heritage furthered
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8 Forgan in ‘Building the museum’ (2005) has emphasised the significance of the museum building as artefact; Cardwell was particularly aware of this notion.
the ‘oldest’ narrative through the creation of a temporary interpretation centre before the official Museum’s transfer, which I address in Chapter 5.

Section 1: Building a Science Museum to rival South Kensington: establishing the NWMSI in response to the de-industrialisation of Manchester

In this section, I chart the foundation of the North Western Museum of Science and Industry (NWMSI). The NWMSI was established largely by UMIST staff in collaboration with the Victoria University and Salford University along with financial support from the City Council, as well as input from several private sector groups and public sector agencies. In Section 1.1 I argue that plans for the museum from the late 1950s were a direct response to the visible removal of buildings and equipment from industrial Manchester: a memorial act. In Section 1.2 the preservation agenda transforms into an aspirational venture, when academic staff at UMIST saw the potential of a science museum to influence the Manchester area’s status as a centre for learning. The UMIST academics and other members of the Museum Working Party were greatly concerned with developing a vision of Manchester as not only a formerly great industrial city, but also as a rival to the capital in cultural and educational terms in the 1960s.

Section 1.1 The Museum Project: preserving the past

Collecting and displaying local material culture or preserving the historic built environment did not figure in plans for Manchester’s post-war future. In the 1945 *City of Manchester Plan* overseen by City Surveyor and Engineer, Rowland Nicholas, museums did not figure. Exhibitionary culture was included in the terms of large-scale temporary exhibitions for trade and retail, not educational purposes. Nicholas envisaged a complex to ‘rival London’s Olympia’ north of Grape and Quay Street (close to the existing City Hall on Lower Byrom Street - see Chapter 3.2), a comparison with the capital typical of the Plan’s boosterist
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9 R. Nicholas, *City of Manchester Plan* (Jarrold & Sons: London, 1945) digitised by Joe Blakey and Martin Dodge <https://issuu.com/cyberbadger/docs/city_of_manchester_plan_1945> [accessed 27 Apr 2016]. Central Manchester was home to a public Art Gallery on Mosley Street (which Nicholas left unscathed in the Plan) whilst the Queen’s Park Museum in Harpurhey to the north-east of the city also housed civic collections.
Like many aspects of the Plan, the exhibition complex was not realised. In the 1950s and 1960s, the City Hall housed in the Lower Campfield Market hall [Figure 2] continued to host popular entertainments and trade shows such as the Fuel Efficiency Exhibition, retail events like The Brighter Homes Exhibition and hosted the 1951 touring Festival of Britain exhibition.\(^{11}\)

Preservation of the mills, factories or warehousing of nineteenth century Manchester was not envisioned by city planners focused on the reconstruction of bomb damaged areas and the clearance of remaining slums. However, architectural continuity with the past was not entirely severed; for example, in the rebuilding of the bomb damaged Free Trade Hall by City Architect, L. C. Hewitt, the intact 1840s façade was retained. The ceremonial official reopening of the Hall by the Queen was centrepiece of Manchester’s celebration of the Festival of Britain.\(^{12}\) The prestige afforded by the past status of the Free Trade Hall, which in recent memory had been home to the Halle Orchestra, afforded it protection from outright removal. As Peter Shapely has noted, whilst post-war civic pride was characterised with by modernist ambition to build for the future, urban actors continued to embrace the past ‘and used it as evidence of status and image’.\(^{13}\)

\(^{10}\) See Larkham & Lilley, ‘Plans, Planners and City Images’.


\(^{13}\) Shapely, ‘Civic Pride’, p.317.
The drive for industrial preservation was instead led by academics in the post-war period, contemporaneous with the emergence of industrial archaeology as a discipline in the late 1950s. At the Victoria University of Manchester, Dr Wolfe Mays of the philosophy department and Professor Louis Matheson in engineering lobbied for a museum of industry, along with Dr David Owen, director of the Manchester Museum. The disappearance of long-established industries, especially textiles, also provoked Peter Lennox-Kerr, Honorary Secretary of the trade publication *Skinner’s Silk and Rayon Record* and the editor of the *Manchester Evening News*, T. E. Henry, into campaigning for a museum. In 1955 Mays and Lennox-Kerr formed a committee for the establishment of a science museum, which was interchangeably described as a museum of industry. The committee also included E. J. Dustan, Industrial Vice Principal of the College of Technology. This group made little progress, which Mays later blamed on the lack of support from the Council.


15 University of Manchester Archive VCA/7/8/11: Vice Chancellor’s archive, Museum of Science and Technology file (1/2) correspondence from Lennox-Kerr to W. Mansfield-Cooper, 12 Oct 1959.

In 1959 this group was re-formed, when Sir Gerald Barry (former administrator of the Festival of Britain and member of the Cities Development Research Committee) approached the university in his capacity as the executive of educational programming at Granada Television with nascent plans to establish a ‘museum of the two revolutions’.\(^{17}\) This museum would exhibit Manchester’s role in the industrial revolution of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and the role of Manchester scientists in the ‘atomic revolution’ of the twentieth. However, the television investors were apparently ‘frightened off’ by a suggestion that the museum be situated in a concrete laboratory as a part of the University’s new science and engineering building programme.\(^{18}\) This scheme highlights the dual role a science museum might perform: combining Manchester’s past glories and most recent successes to celebrate contemporary research culture.

For the academics involved, the speed of changes taking place in local industry provided a strong impetus to establish the museum quickly. By 1963, the initiative for a science museum had migrated to the Manchester College of Technology, where Principal Vivian Bowen, and staff at the newly formed Department for the History of Science and Technology – led by Donald Cardwell, proposed a university museum. Whilst Cardwell and Professor W. Johnson of the Engineering Department stressed that the proposed museum would not be ‘parochial’, Manchester and the North West area context was crucial to their vision. Like the proposals of the 1950s, it is evident that museum plans were a reaction to the rapid de-industrialisation of the area and loss of prominent nineteenth century technologies through modernisation programmes. An internal memorandum from Bowden to Cardwell asserted the urgency of the situation ‘in view of the rapid rate’ in modernisation and ‘speedy clearance of Old Manchester (visible to all)’.\(^{19}\) Cardwell stated ‘the achievements of older engineering... are rapidly vanishing. There is very little time left

---


\(^{18}\) UoM Archive VCA/7/8/11 (1/2): Museum of Science and Technology, Statement from Professor J.A.L. Matheson of the Engineering Department citing TV company interest in the setting up a museum of two revolutions, July 1959; correspondence from Matheson to the Vice Chancellor stating Granada were ‘frightened off’ by the concrete laboratory proposal as ‘ridiculously inadequate’, 24 Aug 1959; correspondence from Lennox-Kerr to the Vice Chancellor of Manchester (Victoria) University re. Sir Gerald Barry 13 Oct 1959.

\(^{19}\) UoM Archive TPA/1/32: Proposed Museum of Science and Technology, Memorandum from Principal Bowden to Donald Cardwell, 26 June 1963.
in which to preserve for posterity major achievements of the industrial revolution’. The College of Technology rekindled earlier collaborations with the Victoria University and sought support from advocates of the 1950s scheme. David Owen of the Manchester Museum supported Cardwell’s vision and also stressed the timely nature of the project given the speed of change: ‘since the war, changes are occurring so quickly in every industry that most things which have been superseded have been scrapped... there is still time, however, for Manchester to take action in this field’.21

Section 1.2 The Museum Project: educating future scientists

The foundational phase of the museum established education as a key aim and ensured that it would integrate contemporary scientific teaching with the display of historic industrial exhibits. At an early meeting with City Council officials, Bowden stated that as well as ‘relics of the great past’ the museum should include working exhibits to illustrate principals of engineering and physical science’.22 On 31 October 1966 ‘The City of Manchester, Proposed Museum of Science and Technology: The Report of the Working Party’ was produced by a committee comprising staff from the Victoria University, UMIST and the City Council. This foundational document of the NWMSI outlined that the educational functions ‘would have to apply to a very wide public’ in order to ‘arouse at as an early an age as possible the latent interests of youngsters who happen to have natural aptitudes for technology or science’.23 In 1968, Richard Hills, Cardwell’s research assistant who became director of the NWMSI, stated the plan for it to be a ‘living museum’ engaged with the research cultures of the universities and local ‘school science’.24 Again, this emphasises that the museum would inspire young students and improve Manchester’s scientific education provision. Bowden later declared: ‘we do not think that the past and

21 Ibid., Dr Owen, ‘Museum of the history of science and technology for Manchester’, 14 June 1963, notes based on discussions with Cardwell.
22 Ibid., Minutes of meeting re. Manchester Museum of Science and Technology, 5 Feb 1964.
present of technology and science can be separated without a danger of the former being rather too antiquarian in nature and the latter too ephemeral'. This emphasis on parity in the inclusion of technology and science in the museum stemmed from the scientific educational remit of the College of Technology advocates, whereas in the late 1950s and beginning of the 1960s academics and curators from the Victoria University had framed the venture as a salvage mission to preserve the region’s industrial archaeology.

A crucial context for this educational emphasis was the changes taking place in higher education. The Robbins Report, issued in 1963, recommended that advanced colleges of technology should receive university status. The Report recommended the swift development of three institutions of science and technology: Manchester’s College of Technology, Imperial College London and the University of Strathclyde. Professor Johnson cited the Robbins Report in the document ‘Proposed Museum of Science and Industry’ in which he (and Cardwell) had made clear that the proposal would contribute to Manchester as a ‘university city’. These early plans outlined an educational remit, yet, arguably the museum would also enhance the status of the College of Technology within the city of Manchester during its transformation into a university. In 1966 the College was renamed the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology (UMIST). The Report of the Working Party, produced the same year, explicitly states that the museum should ‘contribute towards an embellishment of the national and international image’ of the city and provide a public appeal as ‘their importance is heightened in the imaginative “Education Precinct” scheme, by the national priority to be given to the Institute for Science and Technology’. Plans for the museum were closely bound to the enhancement of the image of UMIST in Manchester and as a national education institution, with rhetoric about the City’s international image fulfilling wider civic boosterist aims.

---

25 UoM Archive TPA/1/32: memorandum from Cardwell to Bowden re. chairing the upcoming meeting with the Ministry of Technology, 7 Oct 1968.


29 Ibid., ‘The Report of the Working Party appointed by the Joint Committee of representatives of the University of Manchester, University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology and the City Council’, 31 Oct 1966.
As plans for the museum evolved, the historians and scientists drew inspiration from regional rivalry, making parallels with Birmingham and London as contrasting (even inferior) contexts for scientific achievement. Manchester was portrayed as a centre for science, invention and the application of technologies. Furthermore, museum ventures in these cities were incorporated into arguments put forth for the Manchester institution. In the October 1963 ‘Proposed Museum’ document, Cardwell and Johnson boldly claimed:

On any realistic assessment Manchester and its sister towns constitute the first provincial city in the United Kingdom, and more than any other locality in the world, can claim to be the birth place of the Industrial Revolution... [lists engineers, textile technologists, industrial chemists, scientists and philosophers] ...In brief, Manchester boasts a record in science, technology and education which no other city can rival. Certainly Birmingham cannot, yet Birmingham now has a Science Museum while Manchester has not.\(^{30}\)

Whilst behind the scenes, Directors Norman Berthenshaw of the Birmingham Science Museum and Dr David Follett of the South Kensington Science Museum were consulted and lent support to the Manchester venture, in reports and public documents conventionally negative comparisons emerged. For example, in January 1964 Bowden stated in the \textit{Daily Telegraph} it was ‘quite scandalous’ that the North-West did not have a science museum: ‘I am sure Manchester needs such a museum. The Science Museum in Kensington has many exhibits of historical items made in the area and they should be on show here’.\(^{31}\) As well as Bowden’s claim to the North-West made exhibits at the Science Museum, Cardwell and Johnson made clear their aspiration to create a science museum ‘to rival South Kensington.’\(^{32}\) This reveals the extent of ambitions for the site, whilst also alluding to the role of the Science Museum in higher education. Cardwell and Johnson believed they were able to achieve what Prince Albert had ‘failed’ to do in South Kensington and create a true ‘university city’.\(^{33}\)

\(^{31}\) \textit{Daily Telegraph} (27 Jan 1964).
\(^{33}\) UoM Archive TPA/1/32: Cardwell and Johnson paper, 25 Oct 1963, states that ‘Manchester has the chance to achieve what the Prince Consort hoped for London 100 years ago’.
Whilst the educational remit of the Museum was a priority, the 1966 Working Party’s Report set out the institutions primary function as a science museum to acquire, conserve, research and exhibit objects.34 A collecting policy defined nine categories: mechanical engineering, textile machinery, chemical industry, electrical engineering, printing/paper, astronomy and space technology, instruments pertaining to methods and techniques of physical sciences, local engineers and scientists, and civil engineering. For large objects, much emphasis was placed upon displaying the industrial revolution ‘in appropriate milieu’ suggesting a satellite museum for machines in their ‘historically correct conditions.’ The policy evolved from years of discussions within UMIST, the wider academic community and Council representatives; it placed a strong emphasis on local industries like textile technology and chemical industries. Despite ambitions to ‘rival South Kensington’, the Museum hoped to acquire a distinctly regional collection. Instituted in the Manchester Corporation Bill 1966-67, the Manchester Museum of Science and Technology officially opened on 20 October 1969 at the Oddfellows Hall on Grosvenor Street [Figure 1].35 This was a temporary location secured for the collection by UMIST’s Bursar, Geoffrey McComas, as the building was scheduled for demolition to make way for an extension to the Metallurgy building.36

Section 2: From unofficial tourist destination to potential museum site: heritage at Liverpool Road Station in the post-war period

With the formal establishment of the NWMSI in 1966 came an urgent need to find a permanent home for the collection. Objects, many of which were examples of heavy industrial machinery collected by Richard Hills and his team, were stored in inadequate facilities around the UMIST campus.37 One of the earliest candidates for the museum site was Liverpool Road Station. In Section 2.1, I outline post-war continuities with the earlier

twentieth century uses of the site as a place of ad hoc, unofficial tourism to the ‘oldest station in the world’. As I shown in Chapter 1, by this period the site was materially a lieu de memoire in the collective memory and ritual activity of railway enthusiasts and, to some extent, Mancunians. By the 1950s, the passenger station was integrated into the civic history of Manchester at a time of increased freight traffic. Section 2.2 outlines proposals for freight modernisation at Liverpool Road during the 1950s. In Section 2.3, I demonstrate that the 1830 passenger buildings were conceptualised as a potential museum by the British Transport Commission’s Relics and Records division in the early 1960s. The visions for the future of the stucco fronted Georgian passenger building, used as a staff area, contrasted with the freight operations active across the site behind the historic façade, echoing the earlier divergent representations of the passenger and freight stations. The close of this section details the failure of plans to modernise the station and how a missed opportunity to develop Liverpool Road as an International Freight depot ultimately led to its dereliction in the early 1970s. An inspection of the Station in 1968 by NWMSI advocates reveal reservations about its suitability as a museum, despite its long-held position as a site of memory.

Section 2.1 Liverpool Road Station & the tourist gaze

Fascination with Liverpool Road was revived amongst railway historians and enthusiasts in the post-war period and the Station became more prominent in Manchester history through civic displays and memorabilia. As outlined in Chapter 1, the 1930 Railway Centenary raised the profile of Liverpool Road Station as ‘first railway station’ amongst Liverpool and Manchester publics with a permanent monument to the passenger station erected conspicuously on Liverpool Road. The Station featured in official civic histories with the display of the T.T. Bury plates at the Central Library in Manchester: Past and Present in 1944, and the city’s Centenary Exhibition of 1953.38 The same year, the Station buildings were highlighted as an ‘oddity’ to visit in a new A to Z of Manchester, aimed at tourists.39 The location of the plaque on the Georgian frontage provided a focal point for tourists. A set of official postcards produced by Manchester Corporation in November 1956 and sold in the information bureau of the Town Hall included an illustration of the Station

and a ‘Turneresque view of the docks’. Whilst prints displayed in civic exhibitions and the postcard illustrations showed what *The Manchester Guardian* deemed a ‘picturesque’ and ‘a vastly different Manchester’, the recurrence of views of the Station strengthened its position in the narrative of the city’s development.

Ad-hoc, unofficial tourism to the site took place regularly throughout the post-war period. Staff at Liverpool Road became so accustomed to visitors that original objects from the Station Buildings were compiled into a ‘museum of relics’. This comprised an original stone sleeper and chair from the railway line, the Station’s bell and a sundial removed from the 1830 warehouse in 1929 and placed outside the Station’s goods agent’s office at the time. A female member of staff posed with the sundial for a photograph for the *Liverpool Echo* in 1937 and in 1943 it was re-discovered with relics during the installation of a canteen in part of the Station Building. The bell [Figure 4] was photographed with a railwayman for an article in *The Manchester Guardian* on the survival of the station in 1955. The reporter was shown items from the Station, describing old clerk’s desks, the sundial and original window as well as documents including an insurance ticket and register of fines from the 1870s. The relics became a talking point for railway enthusiasts, such as members of the Stephenson Locomotive Society who began the ‘Old Manchester Rail Tour’ at the Station on 12 May 1956 [Figure 3]. Weaver, the Goods Agent, and his colleagues allowed the visitors in from Liverpool Road into the original booking hall and took them up the staircase to platform level, ‘here relics were displayed in the main office’. This ‘authentic’ route into the building and up the stairs to track level was the same as that taken by the Mayors of Liverpool and Manchester during their visit on 15 September 1930. The Goods Office staff were clearly informed of the layout of the passenger station in order to present this experience to visitors.

---

41 George, ‘Liverpool Road Goods Depot’, p.64, information based on interviews with H. Hey, J. J. Purcell and Walter Bowman.
44 The current location of the register of fines remains a mystery, whilst an entry appears on the TNA catalogue (RAIL 410/1271) it has never been produced. A note on the record and subsequent enquiries suggest this was last located at Victoria Station.
Figure 3. Photograph of patrons of the ‘Old Manchester Rail Tour’ exploring the station on 12 May 1956 (W. H. Shercliff, Manchester Library collection)

Figure 4. Photograph of the ‘old bell’ displayed on the ground floor of the Station Building (formerly the first class booking hall) in 1955 (Manchester Library collection).
Staff at Liverpool Road not only dealt with journalists and organised railway enthusiast groups, but also individuals who made pilgrimages to visit the ‘first station’. Eileen Seddon, a typist at the Station from 1957 to 1964, recalls regularly receiving visitors in the goods offices fascinated with their high desks and chairs. Eileen particularly remembered Japanese and German individuals visiting, an indication of the continued international prominence on the ‘oldest in the world’ story.\(^{46}\) Paul Abell visited the site three times prior to its closure, the first on his third birthday in 1954. Abell recalls that on a Saturday in May 1954, his father took him on a historic tour:

The visit to Liverpool Road was the second of three places my Dad took me to that morning. First, we went to see the remains of the Roman fort tucked away under one of the railway arches on the line from Castlefield Junction to Ordsall Lane... The fort itself was an unprepossessing lump of stone through a locked door into the railway arch, there were rats scurrying about and they have stuck in my memory more than the details of the fort. After that we went across the road to the goods station, going in through the old entrance at the bottom of Liverpool Road. I think my Dad saw someone on the bottom floor before we went up the stairs to the tracks. I have a memory (possibly from later visits) that the downstairs portion was not at all the wide open booking hall that it was restored as in 1980 but was much divided up. When we got to the track level the booking office window was still very obvious by the doorway and my Dad jokingly asked for a ticket to Liverpool. There were a couple of men around who were quite happy to see us and were quite aware of the historic nature of the place even though functionally it was really just one of many similar goods stations at the time.\(^{47}\)

As with formal guests, the railway staff allowed Abell and his father in through the original passenger station doorway on Liverpool Road and allowed them up to the track. Abell recalls how his father situated the railway station within the context of the area, combining it with the visit to the Roman Fort, which, although in poor condition, regularly featured in histories of the city published at the time.\(^{48}\)

---

\(^{46}\) Eileen Seddon (nee Yates), Oral History Interview for the Liverpool Road Station Project, recorded by Erin Beeston, 24 Jul 2015. 1957 until 1964 in the goods forwarding office, then as the goods agent’s typist.

\(^{47}\) Pers Comms: Paul Abell, ‘Re. Liverpool Road Station’, message to author, 10 Sept 2015, E-mail.

Section 2.2 Modernisation

Whilst staff in the goods offices of the Station Building accommodated ad hoc visitors, the buildings at Liverpool Road were rapidly degrading after only minor wartime repairs and modifications to staff facilities invested by the London Midland & Scottish Railway (LMS) and British Railways (BR) after 1947. The lack of interwar period investment in freight infrastructure was an issue at a national level. In parliamentary debates on the prospect of nationalisation for the railways the 'big four' companies were criticised for the degradation and obsolescence of railways buildings, facilities and equipment, which were viewed as the 'cumulative effects of private ownership'.  

49 The British Transport Commission (BTC) (responsible for British Railways) in 1954 were required to produce future plans for the Ministry of Transport. In October 1956 the White Paper, Proposals for the Railways, presented the case for modernisation.  

50 Freight modernisation was the subject of the BTC's Traffic Survey Group's first report in March 1956. The core recommendation for terminals was the establishment of 'freight transfer depots' also described as railheads. These major depots for wagon load traffic were ideally to be situated ‘as to obtain maximum operational advantages... in the outskirts of large towns and cities’. Liverpool Road Station was ear-marked for modernisation as one Manchester’s four major railheads by the London Midland Area Board, which was established in 1955 to oversee regional operations. The location of Liverpool Road, deemed too peripheral for passenger traffic in the 1840s and notorious for slums, public houses and subversive activity in the nineteenth century, was still a prime site for freight. The planned City Circle Road proposed in the 1945 City of Manchester Plan, which would pass the Station along Lower Byrom, also fitted with the requirement for new termini that should integrate with ‘new streams of road traffic into the highway system’.  


In June 1956, the Freight Planning Department drew up radical plans [Figure 5] for the modernisation of the Station that would completely alter the layout of buildings and tracks at the cost of the nineteenth century warehouse buildings. The BTC’s contemporaneous Handbook of Freight and Parcels Terminal Planning advised that adapting existing warehouse premises was difficult owing to a lack of head room, inadequate floor strength and structural impediments to movement. This would limit the use of them for the preferred method of transporting goods – which was as pallet loads. In this diagram the warehousing and infrastructure built by LNWR between 1867 and 1890 would be radically restructured. The ‘Old Warehouse’ (1830 Warehouse) is annotated ‘to be demolished’ and in its place the area was ‘to be filled in or bridged’. Elsewhere, the Shipping Shed, New Warehouse (Lower Byron Street), the 1890 gantry and track works in the upper yard would also be removed. Grape Street Warehouse would have been the only survivor, although the stables alongside it were to be demolished to make space for a new entrance at the corner of Grape Street and Lower Byrom Street. The planner noted that this new entrance would intersect with the ‘proposed new ring road’. The accumulator tower was also marked for removal, suggesting that the hydraulic system would be replaced with electric power throughout the site.

Surviving this proposed re-arrangement was the 1830 Station Buildings and former shops along Liverpool Road. In the 1956 plan [Figure 5], the railway line in front of the Station Building terminates short of its original end point. The abrupt end of the line marked ‘line severed’, in front of the original wagon shed area does not appear to have a purpose for the transhipment of goods. The line is labelled ‘exhibition line’. Were the line not severed before approaching the Lower Byrom Street end of the site, the ‘exhibition line’ could indicate a route for the movement of exhibition materials, which Liverpool Road is recorded as carrying out for shows at the City Hall (see chapter 3 on Bostock’s Menagerie). However, considering its location in front of the ‘oldest station in the world’ it may have been intended as a terminus for rail tours. Further context to this plan is provided by the contemporaneous work on the Station’s history by the BTC’s Department

---

**Apr 2016]**; NRM 2003.9147: BTC Modernisation and Re-equipment of British Railways, handbook of freight and parcels terminal planning (c.1957), Section 23, 2.

54 NRM 2004-7758: Coloured diagram of Liverpool Road Station, 1956.

55 NRM 2003.9147: Handbook of freight and parcels terminal planning (c.1957), Section 21, 4.

of Relics and Records. John Scholes and L. C. Johnson, the curator and archivist at the department, drafted a report on the Station in April 1956. They used records compiled in the 1930s and 1940s by LMS and Liverpool Road staff on the historical site and the surviving relics. Circulation of this report within the BTC coupled with the preservation of the passenger building in the 1956 proposals - which, had they been enacted, would have removed the Old Warehouse, New Warehouse and 1850s Shipping Shed, demonstrates that the Station’s significance was well known by the BTC and British Railways Midland Region Area Board.

![Figure 5. Section of coloured diagram of Liverpool Road Station, 1956 (in greyscale for legibility). The 1830 station buildings are shown as ‘existing office to remain’ with a so-called ‘exhibition line’ running alongside. The area ‘to be filled’ is the footprint of the 1830 Warehouse (NRM: 2004-7758).](image)

After the work by Scholes and Johnson on Liverpool Road Station’s historic significance, the 1830 passenger building was earmarked for listing in 1959 under the 1947 Town and

---

57 TNA RAIL 1007/548: LMS Record Office files, Liverpool and Manchester Railway: Historical notes, extracts from periodicals, including notes on Liverpool Road Station, Manchester oldest station. Documents span 1920s to 1950s. Correspondence from L. C. Johnson to John (Scholes), 25 April 1956 discusses the report.
Country Planning Act. 58 The Station Building was officially listed Grade 1 in 1963, 59 one year after the demolition of the Euston Arch, an 1838 neo-classical Doric archway that marked the entrance to the original London and Birmingham Railway Station in London. The demolition of the Euston Arch by British Railways created a public outcry, not only from those interested in railway history, but also from leading architectural historians and public figures such as John Betjeman. The subsequent listing of Liverpool Road's Georgian, stucco fronted 1830 passenger building was timely in the context of the popular reaction to the Euston Arch controversy. Diane Barthel identifies the urgency this instilled across the British preservation movement. 60 The listing also provides an unusual case study as a Station in use for freight purposes with increasing traffic as opposed to an already defunct building. 61 BR were owners of other working stations listed as protected monuments, for example, the Central Station in Manchester was listed at the same time as Liverpool Road and continued to operate as a passenger station. 62

Whilst to some extent protected by its listed status, the Station Building was still included on a list compiled by the Victorian Society in 1966 including sixty railway stations ‘worthy of preservation’. 63 This list was produced in reaction to the recommendations of the Beeching Report, which proposed the closure of numerous lines and stations. 64 The Society described Liverpool Road as of ‘great historical interest as the earliest surviving railway building in the world’, although as with earlier descriptions of the ‘earliest’ or ‘oldest station’, freight buildings do not figure. 65 Annotations on the Goad’s Fire Insurance plans [Figure 6]

59 Historic England cites the listing as 18 Dec 1963, ‘Former Liverpool Road Railway Station, Station Masters House’ list entry summary: < https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1291477> [accessed 10 May 2016].
61 Regional express freight guides show Liverpool Road became busier between 1955 and 1965. By 1965, more principal destinations were listed for Liverpool Road than Oldham Road Goods Station or London Road: British Railways London Midland Region, Principal Express Freight Train Services and facilities (London: British Railways, July 1957); Ibid., (Feb, 1958); Ibid., (Oct, 1959), & British Railways London Midland Region, Freight Handbook (London: British Railways, 1965).
indicates that all of the warehouses were vacant on certain on floors by June 1961.\(^{66}\) Despite the growth in express freight traffic between 1955 and 1965, the top two storeys of the New Warehouse and Grape Street were empty, along with the lower areas of the Old Warehouse - evidence that the criticisms levied at old warehouses in the BTC's *Handbook of freight and parcels terminal planning* were accurate. Preservation efforts in this period are clearly focused on the remains of early passenger structures at the expense of warehousing. The Victorian Society list is dominated by 1840s classical, Italianate, mock-Tudor and gothic station facades, reflecting an early station aesthetic which incorporated the railway into vernacular urban architecture, before the iron and glass train shed became the norm.\(^{67}\) The endangered freight infrastructure of Britain was given little consideration by architects, historians or railway enthusiasts - who focused preservation campaigns on rolling stock and passenger terminals.

Figure 6. Cross section of the Old (1830) Warehouse from Chas E Goad Ltd., *Manchester Carriers’ Warehouse District fire insurance plans circa 1899*, annotated up to 1961 (SIM Archive: E2019.0032).

\(^{66}\) SIM Archive E2019.0032: *Manchester Carriers’ Warehouse District, Showing Railway Stations and Positions of Warehouses Within 30 Miles of Manchester* (Chas E Goad Ltd. September 1899).

Section 2.3 Towards preservation

Around the same time as the listing of the Station Building, the idea that it could be re-used as a museum was mooted. In a report by the *Daily Telegraph* in December 1959, a BR official stated there were ‘no plans to convert the station into a railway museum’.\(^{68}\) This suggests that the listing fuelled such speculation. According to Richard Hills, in 1963 Scholes suggested the Station might act as a regional outpost of the Transport Museum, which had opened in stages at Clapham from 1961.\(^{69}\) The notion of a national transport museum housing railway relics, many of which were transferred to the BTC after nationalisation, was discussed from 1950 onwards with the appointment of the Relics and Records Committee.\(^{70}\) A National Transport Treasures Consultative Panel was set up in February 1958 to advise the BTC on the preservation. The Committee comprised members of railway societies including the Stephenson Locomotive Society, the Newcomen Society and the Model Railway Club. Collaborative efforts focused on the creation of a list of locomotives to be preserved for the nation and by July 1958 regional museums were proposed to house collections to correspond with the British Railways regional areas.\(^{71}\) However, the transport museums at Clapham, Swinton and York were beset by soaring costs.\(^{72}\) In this context, the possibility of a museum for the Manchester area within the London Midland region was slim. However, local authorities in Glasgow, Leicester, Liverpool and Birmingham all independently created museums or galleries within civic museums with a focus on transport between 1965 and 1972.\(^{73}\) Whilst interest in Liverpool Road Station was expressed by staff and railway enthusiasts, Manchester Corporation did not consider it for

---

\(^{68}\) *Daily Telegraph* (31 Dec 1959), p.11.


\(^{70}\) TNA AN104/1: BTC Relics and Records Committee official correspondence and main report, first meeting minutes, 15 Feb 1950.

\(^{71}\) UoM Archive: R212847 *Stephenson Locomotive Society Journal* vol.35 no.403 (Jan 1959) p.5.


a transport museum. Instead, as outlined in Section 1, City Councillor Maurice Pariser supported plans for an industrial archaeology museum. These ambitions were then combined with the growing role of scientific education in Manchester and hence support for the UMIST enterprise grew between 1963 and 1966 when the campus museum was established.

There were opportunities during the 1960s to establish a transport collection for the North Western Museum. Although the collecting policy developed by Richard Hills focused on the industries of engineering, textiles and computing, Donald Cardwell was concerned with the loss of steam locomotive technology. Writing in the same year as the Beeching Report and in the context of the scrappage scheme that replaced steam locomotives with diesel engines, Cardwell believed the steam locomotive was a technology at risk of disappearing within twenty years.74 Vivian Bowden recalled a missed opportunity to collect a Britannia locomotive around 1960 whilst Cardwell sought to retain a locomotive for Manchester in 1970. Cardwell was particularly concerned with the exchange of significant locomotives between BR and the ‘old-boys network’ at the detriment to the even distribution of objects of national importance. In 1969, writing to Jennie Lee MP, Minister for the Arts, Cardwell suggested that if the Clapham Transport Museum closed (which it did in 1973) that the NWMSI should be given priority for exhibits manufactured in Manchester.75 Bowden tempered his enthusiasm highlighting the lack of storage space and limitations of accommodation at Grosvenor Street.76 These decisions, made on the basis of storage and collecting priorities meant that, unlike its regional and national rivals, the NWMSI featured no transport displays.

The failure to effectively modernise Manchester’s freight system led to drastic reductions in traffic and staffing at Liverpool Road Station from 1965 to 1968 and the site was once again considered as a potential museum.77 Veterans of the late 1950s Science Museum

74 UoM Archive TPA/1/32: ‘Preliminary notes on a proposed museum of science and technology’ by Donald Cardwell, 19 Jun 1963.
75 UoM Archive TPA/1/70 (1/2): Museum of Science and Technology file, draft marked ‘penultimate’ of a letter sent to Jennie Lee, MP, from Donald Cardwell 7 Dec 1969.
76 Ibid., Memorandum from Donald Cardwell to Vivian Bowden expressing concern Manchester won’t get a steam locomotive 21 Jan 1970 & response 27 Jan 1970.
77 Manchester Archive 124.A.BRB 546: British Railways Board file, Concentration of freight sundries traffic at Ancoats, Ardwick and Oldham Road Manchester, Report (1966), states sundries traffic ceased at Liverpool Road (except for tobacco) on 3 May 1965 resulting in the loss of 183 waged staff position with the cartage departments motor vehicles reduced from 167 to just 71.
Committee, David Owen and Jack Diamond, Professor of Mechanical Engineering at the Victoria University, inspected Liverpool Road along with Richard Hills. The Station was swiftly dismissed as a suitable home for the new museum. Hills later recounted his impressions during this visit:

Whilst we admired the magnificent structure of the 1830 Warehouse, with its wooden floors, wooden beams and wooden columns, we realised how inadequate it would be due to the limited floor loadings, close spacing of the columns, access problems for both exhibits and visitors. In addition, lead flashings and guttering had been stripped off the roofs so rain was pouring in. We trod with great caution on some of the rotting floors. Parts of some of the internal walls were collapsing. We were glad to escape into the fresh open air away from the smell of dry rot.\textsuperscript{78}

The Station was deemed inadequate for a museum largely on the basis that the academics were only presented with the Station Building and 1830 Warehouse. The freight complex in its entirety includes the more modern 1850s to 1880s buildings with iron columns and stronger floors. Recollections of this visit indicate that the 1830 Warehouse was now considered for preservation, whereas earlier heritage activity focused singularly on the passenger building.

Despite the re-emergence of discussions regarding a museum at the site, the closure of the Station was not a certainty. As late as 1967, a new customs clearance facility was opened, enabling container traffic to be dealt with in Manchester rather than at port customs sheds.\textsuperscript{79} Furthermore, in summer 1968 BR was engaged in discussions with a consortium of Manchester forwarding agents regarding a new International Freight Terminal. Reporting on the present methods of working, the LM Region Divisional Manager for Manchester stated that the Grape Street Warehouse was in use by a container company Gentransco Services Ltd., at rail level only as the ‘remainder being empty with no possible future in its derelict condition’.\textsuperscript{80} As a result of underinvestment in infrastructure and buildings by LMS and the BR, Liverpool Road was disregarded for the new terminal as: ‘limited in area and the existing buildings did not appear capable of catering for any additional traffic’.\textsuperscript{81} Three other options were presented by BR: Trafford Park, Barton Dock, or the former goods

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{78} R. L. Hills, \textit{The North-Western Museum of Science and Industry}, p.9.
\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., minutes of meeting between BR and Manchester forwarding agents re. Development of a terminal for ferry wagon traffic, 18 Feb 1968.
\end{flushright}
depot at Patricroft with proposals made to improve short-term facilities for import traffic at Liverpool Road. The International Freight Terminal was ultimately constructed adjacent to the Freightliner terminal at Trafford Park, opening on 16 September 1974. A skeleton service continued at Liverpool Road, where consignments of sand and cement continued to be delivered by Blue Circle Aggregates Limited, who operated on a week-by-week basis as late as April 1975.

Section 3: The politics of preservation

In this final section I reveal the politics of Liverpool Road Station’s selection as the permanent home for the NWMSI. The Museum’s preferred locations are presented in 3.1, particularly Cardwell’s designs for the Central Station and purpose-built premises as a part of Manchester’s ‘Education Corridor’ in the early 1970s. In Section 3.2, I discuss how the prospect of Liverpool Road as a candidate was dismissed and simultaneously encouraged by interested parties. The subject of national preservation campaigning, the Station was in a critical state by 1972. Yet, the NWMSI staff found it incompatible with their aims. The creation of Greater Manchester Council (GMC) and its position as major funder from 1975 was crucial in bringing Liverpool Road onto the agenda. Whilst archival evidence shows Liverpool Road was discussed in relation to the Museum from the late 1960s and GMC promoted it to a priority, it took pressure from campaign group, the Liverpool Road Station Society (LRSS) to transform ambition into action. In 3.3, the Society’s composition, as a group comprising experts, professionals, civic officials, workers from the Station and members of public is introduced. The influence of the Society over Station spaces was a significant source of tension during and beyond the Museum’s migration to Liverpool Road, which I address in Chapter 5.

82 ibid, minutes of the First Meeting of the Working Party, 13 May 1969.
84 TNA AN 169/207: BR Property Board, Buildings of historical or architectural interest, correspondence from BR Public Relations Managing Director to BR Property Board PR Controller, J.H.C Fulford, re. Manchester Liverpool Road Station/The Georgian Group, 18 April 1975.
Figure 7. Visitor map showing the location of the museum, circa 1968-1971. Here you can see the museum was equidistant from the Victoria University (‘University’) and the Institute of the Science and Technology (UoM Archive TPA/1/70 (1/2)).

Section 3.1 The University’s preferred spaces

From the opening of the NWMSI at temporary premises in Oddfellows Hall, the search for a permanent home accelerated as the collection expanded. Along with Liverpool Road, several sites were considered during the later 1960s and early 1970s. Plans often evolved in response to changes planned by the City Architects Department. The desire to preserve ‘old Manchester’ extended beyond the material culture of industrial technologies to sites and structures of industry, thus all but one proposal involved the re-purposing of a defunct industrial complex. These multifarious sites challenged the aspiration to use the museum to
enhance the relationship between ‘town and gown’; proximity to the UMIST and Victoria Universities was regularly raised by academics in discussions. An ex-mill and coal mines located outside Manchester were investigated. Quarry Bank Mill at Styal in Cheshire warranted a full-scale report in 1964 by Wolfe Mays, only to be found unsuitable several years before the National Trust intervened and preserved the mill complex. Preferred options were often located in Manchester close to Piccadilly and the Sackville Street campus. Councillor Maurice Pariser, whom Cardwell credited with providing much momentum in the early stages of the NWMSI, envisaged a ‘cultural quarter’ on the corner of Princess Street and Portland Street. In 1966 a warehouse at 101 Princess Street was proposed, plans for which were de-railed by a new road scheme which would have affected the building (later abandoned). Another option, the ornate Cook and Watts warehouse on Portland Street was a possibility for some years. York House, a 1911 warehouse, was a favourite with the Manchester College of Art and Design academics as it was ‘central to the city, adjacent to both arts and education precincts, alongside a canal in a part of the city very much in need of redevelopment’. This site was considered too expensive to redevelop and the Council decided to take no further action in October 1967. The Working Party were wary of the limitations of space between pillars inside the warehouses and concerned that the floors would not support heavy engineering exhibits, seen as key objects. Similar concerns to those raised by Hills in relation to the 1830 Warehouse the following year.

Donald Cardwell’s preferred site by 1970 was another former railway station, which he considered historically significant. NWMSI staff and leading conservationists advanced the case for Manchester Central Station, closed due to the recommendations of Beeching. Erected between 1876 and 1879, Central Station served passengers and freight for the

85 Ibid., memorandum from Cardwell to Bowden 24 Apr 1964 with report by W. Mays and F. E. White.
86 Donald Cardwell, ‘Castlefield past and present’, 93-4; Manchester Archive RA1(A).1.3: Museum Correspondence, Cardwell, ‘Report on the History of the NWMSI’.
87 UoM Archive TPA/1/32: Proposed Museum, appendix to meeting of the Joint Committee held 9 Nov 1967.
88 Ibid., Correspondence from John Bishop and Joseph Paul D’uras of the Manchester College of Art and Design to Bowden, 14 Jan 1968.
89 Ibid., Appendix to Joint Committee meeting 9 Nov 1967 states the Council decided to take no action on York House, though correspondence regarding its suitability continued amongst the academics.
Cheshire Lines Committee railway route into Manchester. Central, along with Exchange Station, a passenger station adjoining Victoria, were abandoned by British Railways in May 1969. As early as 1965, the City Council was in talks with BR over the potential re-use of the site for an exhibition hall, rather than for a museum. As earlier plans for the exhibition complex proposed in the *City of Manchester Plan* remained inert, the size of the Central Station provided a solution to the lack of capital available to erect a new hall. Central Station was listed in 1963, affording it some protection from demolition, which the Exchange Station did not receive.

Cardwell’s vision for Central Station integrated the NWMSI collections into a narrative of industrial infrastructure. Dr Arnold Pacey, a colleague of Cardwell, wrote a report on the architectural significance of Central Station, stating it was the second largest arch span-roofed railway station in the country after St Pancras and there was ‘reason to believe it was the first steel framed building in the world’. This trope, another ‘first’ for the history of technology in Manchester (which hasn’t been proliferated since), bolstered Cardwell’s ambitions to instate a science museum in the Station, at odds with the City’s plan to create a general purpose exhibition hall. *The Times* published Pacey’s findings and the ‘special reasons’ the Station would better suite a science museum. These included Cardwell’s opinion that the building itself would constitute an exhibit of technological importance. Ambitions for displays included a series of full-scale bridges, comparative building materials and even fabric from the Station’s roof for visitors to admire the progress of construction techniques. This proposed integration of site story and collections was not effectively taken up in the later interpretation of Liverpool Road Station by Cardwell and Hills’ successors, as will be discussed in Chapter 5.

At UMIST, in co-operation with the Victoria University, the idea of a new purpose-built museum gained momentum in the context of plans for Manchester’s Education Precinct. In 1972, a notional design was drawn up by the Precinct and Hulme Crescents architects,
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92 UoM Archive TPA/1/32: A. J. Pacey, ‘Manchester Central Station as a museum of technology, a memorandum’ (undated).
Hugh Wilson and Lewis Womersley [Figure 8]. This was to be located at the corner of Oxford Road and Booth Street East, near the Oddfellows Hall site and along the main thoroughfare conceptualised as the ‘education corridor’ of Oxford Road. The cost of this structure was high, estimated at £600,000 plus £50,000 to transfer the existing collection, although the land was to be provided in kind by the Victoria University. The Education Precinct plan was considered the best option in a review of prospective sites by the Museums Association and Carnegie Trust, although the committee did note a possible conflict of interest with a contemporary bid for £740,000 to update galleries at the Manchester Museum. Whilst the footprint of the new museum was smaller than other sites, at about two acres, its proximity to the universities was deemed advantageous.


Figure 8. Notional perspective drawing of the Museum of Science and Technology by Hugh Wilson and Lewis Womersley, architects, March 1972 (University of Manchester Archive: TPA/1/70 (1/2)).
The proposal for the Education Precinct museum was weakened in 1975 when the newly formed local government body, the Greater Manchester County Council (GMC), replaced the City Council as a major funder of NWMSI. Since lobbying for the Central Station failed, Cardwell now advocated the campus site, suggesting to GMC that the public might be drawn into the campus area, thus minimising social distinctions between ‘town and gown’. A visitor map [Figure 7] signposting the NWMSI highlights landmarks, the Town Hall and Central Library, and Piccadilly Station. The GMC represented ten Metropolitan Boroughs and it was deemed that a new museum should be readily accessible to all citizens. Whilst Oxford Road was physically close to the centre of Manchester, it was considered too peripheral for the regional visitor. This reflects perceptions of Piccadilly Gardens as the city centre and Piccadilly Station as the main transport hub. Piccadilly (previously named London Road Station) was modernised in the 1960s and, after the 1968 City Centre Plan, the proposed terminus of an underground ‘Picc-Vic Tunnel’ connected with Victoria Station. Ultimately, Councillor B. S. Langton of the GMC’s Recreation and Arts Committee stated that too much support was given to Manchester over the region, and that the Museum should not be located on the site ‘ear-marked within the Education Precinct’.

The politics of re-housing the NWMSI was shaped by the local government reorganisation of 1974. Upon the formation of the GMC, preservation of industrial heritage was an immediate priority as the constituent Metropolitan boroughs were already actively involved in planning new heritage sites. Six of the ten authorities had plans for industrial collections or living history type museums, following the example of Beamish, which was funded by a consortium of Councils in the North East and opened in 1972. Only Rochdale Council advocated an alternative form of preservation, suggesting the foundation of a county wide industrial archaeology trust. The effects of de-industrialisation in the region
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96 Manchester Archive RA1 (A).1.4: Correspondence from GMC secretary to Stevenson, UMIST Bursar, stating GMC agreed £50,000 of funding for the financial year 1975-6, 27 Nov 1975.
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were evident in the sites identified. Salford Council planned a coal mining museum at Buille Hill, in Wigan Astley Green Colliery was to be preserved with its intact pithead, whilst Park Bridge Ironworks was the priority for Tameside Council to preserve. Bolton wished to develop Barrow Bridge Institute as an industrial museum, Bury planned a Railway Museum, and for Manchester, Liverpool Road Station was regarded as the most important endangered site.

Section 3.2 Liverpool Road Station and the preservation agenda

As British Railways kept Liverpool Road nominally open but in a state of dereliction from 1969 to 1975, the poor condition of the site attracted the criticism locally from individuals and newspaper reporters, railway enthusiasts, architectural historians, the Historic Buildings Council and the Victorian and Georgian Societies. In 1971, the Manchester Conservation Area and Historic Building Panel inspected the site reporting ‘ominous signs of decay’. By June 1972, BR stated the Station would be redundant in eighteen months. Although it was not public knowledge, the Station continued to be discussed as a potential site for the NWMSI. For example, it was one of the sites studied by the Museums Association and Carnegie Trust, however, the Committee stated it ‘did not appear worth serious consideration.’ Campaigning intensified in March 1973, when the Chairmen of the Victorian and Georgian Societies, Nikolaus Pevsner and I. O. Chance, wrote to The Times outlining the dismissal of their concerns by BR for over eighteen months. They described the Station as a ‘complex of buildings which make an outstanding architectural contribution’. On 8 May 1973 the 1830 Warehouse was also listed as architecturally significant and brought one of the freight buildings into the campaign; the remaining structures from the stables to the Station’s Shipping Shed did not explicitly figure in preservation discourse. The 1830 structures were signifiers of the ‘oldest’ or ‘first’ story, the dominant site narrative, which denoted a specificity of place and an authenticity which...

could not be encountered elsewhere as the contemporaneous Crown Street Station had fallen into a state of disrepair (and was further bomb-damaged during the Second World War).105

In the early 1970s, pleas to British Railways for preservation of the 1830 Station were frequently accompanied by suggestions that it should be restored to its former appearance and become a museum. In 1972, Harry M. Fairhurst, architect of numerous UMIST/Victoria University buildings, stated on behalf of the Manchester Conservation Area and Historic Building Panel that: ‘we would like to see it restored to its original state as a museum... it is enormously important historically and visited by railway enthusiasts from all over the world’.106 This indicates that pilgrimages to the former passenger station continued, with ad hoc tourism persisting despite its deteriorating condition. As with contemporaneous heritage campaigns, there was a firm belief that a building could be rendered ‘original’ once again and restored to a previous state whilst simultaneously re-made as a museum. This concept was later decried by critics of the heritage boom, particularly Hewison.107 The aim to restore the 1830 passenger facilities was upheld by all parties involved in the preservation discussions and campaigns of the later 1970s, discussed further in Chapter 5. This conception of what constituted ‘original’ history at the site set the place narrative in 1830s industrial Manchester, with the city as pioneer, another example of heritage as boosterism.

The question of authenticity and what constituted an ‘original’ version of the Station Building was raised when the GMC became an advocate of the site for the NWMSI in 1975. Plans were made to combine the aspiration to create a living history museum at Astley Green Colliery with both saving Liverpool Road and housing the Electricity Council’s collection (which Cardwell and NWMSI were brokering the acquisition of at the time). Cardwell was outspoken in the local press about ambitions for the Colliery site as a national energy museum in February 1975, which provoked criticism from the GMC.108 For this site,

108 ‘Energetic Don has Capital Idea’, Manchester Evening News (Manchester, England) (6 Feb 1975); UoM Archive TPA/1/70 (1/2), memorandum from Donald Cardwell to Vivian Bowden citing criticism from a ‘distinguished individual’ attached to a formal letter 11 April 1975 which defends his press discussions and describes the GMC’s lack of understanding regarding the history of the museum.
Cardwell proposed interpretation of the extant steam engine used for winding at the pit; as with Central Station, the surviving structures were related to interpreting the NWMSI collection. Cardwell and other supporters of the Colliery venture were clearly inspired by the North of England Open Air Museum, Beamish, where a winding engine had been translocated and interpreted in 1973.

The GMC faced the challenge of unifying preservation of their disparate industrial sites and the orphan NWMSI collection. Under a proposal discussed with Victoria University representatives, Liverpool Road Station was suggested as a city satellite museum to a larger, hub museum at the Colliery. In this debate, the question of whether the passenger building could be removed from its urban context and entirely re-erected at the Colliery emerged. This concept was not a radical one, as at Beamish a 1910 era country railway station was re-created from several disused stations for the pseudo-industrial town. David Owen personally disapproved of the idea and Maund, the County Planning Officer, questioned whether the rebuilding of the ‘essential part’ of the Station at Astley Green ‘would constitute in the public’s mind an adequate reflection of the original station’. The complete rebuilding of the Station was considered in danger of undermining the relationship between the public and the fabric of the site, which, as I have argued, was materially as well as symbolically a realm of memory.

Liverpool Road Station appeared quickly as a priority for the GMC, whose preference for the site caused tension with UMIST, particularly Donald Cardwell. Rebecca Madgin suggests the scheme provided a high-profile project to pronounce the County Council’s arrival to the complex structure of local governance. Whilst Michael Leary contends that the revalorisation of the Station: ‘created an opportunity for a powerful symbolic

109 Manchester Archive: RA1.1(A).2, Note on a Meeting with representatives of Manchester University (GMC, date unspecified).


111 Man Archive: RA1.1(A).2 Museum Corres re. Future of NWMSI, note on a meeting with representatives of Manchester University (GMC, date unspecified).

demonstration of GMC’s ability to deliver visible projects on the ground’. In 1975, Cardwell drafted a report on the history of the museum for his new funders, in which he surveyed the potential sites:

We have also looked at Liverpool Road Station. I, for one, am unimpressed. The site is bleak and remote from all other cultural and educational institutions. The building itself is unattractive and though perhaps of some antiquarian interest, it is of no scientific or technological importance. Liverpool Road ‘station’ might just as well have been the first fish and chip shop in the North West. Here, the established narratives of ‘oldest in the world’ and of the architectural significance of the 1830 structures communicated by preservation bodies were undermined. Unlike the Central Station, which Cardwell deemed of outstanding engineering significance, he rejected Liverpool Road’s long-standing status, potentially because its popularity prevented serious consideration of his preferred locations. In 1982, the historian revised his view, declaring to the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society: ‘the old station still stands, the oldest true railway station in the world; just a few yards from the original canal terminus at the Castlefield Basin… no site in the world is more important in the history of transport than Castlefield. Notwithstanding his prior concern for the preservation of steam locomotives, Cardwell viewed the transport history potential of Liverpool Road unfavourably until the site became a certainty for the NWMSI. Although the NWMSI continued under the directorship of Richard Hills at the Grosvenor Street site (which was not demolished as scheduled), 1975 marked a watershed in the governance of the Museum. As the main funders, GMC persisted with their preferred site of Liverpool Road, despite the protestations of the academic staff, who continued to aspire to a ‘museum to rival South Kensington’ close to campus.


114 Manchester Archive RA1(A).1.3: Museum Correspondence, D.S.L Cardwell, Report on the History of the NWMSI.

Section 3.3 The Society and the Station

The politics of transferring the Museum to Liverpool Road was also influenced by a dedicated campaign group from January 1978. The Liverpool Road Station Society (LRSS) performed a pivotal role in the rescue of Liverpool Road and the wider regeneration of Castlefield (as Madgin and Leary have observed). The group were also agents in the transformation of the Station. Despite designs to re-make Liverpool Road Station as the NWMSI, GMC ignored an offer from BR to purchase the site for £1 in September 1976, owing to extensive structural problems with the buildings. Numerous societies and individuals lobbied GMC and the City Council to intervene, however the latter favoured the re-use of a large area of the site for housing. On 11 May 1977 a public meeting was held by GMC, whose Liverpool and Manchester Railway 150th anniversary celebrations committee sought volunteers to assist with planning the upcoming anniversary (explored in Chapter 5, Section 1.1.). This attracted representatives of diverse societies including the Georgian Group, the Manchester Locomotive Society, Victorian Society, Dinting Railway Centre, Bury Transport Museum and even the Carbophilic Society. This meeting is often cited as a catalyst for the establishment of the LRSS later that year by David Rhodes and Jane Kennedy of the Victorian Society. The Society’s Manchester Group Conservation sub-committee called a meeting on 12 December 1977, to encourage action. By January 1978 the LRSS formed with two core aims – to secure the Station’s future and to ensure Manchester celebrated the 150th anniversary in an ‘appropriate manner’.


119 Manchester Archive GMC 4/BOX 44: minutes of Meeting of Representatives of Local Societies and Interested Parties held at County Hall, Manchester, 11 May 1977; An earlier initiative is cited at the meeting, a Transport Appreciation Society formed in 1975 to campaign for Liverpool Road, although there is no indication of membership or if they actively campaigned.


The initial involvement of Georgian Group and Victorian Society members underlines the significance the Station was afforded as a unique survival architecturally. It was this drive to preserve the physical building that led to the foundation of the LRSS, with the Station’s fame as the ‘oldest in the world’ – rather than as the location of early railway technologies or its association with George Stephenson. Jane Kennedy, an architecture student who worked for GMC’s Design Department, reflected in a 1986 lecture: ‘looking back to the reasons for our success, I think we were undoubtedly helped by the fact that the Station was a Grade I listed building. We also had the tag ‘oldest in the world’.\textsuperscript{122} Steve Little, an LRSS member recalled in 2015: ‘what I suppose was most peculiar about it was that the original members – most were not railway enthusiasts as such it was much more to do with the building and its history than was to do with being a railway’.\textsuperscript{123} This concern for the building owes much to the approach to commemoration adopted in the earlier twentieth century (see Chapter 1 Section 3), when the Georgian frontage and bridge were prominently memorialised.

\textbf{Figure 9.} Members of the Liverpool Road Station Society inspect the Station in 1978 (SIM Archive 2007/41/1/9)

\textsuperscript{122} Kennedy, ‘Liverpool Road: a case study’, p.49.

\textsuperscript{123} Steve Little, Oral History Interview for the Liverpool Road Station Project, recorded by Erin Beeston, 22 Apr 2015.
The professional backgrounds of the core twenty to thirty members of the LRSS who began campaigning enabled the Society to shape the official history of the site. Following the Town Hall meeting, further meetings took place at the Manchester University School of Architecture. The Society’s first Chairman, David Rhodes, an historic buildings conservation officer in the City Council’s Planning Department, recounts numerous gatherings in Manchester’s public houses, with academics and archaeologists meeting at the Briton’s Protection to debate the conservation of Castlefield (particularly in the wake of the 1972 Roman fort archaeological investigations).¹²⁴ Several LRSS members, including Steve Little, Anita George and David George were also involved in the Manchester Region Industrial Archaeology Society. The industrial archaeologists worked contemporaneously to preserve the Bridgewater canal basin and played a pivotal role in the later development of the Castlefield Urban Heritage Park.¹²⁵ At Liverpool Road, LRSS members aided Ron Fitzgerald with his architectural survey in the summer of 1979, further evidence of expertise within the group. Local historians were also active in the Society, with Alan Chorlton undertaking original research while Anita George led the collection of oral history recordings with staff from the Station.¹²⁶

In 1979, the LRSS used their expertise and contacts to develop a heritage experience. Moira Stevenson, a museum professional who joined the LRSS through the Victorian Society, helped curate an interpretation centre in the freight offices.¹²⁷ The interpretation centre partly opened in 1979 and fully opened on 15 May 1980 with an exhibition on ‘The First Inter-City Railway’.¹²⁸ Students were also recruited from the Manchester College of Building by Len Clarke to assist with the exhibition and later contributed to the freight offices restoration in 1982.¹²⁹ A sub-group of individuals with mechanical skills, known as the ‘restoration gang’, were headed by foreman of works (and from 1980, secretary of the Society) Ray Sharples.¹³⁰ David Rhodes also recalls informal meetings of the nascent LRSS in
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¹²⁴ David Rhodes, Oral History Interview for the Liverpool Road Station Project, recorded by Erin Beeston, 11 Sept 2014.
¹²⁵ Madgin, ‘Reconceptualising the historic urban environment’, p.36.
¹³⁰ Ibid., LRSS Newsletter no.14, Aug 1981.
the White Lion with former Station employees and deliberately recruiting railway enthusiasts.\textsuperscript{131} Whilst the original members of the LRSS were largely unaccustomed to manual labour, many assisted in remedial work around the site to prepare it for visitors and the ‘Great Railway Exposition’ of 1980.\textsuperscript{132} In 1993, a member of the Friends organisation reminisced:

> Having regard for the varied antecedents of the gang and the fact that many of us were, like me, in sedentary occupations it is surprising how much heavy work we did and how few shirked their share of toil.\textsuperscript{133}

Urgent calls for assistance with the task of clearing of weeds and debris from the site in the Society’s Newsletter, however, reveal only a core group of twenty members out of 300 regularly met at weekends to volunteer.\textsuperscript{134} As professional museum staff were recruited by GMC, Stevenson felt it appropriate to step back, along with many of the original Victorian Society members.\textsuperscript{135}

Whilst an interest in locomotives and historic buildings are not mutually exclusive categories, the membership of the LRSS from 1977 to 1983 provides an insight into a group with divergent interests in the Station. Those volunteers who joined out of a passion for steam and engineering continued to have a role once the museum opened (discussed in Chapter 5, Section 2.3), whilst those with an interest in architectural preservation mostly left the group once the Station Building was officially saved.\textsuperscript{136} Rather than perceiving the Society as a barrier to the NWMSI vision for the prospective museum, Hills embraced the LRSS including them in the open days and volunteering opportunities at the Grovesnor Street premises.\textsuperscript{137} The complexities of relationships forged during the transformation of Liverpool Road Station into the next iteration of the NWMSI is a theme continued in Chapter 5.

\textsuperscript{131} Rhodes, Oral History Interview, 11 Sept 2014.
\textsuperscript{133} Ibid., transcript of recollections written on the tenth anniversary of the Friends of the Museum, c.1993. Author unknown.
\textsuperscript{134} Ibid., LRSS Newsletter no.5, Sept 1979.
\textsuperscript{135} Stevenson, Pers. Comms., 5 Dec 2014.
\textsuperscript{136} Little, Oral History Interview, 22 Apr 2015.
Conclusion

The rhetoric surrounding plans for both the Museum and Station from the later 1950s and throughout the 1960s portrays optimism and aspiration alongside concern for the loss of traditional industries and the physical effects of modernisation on the urban landscape. In the case of UMIST and the academics behind the NWSMI, perhaps this is unsurprising as the newly established University had cause to champion the science and engineering prospects of the area for the future with their newly found status and government funding. It was UMIST support for the NWMSI and its collections that made it viable. The Council alone with their grand city plans and investment in infrastructure refused to fund the industrial archaeology museum proposed in the later 1950s. This period can be characterised by the drive for the modern in city planning, with preservation only exceptionally considered. The earliest phase of museum discussions presents nostalgia for a lost urban scene: ‘old Manchester’, and distress at the visible fragmentation of the industries that underpinned Manchester’s status and prosperity. It was the combination of the drive to preserve with the contemporary and future stance of the university that made the museum an acceptable venture to the tripartite funders by the mid-1960s.

Similarly, a complex picture has emerged of Liverpool Road Station in the 1950s and 1960s, which challenges the established narrative of a site in continuous ‘decline’. From the 1956 regional modernisation plans and the proposed overhaul of the station, to the 1960s plans for an inland customs and international freight terminal, Liverpool Road was perceived as outmoded, yet simultaneously a place with potential for re-use. Contemporaneous with freight modernisation discussions, the 1830 Station Building was frequently conceptualised as worthy of retention and re-use as a museum. This ambition was the legacy of the ‘oldest in the world’ narrative, disseminated widely since the 1930s. The Station was positioned in boosterist terms, as a city landmark and Manchester ‘first’. Through the listing of the building and the work of curators like Scholes and architectural historians, its national significance was also recognised by the time it was abandoned. The Station provides another example of the contradictory nature of post-war preservation in Manchester, the sense that a place might be re-used and renewed and simultaneously set in a safe and distant past which foreshadowed contemporary developments.

It was this tension, between looking ‘backwards’ and ‘forwards’ that underpinned the debate between Donald Cardwell and his supporters, and the Greater Manchester County
Council on the new home for the NWMSI. Although named as the ‘North Western Museum’ from 1971, the foundational period presents a Manchester-centric initiative. From hopes that it might invigorate the city centre amidst a new cultural quarter, to revitalising defunct warehouses on offer, proximity to UMIST, Oxford Road or the city centre was frequently discussed. Although Liverpool Road Station is only 1 mile along Deansgate from Manchester’s centre, the site was distant from the universities and was amongst a swath of dilapidated industrial buildings. It was not in a location that Museum staff felt could fulfil their aim to establish an institution of the scale and educational remit of South Kensington. The perception of the Station as peripheral, and an outside candidate owing to the condition of the buildings, was at odds with the GMC’s remit. Yet, the new Council wished to present a site for the region, and, notwithstanding its Manchester location, Liverpool Road was considered significant to the entire North West as the ‘oldest station in the world’. Despite this opportunity, the cost of acquisition and restoration stalled saving the Station, leading to the establishment of the LRSS. The earliest Society members understood the ‘oldest’ trope in architectural terms. A civic minded group of highly educated individuals working alongside former railway workers and the ‘restoration gang’ set up their own interpretation centre at the Station during an interim period between Station and Museum. The convergence of concepts for the Museum of the NWMSI staff, the LRSS and GMC underlines my final chapter.
Chapter 5
Transforming Liverpool Road Station: 
the politics of memory and museum-making

_The Manchester site is one of those key elements in the birth of the railway. The events that took place at the opening of the Liverpool and Manchester railway are still there, you can smell and feel them, in that group of buildings_

- Sir Neil Cossons

Introduction

On 15 September 1983 the Greater Manchester Museum of Science and Industry (GMMSI) opened at Liverpool Road Station. As shown in Chapter 4, the North Western Museum of Science and Industry (NWMSI) moved to Liverpool Road due to the complex intersection of the Museum’s needs, status sought by Greater Manchester Council and pressure from preservation groups. In this final chapter, I ask how these stakeholders influenced the GMMSI’s development. I highlight the role of the original museum, suggesting that the NWMSI collections influenced not only exhibition spaces, but also how the site was perceived in the context of a narrative technological progress. Moreover, the NWMSI’s educational remit, with its emphasis on working exhibits and interactivity, led to the separation of gallery contents from their context – the historic environment of the Station. The ongoing influence of the 1830 centric ‘oldest in the world’ narrative meant that interpretation of collections in relation to buildings was uneven, with the history of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway (LMR) prominently displayed in the Station Building, in stark contrast the later, 1880 New Warehouse was subjected to façadism: considered an empty shell in which to house established collections, an interactive gallery and contemporary science. Through examining the complicated convergence of interests at the heart of the Liverpool Road project, explanations (and, in Appendix A, proposed remedies)
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provide insights for the myriad of similar historic sites that have been simultaneously preserved and re-used.

I argue that site interpretation, particularly galleries arranged within the freight buildings, were dictated by three main factors: the collections, disparate funding arrangements secured for galleries and the prominence of the ‘oldest in the world’ narrative. Director, Patrick Greene’s vision for a museum ‘of the industrial city’ also shaped the site narrative. Greene was aware that the institution could perform the role of a city museum. Manchester boasted the civic Manchester Art Gallery, national institutions like the People’s History Museum and the Manchester Museum holding global cultural and natural history collections, however, with the contemporaneous closure of Queen’s Park Museum in 1984 (with its nominal history displays) there was no city museum. In this chapter, I demonstrate that the ‘oldest in the world’ trope ensured a level of engagement with the site story in the 1830 buildings: the Station Building and 1830 Warehouse. However, despite attempts to arrange a chronological route around the site, the history of the evolution of the Station into a freight hub for Manchester was lost. The scientific educational remit of the Museum (discussed in Chapter 4) led staff to find space for science in the buildings – present and ‘future’, especially in the form of an interactive gallery. I suggest that this further compounded the problem of telling the story of the site to visitors.

In Section 1, I explore the influence of the Liverpool Road Station Society (LRSS) over heritage interpretation during the crucial period from their campaign to the foundation of the Museum. The group held certain rights over buildings and even the permanent way, thus directly influencing public history at the Station before the GMMSI was formalised. As detailed in Chapter 4, the founding members (many with an interest in architecture) were invested in rescuing the Station Building. Yet, LRSS had another core aim, they demanded that the 150th anniversary of Liverpool Manchester Railway be marked in an ‘appropriate manner’. Liverpool Road Station was clearly regarded as lieu de memoire in the planning and performance of anniversary celebrations discussed in 1.1; using the original location of the opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway (LMR) was essential to the LRSS. Section 1.2 addresses the role of volunteers in driving interpretation, particularly the creation of a railway experience on site. This approach had more commonality with living history museums than science and technology institutions. The LRSS, later incorporated
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into the Friends of the Museum, lost their political agency once the GMMSI moved to Liverpool Road, but their interests in the ‘oldest station’ and a re-imagined railway experience shaped the institution.

In Section 2, I ask why the new iteration of the NWMSI did not become a transport museum, which was the ambition of multiple actors involved in funding, planning and even the nomenclature of the Liverpool Road project. In April 1983, the Manchester Air and Space Museum opened directly opposite Liverpool Road, a rival venture supported by the City Council (who no longer had a stake in the NWMSI). A financial failure, the Air and Space Museum was swiftly incorporated into the GMMSI providing a distinct air transport collection (albeit populated with loaned objects). Section 2 closes with coverage of attempts to remedy the lack of railway objects as the focus for displays shifted to locally manufactured railway exhibits, with the Museum poised to become ‘the Greater Manchester Museum of Science and Railways’. In Section 3, I analyse how the Museum was realised in the Station Building, freight buildings and spaces and the 1830 Warehouse. Coverage includes realised displays and those seriously considered that did not come to fruition. The latter reveal a concern for the freight and industrial heritage of Liverpool Road that did not translate into the overall visitor message, owing to challenges from logistics to funding.

Section 1: The Liverpool Road Station Society: from saving the oldest station to re-creating railway history

In this section, I analyse the role of the Liverpool Road Station Society (LRSS) in the museumification of the Station. Leary has shown the crucial role of the Society in the re-production of heritage ‘counter-space’ in Castlefield. Here I posit that it was the use of the grand narrative of the ‘oldest in the world’ and by celebrating anniversaries in a strong public history tradition that cemented their claims. The LRSS may have been crucial to the re-production (or I prefer reimagining) of Castlefield, but they relied upon a long-established vision for a museum at the site (as outlined in Chapter 4, Section 2) and a wave of post-Beeching railway nostalgia. In 1.1, regional rivalry underpins pressure on the Councils to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the railway ‘appropriately’ in response to activities centred on Liverpool. Plans for the ‘Great Railway Exposition’ of 1980 on site provide an insight into how the space was conceptualized for a railway fete, which emphasised the history of transport. In the 1.2, I highlight the roles performed by the
NWMSI, GMC and the railway ‘restoration gang’ of the LRSS for a permanent working railway experience on site. Concepts for which portray a vision for the site between 1979-1982 as a living history type museum, rather than a traditional science and technology museum.

Section 1.1 Anniversaries and action

In this section, I explore the role of ‘birthdays’ in galvanising support for the heritage campaign and enabling actors to imagine the Station as a museum space. A series of ‘birthdays’, especially the 150th anniversary of the LMR, were the focus for action by the LRSS. Anniversaries of technological innovations or the birth or death of key inventors were popularised in the nineteenth century. As I proposed in Chapter 1, it was the response of the engineering trade press to the absence of a jubilee at Liverpool Road Station in 1880 that first drew public attention to the historic significance of the surviving buildings. The LMR Centenary pageant and events of the September 1930 brought the ‘first’ or ‘oldest’ station narrative to a new generation of Liverpool and Manchester residents, and gained national attention in newspapers and on the radio. Whilst there is little academic research on the ‘cult of centenary’ and public history beyond the 1960s, it is evident from a number of large scale events in the later twentieth century that the form was still a popular vehicle for public history.³ The use of the site to exhibit museum material from the NWMSI, facilitate visits of prestigious steam locomotives and for community history activities contributed to the emerging museum vision.

As with civic anniversaries, the anniversary of the railway was shaped by sense of place and regional rivalry. The pending 150th anniversary had not gone unnoticed by British Railways,

³ Academic research into later twentieth century commemoration is largely framed against national events, like the 1977 Silver Jubilee (see David Cannadine, ‘The Context, Performance and Meaning Of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the ‘Invention of Tradition’, c.1820-1977’ in Eric Hobsbawm & Terence Ranger (eds) The Invention of Tradition (Cambridge: CUP, repr. 2015) pp.101-165). Thomas Hulme has noted that civic culture was usurped as new forms of citizenship emerged under the welfare state in After the Shock City: Urban Culture and the Making of Modern Citizenship (Suffolk: Boydell Press/Royal Historical Society, 2019) pp.205-6. Mark Freeman in ‘Splendid Display; Pompous Spectacle’: historical pageants in twentieth-century Britain’, Social History vol.38 no.4 (2013) (pp.423-455), p.454 concludes ‘by this time [1960s] it was more difficult to mobilize a whole community behind a historical pageant, or any other form of civic display and ritual’. Considering the widespread popularity of railway commemorations in the 1970s and 1980s, which were part-civic part-railway in nature, these were expressions of both local and national citizenship as railway history is intrinsically bound with national tropes of technological progress.
whose Chairman (1976 – 1983), Peter Parker, was particularly enthused. In 1976, Councils along the LMR route formed an Anniversary Joint Committee. One particular motivation for collaboration between Merseyside County Council, GMC and smaller councils was to celebrate the LMR in the North West and not be usurped by events at the Science Museum in London or National Railway Museum in York. Merseyside County Council headed a Joint Committee (much like the Liverpool Organisation, which planned the 1930 Centenary), which included Manchester representatives, the North West Tourist Board and BR members. Rainhill Parish Council were already preparing to commemorate the related anniversary of the Rainhill Trials in 1979. The trails, where prospective locomotives for the railway were tested, are an essential aspect of the grand narrative of the LMR and were the site of Rocket’s pivotal selection for the railway. The emphasis on the Rainhill anniversary provoked Manchester councillors and civic societies to promote the Liverpool Road as a potential site of activity for 1980. It was felt so strongly that the city’s leaders were failing to draw significant attention to Manchester that the LRSS made marking the 150th anniversary in Manchester a central aim of their campaign.

The bid to save Liverpool Road’s oldest buildings was bolstered by preservation groups’ interest in the upcoming 150th anniversary. Records of the pivotal 11 May 1977 County Hall meeting (discussed in Chapter 4.3.3) show groups across Greater Manchester and beyond offered to assist with the upcoming anniversary and restoration of the Station. These ranged from specialist railway interest groups, such as the Manchester Model Railway Society, the Tameside Railway Club and Manchester Locomotive Society to groups that operated heritage railways such as the Severn Valley Railway, Talyllyn Railway and the Peak

---


5 Manchester Archive GMC 4/BOX 44: LMR 150th Anniversary Joint Committee meeting minutes 23 Nov 1976.

6 Ibid., Note of a meeting of representatives of local societies and interested parties, County Hall, Manchester, 11 May 1977.


8 Manchester Archive GMC 4/BOX 44: Note of a meeting to discuss the 150th anniversary of the Liverpool Manchester Railway (Manchester region council representatives) 24 Apr 1977.


10 Manchester Archive GMC 4/BOX 44: Note of a meeting of representatives of local societies, County Hall, Manchester, 11 May 1977.
Railway Society. More general transport interest groups included the Greater Manchester Transport Action Group and Bury Transport Museum. Discussions about the upcoming anniversary, with hopes for a cavalcade of locomotives from various individuals and propositions for replica locomotives and models, for example from the Stephenson Locomotive Society, provided the basis for the work of the LRSS and later railway experience on site.
Figure 1. Photocopy of a flyer the LRSS distributed on the 149th ‘birthday’ of Liverpool Road Station: 15 September 1979. The Society also distributed leaflets to commuters on the 148th ‘birthday’ (SIM Archive 2007/41/1/9).

The upcoming 150th anniversary not only provided a focus for pressuring the GMC, but also enabled the LRSS to elicit support through publicity stunts for the Station’s 148th and 149th ‘birthdays’. Four thousand ‘Happy Birthday Liverpool Road Station’ flyers were distributed at Manchester’s commuter stations on Friday 15 September 1978 to galvanise support the
Society. This gained media attention, with members at Oxford Road Station appearing on local news programme, *Look North*. The following day, BR allowed about fifty members to visit the site, from which point the LRSS were allowed increased access in order to undertake track restoration work to prepare for the upcoming 150\textsuperscript{th} anniversary. The GMC established the Liverpool Road Celebration Joint Advisory Committee with the LRSS, and the Society was initially seen as an ‘umbrella’ through which to co-ordinate the participation of fifty other societies. A festival administrator, David Sumner, was appointed to plan the event and co-ordinate the volunteer societies, BR, the GMC and NWMSI. Collaborations between the LRSS and these groups led to celebrations for the 149\textsuperscript{th} birthday, with a procession through Manchester beginning at the UMIST Campus at Sackville Street to Liverpool Road via Piccadilly Bus Station, Market Street and Deansgate. Societies and museums lent steam traction engines, historic motor vehicles such as open top buses, vintage cars and motor cycles which arrived at the Station where the LRSS had established an interpretation centre within the Freight Offices. A view was offered of the site from a small cordoned area next to the Freight Office, but at this stage the public were not able to access the Station on safety grounds. The cavalcade of various types of transport shows the Station was perceived as symbolic of transport innovations beyond railways; the prospect of a broader transport museum at Liverpool Road is discussed further in Section 2.1.
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12 Ibid., LRSS Newsletter no.3, Feb 1979.

13 Ibid., LRSS Newsletter no.5, Sept 1979.
Figure 2. Guide to the ‘Great Railway Exposition’, the 150th anniversary celebrations of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway held at Liverpool Road Station from 2 August to 14 September 1980. (SIM Records Management, ‘150th Anniversary Special’ publicity folder).
The ‘Great Railway Exposition’, as the 150th anniversary was named, was coordinated alongside museum planning and influenced how the Station was imagined as a permanent heritage attraction. Thomas Worthington & Sons drafted a layout for the ‘Railway Exposition’ for GMC in February 1980 [Figure 3], this can be compared to their July 1980 museum proposal [Figure 4].¹⁴ Unlike the 1975 museum plan discussed in Section 2.1, the Shipping Shed was now incorporated into designs. As the Shed was used to display locomotive exhibits at the ‘Railway Exposition’, it was to house transport exhibits and prime movers (motive powered engines) in the museum plan. The Station Building accommodated a bar in the old canteen (the eastern end of the 1831 extension) for the ‘Exposition’ and a shop was installed in the Station Master’s House. In the museum plan, this part of the Station Building would house amenities. The main difference between these plans was the 1830 Warehouse, which was unsafe for use in the 1980 event, was earmarked as the key location for NWMSI exhibits of power technology, manufacturing industry and scientific collections. Furthermore, track works for a cavalcade of historic steam locomotives – a popular aspect of the ‘Exposition’, fuelled ambitions to run a railway once the Station became a museum.¹⁵ The popularity of the event, which took place over six weeks from 2 August to 14 September, strengthened the case for the museum. A report on the future museum cited the ‘Exposition’ as evidence of interest in industrial heritage and nostalgia for steam.¹⁶


Figure 3. ‘Site Layout for Festival’, by Thomas Worthington & Sons Architects, January 1980 (SIM Records Management: David Sumner file).
Figure 4. Thomas Worthington & Sons, Architects ‘The GMC Railway and Science Museum Liverpool Road Station’ site proposal, July 1980. (SIM Records Management: David Sumner file).
Activities during the ‘Exposition’ were imbued with nostalgia for railways and the nineteenth century, with marketing material highlighting fantastical recreations of the past rather than the authentic nature of the site. ‘See the steam fantasia’ and ‘experience the way we were’ through food, crafts, and folk activities, music and a fair figured in official flyers. The interests of railway enthusiasts and heritage concepts at play during the ‘Exposition’ provide an insight into how the Station could be re-used as a living history style museum. It was the pre-existing science and technology collections of the NWMSI that anchored further plans in a more traditional museum direction.

Section 1.2 A Railway experience

The influence of living history museums (also considered in Chapter 4.3.2 in relation to Astley Green Colliery) is evident from discussions between GMC, NWMSI staff and the LRSS about a railway experience at Liverpool Road. Operational railways were typical at open-air living history museums and the main attraction of preserved lines. These railways often included re-created stations, with either re-purposed or replica steam locomotives. Neil Cossons suggests ‘the demise of steam on British Railways in the late 1960s invoked a wave of nostalgia quite without precedence’. The NWMSI Advisory Panel advocated a working railway, alongside the societies and enthusiast groups. In autumn 1979, the panel stated that Major Oliver, Her Majesty’s Inspector of Railways had approved of suggestions to run a railway at Liverpool Road. Richard Hills lobbied for a railway experience in June 1980, which he saw as an important tourist attraction. During the subsequent collection of railway exhibits, P.D. Quick stated that the acquisition of locomotives was ‘to be able to run some sort of passenger service within the site so that the station will be a living and not a dead museum’. The desire to recreate the experience of travel within the Liverpool Road site firmly placed the interpretative strategy within the realms of living history. The

18 Ian Carter, British Railway Enthusiasm (Manchester: MUP, 2008), Chapter 5 ‘Preserved Lines’ provides a comprehensive overview of the heritage railway movement.
21 Ibid., NWMSI Advisory Panel, unconfirmed meeting minutes 5 Jun 1980.
emphasis on a ‘living’ site and not a dead museum echoed the report on the NWMSI in Nature in 1968, based on an interview with Hills.\textsuperscript{23} Furthermore, the LRSS regarded GMC’s Conservative leader, Arnold Fieldhouse, as a key proponent of a living history type experience in 1981, indicating a consensus broadly existed amongst the major stakeholders.\textsuperscript{24}

The essential role of a volunteer and trainee workforce to operate exhibits at the ‘Railway Exposition’ and maintain the railway experience at the GMMSI was also common of heritage railways. The LRSS volunteers undertook the initial clearing of the site in 1979 and the Society’s ‘restoration gang’ carried out railway projects like the LMS brake carriage renovation in August 1981.\textsuperscript{25} A criticism levied at the burgeoning heritage industry was over-reliance on government schemes for the unemployed, which, as Stella Butler highlighted, were sometimes the only paid staff at heritage sites.\textsuperscript{26} Community initiatives and funding from the Manpower Services Commission aided the nascent GMMSI. For example, the ‘Pender’ locomotive was sectioned and restored by recruits of a Manpower sponsored Youth Employment Scheme; Community Industry’s woodworking and painting sections also made the bodywork of two replica carriages for the ‘Railway Exposition’.\textsuperscript{27}

Whilst co-operation was essential to the success of the ‘Railway Exposition’, the volunteer workforce subsequently waned with conflict arising between the LRSS and the GMMSI. One volunteer later recalled the lack of purpose members felt after the 150\textsuperscript{th} anniversary:

\begin{quote}
It was then, with a sudden cessation of intense activity, that a feeling of anti-climax prevailed. Whilst they knew that the museum was interested in the site the working membership had no immediate objects apart from the general one of perpetuating the existence of this the oldest railway station in the world. One of the more unfortunate features of the immediate post-Exposition period was the disappearance of many stalwart workers. They left for their own reason but most left because they felt that the
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{25} ibid., LRSS Newsletter no.13, Aug 1981.
\footnotetext{27} Manchester Archive RA1.(A).1.5: Museum Correspondence Re. Future Management of NWMSI, Development of LRS as a Museum meeting of GMC, City Council and UMIST, County Hall 30 June 1980; ‘The Future Museum’ document.
\end{footnotes}
aspirations they had held when the site was being prepared were not likely to be realised in the future.\textsuperscript{28}

By February 1981, the LRSS felt threatened,\textsuperscript{29} tensions escalated, from disputed object ownership to issues with contractors as Society members ignored strict instructions to keep out of the Shipping Shed and 1830 Warehouse during renovations.\textsuperscript{30} Issues arose between the LRSS and GMC staff, particularly as volunteers felt they did not receive adequate public recognition; for example, when they laid track for the arrival of the Pakistan Railways locomotive no.3157 and were not invited to the official visit of Pakistan’s Ambassador.\textsuperscript{31} As the NWMSI was relocated to Liverpool Road in early 1983, the autonomy the LRSS enjoyed on site ceased. By March 1984, the new GMMSI staff was comprehensive with Hills appointed as curator, keepers of industry and of museum services (a science keeper vacancy), three assistant keepers, a conservation officer, seven technicians and numerous other professionals.\textsuperscript{32} The LRSS-made Interpretation Centre was given over to staff offices to house the curatorial team, which now directed interpretation. Whilst the Society held less influence over the site, its role in establishing the railway experience was the legacy of the volunteer workforce.

The LRSS officially ceased activities and transferred its membership to the Friends of the GMMSI on 15 July 1983.\textsuperscript{33} The Museum’s Friends organisation was created to provide support ranging from fundraising to demonstrating working exhibits and undertaking restoration under the guidance of museum staff.\textsuperscript{34} The political and campaigning role of the LRSS was carefully excluded. GMC’s arts officer warned Quick and Hills in July 1982 that:

\emph{While any Friends Organisation must have freedom of action, the activities of a group based on LRSS (with its historical and practical involvement with the site

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid, LRSS Newsletter no.11, Feb 1981.
\item Manchester Archive RA1(K).1: The Liverpool Road Station Society, numerous correspondence from Feb 1981 to Feb 1982 between Ray Sharples to R.L Scott (GMC County Secretary), P.D. Quick, (County Legal team) and Thomas Worthington & Sons, (architects) chart site access disputes.
\item Ibid., correspondence between P.D. Quick and Ray Sharples, 17 & 21 Oct 1982.
\item Manchester Archive GMC 4/BOX 44: Minutes
\item SIM Archive 2007/41/1/9, LRSS Newsletter no.21, Aug 1983, reported that the LRSS transferred to the Friends at their EGM, 15 Jul 1983.
\item Manchester Archive RA1.(A).1.5: Museum Correspondence Re. Future Management of NWMSI, Development of LRS as a Museum, meeting of representatives of GMC, City Council and UMIST, County Hall 30 Jun 1980; ‘The Future Museum’ document.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
before the museum project commenced and therefore a very natural ‘proprietary air’) could without proper consultation work in conflict with the museum.\textsuperscript{35}

The Museum appealed to the ‘restoration gang’ whose work continued under the guidance of early locomotives expert, Michael Bailey. An ambitious project to create a replica 1830s ‘Planet’ class locomotive began in autumn 1986, as the Friends were dissatisfied with first railway experience that consisted of a twentieth century industrial engine anachronistically pulling the LMR replica carriages.\textsuperscript{36} The ‘Planet’ project is evidence that, whilst the political role of the organisation diminished, the Friends continued to influence the ‘living history’ aspect of the museum experience. The ‘Railway Exposition’ and the work of the LRSS volunteers highlights the significance of railway history and wider transport narratives to the transformation of the Station into a museum.

Section 2: Re-making Liverpool Road Station

In this section, I ask why Liverpool Road Station didn’t become predominantly a transport museum. Whilst a new home was required for the NWMSI, plans as early as 1975 present a very different type of museum. In Section 2.1, I chart the drive to create a transport museum from 1975 to 1981, suggesting that a decline in fervour was due to the condition of those parts of the Station on offer to GMC at this stage. However, the railway element of the museum remained at the fore of discussions; as late as 1981 the Museum Trust retained ‘railway’ in the museum’s working title. In Section 2.2, I analyse GMMSI’s adoption of a distinct transport museum, the Air and Space Museum. Key actors viewed the Air and Space Museum as presenting complementary transport collections, but also felt compelled to save the institution to prevent the failure of the wider Castlefield Urban Heritage Park. In Section 2.3, I consider how Richard Hills and his colleagues from the NWMSI attempted to remedy the lack of railway artefacts in the core collection before 1983. I argue that despite great efforts to acquire a railway collection, it was the original industrial artefacts from other North-West Industries that dictated how gallery narratives evolved.

\textsuperscript{35} Manchester Archive RA1.(K).1: The Liverpool Road Station Society, Memorandum from the Arts Officer to the County Legal Officer and Dr Hills, Re. The future role of the LRSS, 28 Jul 1982.

\textsuperscript{36} Pers Comms: Michael Bailey, Re. ‘Planet’, message to author 30 Jun 2017, Email.
Section 2.1  A transport museum in the making?

The reinvention of the NWMSI at Liverpool Road Station was often conceptualised as a transport museum. As demonstrated in Chapter 4, speculation that the Station could house a transport museum emerged in the 1950s and intensified in the 1960s and early 1970s in preservation discourse. The proponents of a transport museum often had a keen interest in railway history, or, were heritage professionals like the British Transport Commission’s curator, John Scholes. Conservationists were another group (identified in Chapter 4) pressing this agenda which coupled aims for architectural preservation of the Station Building with its functional re-use as a museum. Whilst Donald Cardwell lobbied for continuity for NWMSI in new premises on the UMIST campus, in 1975 GMC representatives asserted the building ‘would likely involve a single museum complex capable of accommodating an expanded collection including heavy exhibits or two or more buildings housing specialist collections, not all necessarily part of the NWMSI’.37 The GMC, which comprised of elected councillors from the region, clearly harboured expectations for a large complex at the Liverpool Road site. In August 1975 concept designs were drawn up by County Planning Officer, J.S. Millar.38 The Proposed Museum of Science and Technology [Figure 5] was drawn when BR only offered the Station Building and 1830 Warehouse buildings to the Council, thus the architect suggests a light-weight structure to act as a link between them to house additional exhibits. Millar has annotated a structure over the ‘train deck’ for use as either a transport exhibition or car park. Notably, the transport exhibition is represented by drawings of buses, not locomotives, highlighting wider transport collection envisaged.

As museum plans progressed, local societies and GMC representatives encouraged the development of a transport museum of national significance. At the May 1977 meeting of representatives of local societies, W. D. Ballard of the Transport Appreciation Society hoped for a museum in the Station, but also stated ‘consideration should also be given to providing a transport museum in a neighbouring building covering all aspects of transport in the county’. In August 1978, GMC County Secretary G. M. Tideswell reported ‘the Warehouse should become a permanent home for the NWMSI, which, linked with the restored Station and track, could create a transport museum of international significance’. The suggestion of linking the Station and Warehouse references Millar’s 1975 concept design. In aspiring to international significance, the GMC linked the status of the Station to the broader museum vision. This rhetoric of international aspiration echoes the ambitions of Vivian Bowden, Donald Cardwell and Richard Hills during the formative years of the NWMSI.
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39 Manchester Archive GMC 4/BOX 44: minutes of Meeting of Representatives of Local Societies and Interested Parties, County Hall, Manchester, 11 May 1977.

40 Ibid., Meeting of the LMR 150th Anniversary Joint Committee 16 Aug 1978, report of the Honorary Secretary re. Liverpool Road Station Site, 4 Aug 1978.
Once the GMC agreed to acquire the 1830 structures and 2 ½ acres of Liverpool Road Station from BR on 26 July 1978, transport displays frequently figured in discussions. However, as with earlier investigations, the condition of the site was swiftly identified as an obstacle to the display of large, heavy objects. In September 1978, the NWMSI Joint Committee found structural issues with both buildings: ‘with the floor strengthened, the old train carriage shed might display some light railway exhibits but there is no room for a general transport display’. The old train carriage shed refers to the covered area alongside the passenger building (not the Shipping Shed), originally used for sheltered storage of wagons and locomotives by the LMR, lending context to the ‘light’ railway exhibits. Whilst dismissing the idea as impractical, the discussion of displaying transport exhibits demonstrates that this was a priority. At the same meeting, the upcoming 150th anniversary was noted: ‘something ought to be open to the public in time for September 1980. This opening will have to concentrate on the history of transport’. It is clear that the Station was not only regarded as a pivotal moment in railway history, but that the ‘oldest in the world’ narrative was also considered in the wider history of transport. As Cardwell later presented to the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society, the Castlefield Basin was a place where turning points in water and rail transport could be understood through the historic environment.

Consideration of the Liverpool Road site as a transport museum was undeterred by the contemporaneous establishment of a local Museum of Transport. This was founded through a successfully cooperation between the Greater Manchester Transport Society, set-up in 1970 to preserve examples of the defunct SELNEC (South East Lancashire and North East Cheshire) bus fleet, and the Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Authority and Executive – the transport body for ten Greater Manchester district councils. The Museum of Transport opened at a Manchester’s ‘earliest bus depot’ at Boyle Street, adjacent to Manchester’s first electric tram depot on Queens Road on 4 May 1978. The collections, stored at Queens Road from 1977, were occasionally loaned to the NWMSI and

---

41 Manchester Archive RA1(A).1.5: Museum Correspondence Re. Future Management of NWMSI, Joint Committee minutes, 14 Sept 1978.


the organization supported the LRSS.\textsuperscript{44} Collections represented the history and development of road transport, especially buses.\textsuperscript{45} With this historic site for bus and tram transport providing context for the Museum of Transport, it is unsurprising GMMSI visions refocused around the railway theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative titles considered for the museum, 17 September 1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Greater Manchester Museum of Science and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Greater Manchester (or North Western) Museum of Science, Railways and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Greater Manchester (or North Western) Museum of Industry and Railways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Greater Manchester (or North Western) Museum of Science and Railways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Greater Manchester (or North Western) Industrial Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Greater Manchester (or North Western) Science Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Greater Manchester (or North Western) Industrial and Railways Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Greater Manchester (or North Western) Science and Railways Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Figure 6}. Titles discussed by the Greater Manchester Railway and Science Museum Trust. Table based on ‘title of new museum’ note by P.D. Quick, 17 Sept 1981 (Manchester Archive GMC 4/BOX 44).

Debates about the nomenclature of the Museum reveal competing concepts for the venture, including the prominence of railway heritage. This marks a shift in how the museum was perceived; a generic transport museum was no longer envisaged. In 1981, with the establishment of the Museum Trust, representatives from the NWMSI and City Council members requested that the original title be retained. In earlier discussions, both UMIST’S Professor Hazeldine and City Councillor, Norman Morris, felt that a ‘Greater Manchester’ prefix would diminish the museum’s national status.\textsuperscript{46} The North Western Museum of Science and Industry title, despite encompassing the museum’s regional collecting remit, was at odds with the GMC’s vision. GMC wished to re-brand the museum

\textsuperscript{44} Manchester Archive GMC 4/BOX 44: LRS Celebrations Joint Advisory Committee meeting, 16/1/80, the GM Transport Museum offered two buses for the anniversary celebrations.

\textsuperscript{45} Turnbull, ‘Museum of Transport’, p.272.

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid: Development of the Liverpool Road Station site as a museum, meeting of GMC, Manchester City Council and UMIST representatives 3 Jan 1980.
‘the Greater Manchester Museum of Science and Railways’. The inclusion of ‘railways’ acknowledged the popular railway heritage agenda and historic significance of the site, whilst the Greater Manchester prefix indicated the museum was a direct result of new governance. Ultimately, after consideration was given to various titles, including five which featured ‘railway’ [Figure 6], the Trust resolved to name the museum the Greater Manchester Museum of Science and Industry.47

Section 2.2 The Air and Space Museum

The Air and Space Museum was created during the establishment of the ‘world’s first’ Urban Heritage Park, after Castlefield was designated a conservation area in 1979. Other aspects of the Urban Heritage Park have been analysed by Madgin, Leary and Rosa, although the Air and Space Museum has received little or no coverage in these studies.48 Its location, the former Lower Campfield Market Hall, has historic connections with the Station, discussed in Chapter 3. The proximity of the Lower Campfield Market Hall to Liverpool Road was perceived by some as beneficial, although the market failed largely due to the dislocation of stallholders from established markets across the city.49 After 1900, the building was re-named the City Hall and altered for re-use as a trade show and popular entertainment venue. Except for wartime commandeering, until fire damage in 1977, the City Hall endured as a place for consumption and leisure. Workers from the Station took advantage of this local amenity. For example, typist Eileen Seddon (nee Yates) recalls visiting the ‘Ideal Homes Show’ during lunch breaks and after work along with five other

---


women workers from the Station in the early 1960s. Yet, with the post-war drive for city centre redevelopment, at various times the City Hall was set for removal or renovation, until the decision to house a museum.

**Figure 7.** Photograph of a poster for the ‘Home Improvements and Leisuretime Exhibition’, 1976, one year before a fire closed the City Hall (Manchester Archive: F1976/160, Crumpsall Station Posters).
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50 Eileen Seddon (nee Yates), Oral History Interview for the Liverpool Road Station Project, recorded by Erin Beeston, 24 Jul 2015. Eileen worked at the Station from 1957 until 1964 in the goods forwarding office, then as the goods agent’s typist.

Governed by a Trust, it was the City Council that oversaw the creation of the Air and Space Museum in the Lower Campfield Market Hall in 1980, which opened 29 April 1983.\textsuperscript{52} Castlefield researchers have identified tensions between the GMC and City Council; key actors recall with some bewilderment the problematic relationship between the two governing bodies.\textsuperscript{53} The political dimension to this clash was the election of the Conservative leadership for the GMC from 1977 until 1981. Whilst the City Council remained under Labour control throughout, it was rife with internal disputes over the administration of funding cuts enforced by the Conservative central government. The Air and Space Museum project is evidence of the competing interests of Manchester’s governing bodies, despite shared ambitions for heritage in the area. Patrick Greene recalls his amazement that the two adjoining projects didn’t talk, highlighting that the Air and Space Museum entrance was located at the opposite end of the building to Lower Byrom Street and the GMMSI main entrance, thus losing an obvious opportunity for visitor interaction across both institutions.\textsuperscript{54}

The decision to support a museum in the City Hall is surprising, as the main priority for City Council for the area between Quay Street and Tonman Street was residential development. The Wimpey Homes private housing scheme for St John’s Gardens in 1978 was the City Council’s first move in repopulating the area to remedy years of post-war depopulation.\textsuperscript{55} Originally proposed by RAF Museum director, Dr John Tanner, the Museum would house loan exhibits not a local collection.\textsuperscript{56} Council Leader, Norman Morris was a proponent of the Museum and became Chairman of the Trustee Committee.\textsuperscript{57} Whilst the City Council was a financial backer of the NWMSI, in 1975 it was superseded as major funder by the GMC.\textsuperscript{58} In June 1979, the City considered a workshop space for the NWMSI during transition to Liverpool Road, a short-term use for the City Hall dismissed when the Air and


\textsuperscript{53} Leary, ‘The Production of Urban Public Space’, p.163.

\textsuperscript{54} Patrick Greene, oral history interview for the Liverpool Road Station Project, recorded by Katie Belshaw, 26 Jul 2016.

\textsuperscript{55} Madgin, ‘Reconceptualising the historic urban environment’, p.40.

\textsuperscript{56} Manchester Archive: M740/2/8/3/66 Air and Space Museum, Note of the director of Cultural Services (L.G. Lovell) for members of the working party, 15/8/84.

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid.

Space Museum emerged. The opportunity to convert the City Hall into an Air and Space Museum presented the City Council with their own prestigious heritage project, one which ultimately it could not afford to support.

Figure 8. Manchester Air and Space Museum, Pocket Guide, c.1983-4 (SIM Collections Centre, Air and Space Museum subject file).

---

59 Manchester Archive: M740/2/8/3/66 Note of the director of Cultural Services (L.G. Lovell) for the working party, 15 Aug 84.
The City Council had restricted its support to the restoration of City Hall and a loan for the Air and Space Museum to open, which the Trust was due to repay. Difficulties in funding quickly arose, when the Manpower Services Commission withdrew funding for front of house staff, a source assumed in the Trust’s financial projections. By December 1984, the City Council considered approaching the GMMSI to take on the Air and Space Museum. Negotiations over finances (regarding outstanding loans and staffing) took place during the summer of 1985 and by 30 September the Museum closed for alterations to become a constituent gallery of the GMMSI from 1 December 1985. The decision to help the Air and Space Museum was driven by a desire for the wider Castlefield Heritage Park Project to succeed. GMMSI Trustees mooted that if the Air and Space Museum closed: ‘the sense of failure which would then affect Castlefield would inevitable reflect badly on this museum the future success of which is partly dependent upon the success of Castlefield as a whole.’

The GMMSI viewed the Air and Space Museum collections as complementary, rather than in conflict with their collecting policy, citing the importance of representing civil aviation production in Manchester. All of the objects on display in the Air and Space Museum [Figure 8] were long-term loans from the RAF Museum, in theory, allowing for flexibility in long-term display. There is no evidence from initial discussions that the building was considered of significance to the Museum’s wider narrative. Plans for the new gallery focussed on the interior and providing interactive displays akin to those at the GMMSI. Much like the New Warehouse, discussed further in Section 3, the building provided merely the means to host galleries and collections. A holistic approach, integrating the history of the market hall and its relationship with the Station could have presented a much more integrated site story to visitors. However, the focus remained compartmentalised, led by the separate collections. Greene recalls that it was the aviation collection which appealed.

---


62 Ibid.

63 SIM object records indicate that, except for two sectioned Rolls Royce engines from UMIST (Y1969.24 and Y1969.41) the first aviation/aeronautics objects to enter GMMSI were acquired in 1986.
to tell the wider story of the history of the industrial city, with, for example, the account of A.V. Roe and early flight.  

Section 2.3 New objects, old narratives?

With the relocation of the NWMSI to Liverpool Road and its transformation into the GMMSI came a new collecting policy. The legacy of the NWMSI core collection and policy direction agreed in 1982 had a significant effect on how the spaces within the Liverpool Road buildings were developed as galleries. The regional scope of the collecting area advocated was largely unchanged. GMC’s Arts Officer reported that the new policy must ‘take into account the position of the museum in its own area and in the County as a whole’, alluding to the new County Council’s boundaries rather than the historic region of Lancashire. Continuity was emphasised, embracing the overall aim of NWMSI: ‘to explain the major discoveries or inventions in the history of technology, using wherever possible exhibits made in or linked with the North West’. The essential remit for a history of technology collection influenced the creation of industrial process led galleries, focussed on textiles, electricity and gas.

The need to cultivate a railway collection was identified by both GMC’s arts officer and Richard Hills (whose position changed from director of the NWMSI to curator of GMMSI). As early as 1966, the NWMSI acquired the archive of Gorton locomotive manufacturers, Beyer, Peacock and Company; however, the collection of large railway objects was impractical. As noted in Chapter 4, opportunities in the 1960s and early 1970s to acquire locally made, significant locomotives were missed owing to the lack of storage space. Hills lamented the loss of locomotives that might have furnished displays at Liverpool Road Station, particularly those lost during the years it took to for the GMMSI Trust to form. Before 1980, the NWMSI staff paid particular attention to objects that could be installed in time for the ‘Great Railway Exposition’. The Beyer, Peacock made ‘Pender’ locomotive
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64 Greene, oral history interview, 26 Jul 2016.


66 Ibid., Report by GMC Arts Officer on Collecting Policy, 17 Feb 1982.

(Y1980.12) was purchased from the Isle of Man Railways, paraded on a low-load truck in the 149th Birthday procession and then used for demonstrations at the ‘Railway Exposition’. As museum planning progressed, Hills brokered offers to the GMMSI from other countries, where Manchester made locomotives remained in use. The Dutch State Railways BR Class 77 EM2 (Y1987.207) electric locomotive and Pakistan Railways Vulcan Foundry manufactured locomotive (Y1982.2) were two such objects recommended for acquisition.

The aims for the acquisition of railway exhibits were underlined by two distinctive narrative points; the first, for use in telling the story of the Station as ‘oldest in the world’, the second, to exhibit regional technological achievements. This strategy thus combined the aims of both the preservation campaign and the overall objective of the NWMSI. P.D. Quick, the Honorary Secretary to the Trust, reported that:

> It will be necessary to have a reasonable collection of rail transport items on display at the world’s first ‘inter-city’ station because foreign visitors in particular will be drawn to the Museum because it the place where rail travel really started... the aim has been to secure as wide a range of different types as possible to explain the main historical development and the technical improvements.

This report shows the management of expectations of visitors to the ‘first’ station, who would expect railway displays. Hills also stated ‘displays at the new museum must explain this significance [of the Station] and also to a lesser extent the subsequent development of railways’. The emphasis on foreign visitors in both reports highlights the international influence of the ‘oldest in the world’ narrative (see Chapter 1, introduction; Chapter 4 Section 2.1). Historical development, as Quick recommended, was not reflected in the concepts for the buildings on site. A distinction was drawn early on between how the 1830 story would be presented to visitors and the technological narrative of progress.

Whilst telling the Station story was a priority, the order in which buildings and galleries were completed meant the technological progress displays were most prominent at the early museum. The two stories were spatially separate within the GMMSI, once the

---


Shipping Shed, used for the ‘Railway Exposition’ was secured for the Museum.\textsuperscript{72} This ‘Power Hall’ enabled curators to house locomotives alongside stationary steam engines and other motive power driven machinery from the NWMSI, whilst smaller, early railway exhibits would eventually be shown in the Station Building. It was the ‘Power Hall’ that was designated to open first, in September 1983, and acted as the visitor entrance to the site. ‘Pender’ was installed to show progress since the 1830s, represented by the re-constructed ‘Novelty’ (1929.866, loaned from NRM, Novelty is largely replica made in 1929, but contains the original cylinder and wheels) one of the competitors in the Rainhill Trails of 1829. It was this chronology of locomotive design and traction that visitors first encountered. In addition to steam powered locomotive, Hills wished to display evolutions in power technology, hence ‘Ariadne’, the Dutch Railways BR Class 77 EM2 (Y1987.207) electric locomotive, made initially in Britain for use on the trans-Pennine Woodhead Tunnel was displayed.\textsuperscript{73} By Easter 1984, only the ‘First Class Booking Hall’ was open to visitors inside the Station Building, thus the site story narrative initially only appeared as technologies in the ‘Power Hall’ and a passenger history in the Station Building.\textsuperscript{74}

Section 3: Forgotten Freight? The challenge of interpreting Liverpool Road Station

In this section, I explore how the site narrative developed as the GMMSI opened in phases. I consider why, when industrial history was so prominent in collections and displays at the NWMSI, the freight story was neglected in interpretation at Liverpool Road. This is not a straightforward instance of ‘remembering and forgetting’ the urban memory of the site. Art historian, Mark Crinson considers ‘amnesia’ as the loss of urban memory, suggesting that collective memory can be recalled as the city provides a limitless archive. For Nora, the lieux de mémoire which embody or reincarnate memory exist as compensation for memory

\textsuperscript{72} Hills, The North Western Museum of Science and Industry, p.10: Hills describes persuading GMC to acquire the Shipping Shed ahead of the 150\textsuperscript{th} anniversary, corresponding archive material has remained oddly elusive. The LRSS refer to remedial work on the Shed due in October 1979 (SIM Archive 2007/41/1/9: LRSS Newsletter no.5, Sept 1979), indicating it was under GMC ownership by then.

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., pp.94-5.

eradicated by history. I suggest that whilst the freight evolution of the site was not valorised like the passenger Station, nor was it forgotten by key actors. Yet, the politics of preservation played out as such those layers of history physically evident were dislocated from the historical narrative presented to visitors. Patrick Greene, Museum Director from January 1983, along with industrial archaeologists, curators and the LRSS all championed the goods station story. Yet, this was restricted to the 1830 Warehouse, contemporaneous with the passenger buildings and imbued with the same mythology surrounding the opening day of the LMR. The 1830 warehouse was therefore a priority for research, restoration and interpretation.

I outline how museum gallery content that could have been intertwined with the site narrative remained distinct from it; the historic buildings became mere façades with - as Crinson describes restored industrial buildings - the innards gutted and re-built. Starting with the emphasis on the passenger narrative of the Station Building and absence of layers of urban memory, which, in part, resulted from the stripping of original features by the site architects (to the dismay of Greene). I then explore how other buildings and spaces were conceptualised. The final part of this section outlines plans for a goods narrative in the 1830 Warehouse. I argue that the absence of a unifying site narrative, relating the buildings to their historic uses, was in part due to a lack of knowledge – whereby archaeological, architectural and historical investigations into the site were led by the overriding aim to establish the station’s historic significance as ‘oldest’ and thus kept much of the information produced around 1980 firmly linked the passenger period (1830-1844). Two further factors challenged the curation of freight history: firstly, the staggered development of the site and the need for specific, industrial galleries and a science centre to attract funding and support for the GMMSI. Secondly, as suggested in Section 2, the established NWMSI collections and aims influenced how the Station site was envisaged in the planning stages. By the mid-1980s, the GMC was again a key influence, with the impending abolition of the County Council, legacy plans mirrored their support of the Station site as a prize project during the early years of the Council.

---


76 Crinson, Urban Memory, p.xi.
Section 3.1 The Station Building

Patrick Greene as Director of GMMSI from January 1983, worked with the existing concepts for the site and phased opening to establish the Museum’s ‘theme and scope’, which guided subsequent interpretation decisions. Greene identified that the 1830s railway period was a ‘strong sub-theme’ for the Museum. This observation, not dissimilar to those of Hills in developing the collecting policy, was specifically bound to the extant buildings, whereas the concept for the rail collection was influenced by the decision to show technological progress through exhibits in the ‘Power Hall’. Greene wished to provide context for the passenger building, even suggesting an extension of the western site boundary and the acquisition of ‘Stephenson’s Bridge’ (over Water Street). Greene’s ambition for the site incorporated different forms of transport, befitting the story of Castlefield. For example, he suggested the prospect of boat trips along the Irwell from Water Street (the former location of docks for the Mersey and Irwell Navigation Company) and use of the stables to expand upon the 1830 Warehouse’s role in linking rail to road transportation of goods. The boat trip prospect is akin to the re-creations enacted in living history type museums; neither suggestion came to fruition. The shrunken nature of the complex, omitting these structures and the 1869 Bonded Warehouse (used for studios by Granada Television since 1968) hinders the presentation of a coherent site story and the inclusion of road or water transport in the visitor experience. Yet, several spaces within the GMMSI boundaries could have provided this crucial context.

As the visitor route was planned for GMMSI, an east to west exploration of buildings was developed to convey a loose chronology of the site story. The ‘Power Hall’, the first gallery encountered, housed a mixed yet long chronology of displays, including major developments in power generation for industry and transport up to the mid-twentieth century. This long gallery narrative was intended to act as benchmark for further exploration by the visitor, whom Greene encouraged to explore the Station Building and
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78 Ibid., GMMSI Trust meeting minutes, 6 Dec 1981, records the City Council finalised site boundary along Lower Byrom Street with Granada.

1830 Warehouse at the west end. Essentially, if due time was taken to read panels and labels within the ‘Power Hall’, the visitor would see an overview of technologies from the late eighteenth to mid-twentieth centuries and could move on from any point. In Greene’s projection, the visitor would go back in time to the 1830s period before completing their journey at the New Warehouse where textiles display, temporary exhibits, contemporary and ‘future’ science could be encountered. The phased opening of the museum and decision to continue to use the Lower Byrom Street side for the entrance prevented a clearer chronological route from the 1830 buildings to more recent structures. A straightforward chronology of the evolution of Liverpool Road is also highly problematic owing to the absence certain buildings, such as Cotton Warehouses 1 and 2. As highlighted, several surviving structures also lay beyond the boundaries of the GMMSI. For example, the 1869 Bonded Warehouse and Accumulator Tower were on land owned by Granada and 1830 infrastructure also lay beyond the Water Street boundary of the site. The complex issue of the site story and non-linear route around the Museum continues to hinder visitor comprehension of the Station’s history.

The Station Building was an urgent priority for the GMMSI. The GMC appointed Arthur Little architect for Thomas Worthington & Sons to develop plans and begin work on the building. Not a firm with a conservation background, this was an insensitive restoration returning the building to its supposed 1830s appearance. This restoration destroyed layers of historic use – particularly evidence of its continual use from 1844 onwards as goods station offices. Spaces lost from the building included rooms for claims and accounts, a general office, a correspondence room and a strong room. For Greene, as a heritage professional, the work done from 1979 to 1983 on the Station Building amounted to vandalism. He recalls: ‘I was horrified to discover that, for example, the original timber doors had been removed and destroyed to be replaced by flawless replicas, thus losing the
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80 Ibid., GMMSI Trust meeting minutes, 6 Dec 1981, the City Council finalised the boundary along Lower Byrom Street with Granada.

81 Tim Neal, ‘Museum of Science & Industry Station Building, perceptions and interest’ (Visitor Insight, Sept 2014). This visitor study carried out by the museum reveals 61% of 555 visitors interviewed upon exit between 1 Apr – 20 Jun 2014 did not know that the Station Building was the oldest station in the world.

Key figures in the nascent GMMSI had little regard for authenticity. As in living history museums, anachronistic proposals abounded. For example, Peter Parker, advocated the re-use of an awning and pillars from closed passenger stations, despite their later date and entirely different style to Liverpool Road.

With the ‘First Class Booking Hall’ developed in time for the opening of the museum in 1983, the overall interpretation strategy for the Station Building was finalised in 1984. The ‘First Class Booking Hall’ presented visitors with a booking scene from the 1830s. With no record of how the interior originally appeared, an imagined interior was created using contemporary catalogues and illustrations of broadly contemporaneous booking halls. As discussed in Chapter 1, the experience of travel and awe dominated individual accounts of the railway, with directory and railway records only pertaining to the use and exterior of the buildings. In common with living history museum interiors, the visitor encountered mannequins in period costume [Figure 9]. Despite available archival evidence and even published accounts by passengers such as Fanny Kemble and the proprietor of the LMR, Henry Booth, all nine characters were invented. The brief explained ‘all characters in the scene are fictional but represent real elements in Manchester’s population at the time’. These included booking clerks, a senior and junior railway porter and passengers; an attorney and his family visiting Liverpool and a wealthy cotton merchant travelling with his clerk. Greene noted that this recreation ‘will enable visitors to get a better understanding of the way in which the railway operated on the passenger side’. The focus on the first class passengers was justified by the incomplete nature of the second class portion of the passenger building (Greene notes the absence of the original staircase). However, given the lack of authenticity of exhibits and period features in the ‘First Class Booking Hall’, a second class experience could equally have been contrived.
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84 Manchester Archive GMC 4/BOX 44: Notes from a meeting with Sir Peter Parker, 8 Jan 1982

85 SIM Curators files, ‘First Class Booking Hall’ display notes. Quotation from specification for the booking hall scene characters.

86 Ibid., ‘Railway Exhibits for 1830 Station Building - Outline Brief’ by Patrick Greene, 13 Jun 1983.
The ‘Second Class Booking Hall’ was instead used for an exhibition on the operations of the LMR, as Hills had intended during the collection of objects for the new site (c.1978-1982). The construction of the railway was told using a ‘slide-sound’ audio visual slide display. Greene identified the personality of George Stephenson as ‘a useful thread to the story’.

The hero-engineer of the line was again emphasised in the telling of the LMR. The exhibition focused on railway operations, here ‘real objects’ and ‘original material’ were employed to tell the story of the passenger period. Whilst the carriage of goods was included here, it was the passenger narrative that unifying the three displays. Greene’s decision to restrict the focus to the 1830s provided a more thorough exploration of the LMR, which he intended to connect closely to the freight story in the 1830 Warehouse but curtailed the possibility for the longer history of station to be told.

In the drive to open the ‘Power Hall’ in time for September 1983 and restore the Station Building, the historical interpretation of several buildings and spaces was postponed or overlooked entirely. For example, adjoining the Station Building was the Station Master’s
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87 SIM Curators files, ‘Railway Exhibits for 1830 Station Building - Outline Brief’ by Patrick Greene, 13 Jun 1983.
House. Originally the home of John Rothwell, partner in Rothwell Harrison dye works on Water Street which was acquired by the LMR, the house dated from 1808. As described in Chapter 1, the house was re-used by the LMR from July 1830 as the residence of the first Superintendent of the Station, Joseph Green, and his family. Throughout the nineteenth century, the building housed employees of the railway, their families and servants; a curious example of domestic life at the edge of an industrial complex. In the twentieth century, LMS gave up the house when Chief Inspector Fitzpatrick and his family left in 1928. It was then converted into Slate, R. ‘bacon curer’, a business appropriately situated close to the Station’s Pig Market and Manchester Corporation’s Water Street Slaughterhouse. The Station Master’s House could have been used to tell the story of the pre-railway era, the lives of railway workers, or, of subsidiary industries that grew up around the site owing to the railway’s pig traffic. Yet, this building did not fit into the ‘oldest in the world’ trope. The nature of the house also presented public access issues. GMC asked Arthur Little to consider the possible re-use of the Station Master’s House for the County Archive Service, which was dismissed owing to lack of floor space for the archives. By February 1979 the Council agreed that the LRSS could use the property for an interpretation centre, however, later that year the scheme moved to the Freight Offices. By 1982, it was proposed as an administrative area for museum employees, which it remains today.

The next major phase of development focussed on the extended portion of the Station Building and introduced Manchester social history as a major theme to the GMMSI. Adjoining the former passenger facilities stand the 1831 extension used for shops along Liverpool Road and a covered carriage shed at track level. The former shops, which had been re-used as offices and stores during the freight period, were refurbished for a ‘Story of Manchester’ gallery in 1985. An artistic impression of the gallery [Figure 10], shows the spaces of former shops and later railway company stores/offices on the ground floor level (street level with Liverpool Road) augmented along the railway viaduct archways. Here,

Greene could realise his plan to emphasise Manchester’s social and urban history as the first industrial city. In his 1983 ‘theme and scope’ statement, Greene suggested that ‘the museum of the industrial revolution’ would be a fitting subtitle. As early as this report, the Director proposed that the shop units could be used to exhibit Manchester history with the cellars below a suitable location for displays on sanitisation.93 Greene recalled in 2016 that:

The underlying objective for the Museum was to portray and explain Manchester’s rise as the first industrial city, a phenomenon that attracted, and at times appalled, commentators in the nineteenth century. Thus as well as a ‘Power Hall’ filled with steam engines, great locomotives and rolling stock, and a textiles gallery with working cotton processing machines, we created displays about the social history of the city.

Whilst the NWMSI worked to preserve local industrial artefacts as evidence of technological developments and the achievements of individual scientists and engineers for use primarily as an educational resource, which tangentially told stories of working life in the region, Greene brought a stronger social history remit to the GMMSI. This was in part due to the director’s professional background and interests but was also strongly influenced by the aims of GMC as the major funder.94
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93 Ibid: Greene, ‘Theme and Scope of the Museum’.

94 Greene, ‘A Heritage Journey’ (unpaginated): Greene worked as an archaeologist and oversaw the development of Norton Priory into a heritage attraction in the 1970s.
Figure 10. GMC County Planning Department illustration of the station building restoration, presentation drawing for press launch circa 1985 (Manchester Archive: GMC5/Box 150).

As the NWMSI had provided a focus for the educational ambitions of UMIST and enhanced the status of the newly instated university, the GMMSI was a vehicle for the GMC. As Madgin explains, by saving Liverpool Road and replacing the City Council as major funders of the NWMSI, the GMC pronounced its role in landscape of local governance. Yet, by the opening of the GMMSI, the GMC was on the brink of dissolution. The Conservative Government’s 1983 White Paper, Streamlining the cities: Government proposals for reorganising local government in Greater London and the Metropolitan counties was brought to the attention of the GMMSI Trust in November 1983. Anticipating its abolition in 1986 with the Local Government Act – which abolished the County Councils established in 1974, the GMC encouraged Greene to incorporate its legacy into the Greater

95 Manchester Archive GMCS/Box 150: GMC Planning Department, GMMSI Grade 1 building press launch presentation drawings.

96 Rebecca Madgin, ‘Reconceptualising the historic urban environment’, p.37.

Manchester Story Exhibition (the working title for the Making of Manchester gallery).\textsuperscript{98} GMC with the European Regional Development Fund provided the £1.25 million funding for the restoration of the carriage sheds, shops and installation of the Making of Manchester and Underground Manchester galleries (which also received support from North West Water).\textsuperscript{99} A ‘GMC Exhibition’ was incorporated into interpretation within Making of Manchester.\textsuperscript{100} The longevity of these galleries – open until 2016, provides a legacy: it was the GMC’s transformation of its early aims for a transport museum into one that focussed more on social history under the leadership of Patrick Greene, which has shaped the local perception of the Science and Industry Museum as a city museum for Manchester.\textsuperscript{101}

Section 3.2 Freight buildings and spaces

Members of the LRSS recognised the skew towards the passenger history of the Station as the GMMSI was planned. In 1981, the Society’s Working Party emphasised the goods station development, whilst local historian, Alan Chorlton, encouraged the collection of cattle and goods vans to show freight history.\textsuperscript{102} The Society collaborated with the NWMSI, and may have held direct discussions with Richard Hills on the subject, who made similar recommendations the following year.\textsuperscript{103} The LRSS strove to forge links with individuals who worked at the Station to record the freight history. The Society’s newsletter dedicated space to obituaries of railway workers, such as Frank Dolan, an LNWR employee from 1918.\textsuperscript{104} Following the death of Walter Bowman, who worked at the Station from 1916 to

\textsuperscript{98} Ibid., GMMSI Trust meeting minutes, 12 Dec 1985.

\textsuperscript{99} Ibid., publicity material for the Greater Manchester Story Exhibition, GMC and ERDF funding arrangements cited in a press release by Greene dated 14 May 1985.

\textsuperscript{100} SIM exhibition file on ‘Underground Manchester’ and ‘Manchester Story’, text and object list for GMC display.

\textsuperscript{101} MSI Records Management: Social History file typed transcript of ‘Machines, Manufacturers and People’, a paper presented by Patrick Greene to the Social History Curators Group, 1 May 1984. For example, there was public outrage when the Science Museum Group mooted closure in 2013 as reported by John Scheerhout & Yakub Qureshi, ‘Closure threat to Museum of Science and Industry greeted with horror’ \textit{Manchester Evening News} (4 Jun 2013).


about 1963, the Society received photographs of Walter with his cartage department colleagues. R. C. Ormston, membership secretary wrote: ‘they are of as much value as the most erudite discovery of the construction of the Station for they remind everyone that it was a place where humanity served the public and not just an old relic destined for distinguished museumship’. The active inclusion of the former employees of Liverpool Road in the Society contributed to the group’s sense that the Station was a reminder of working life, beyond a *lieu de mémoire* of the early railway.

In April 1982, Hills advocated railway displays in the ‘Power Hall’ beyond locomotive design and the LMR, proposing interactive freight exhibits. Hills identified displays that could incorporate existing NWMSI objects such as a permanent way exhibit of rails, sleepers and signals. For rolling stock, Hills suggested that a goods wagon be integrated into a hydraulic power display. An early NWMSI layout for the ‘Power Hall’ ([Figure 11](#)) shows a goods wagon alongside a capstan and a model coal truck. Staff researched instating a hydraulic crane (like those used in the Shipping Shed) to demonstrate the lifting of cotton bales cotton; The National Railway Museum agreed to lend a truck for the purpose.\(^{105}\) Whilst a wagon was later acquired and restored by the Friends (a Manchester, Sheffield & Lincolnshire Railway wagon c.1880, later accessioned: Y1998.24) it was not integrated into the hydraulic power story. This story was told using objects from the NWMSI including: Y1972.79.2 a Manchester Corporation supply meter, Y1969.66, a Tangye vertical press and Y1960.44, a mid-nineteenth century hydraulic pump. When the Museum opened, the railway experience began at a fabricated platform outside the ‘Power Hall’; however, no cranes were demonstrated. This interpretive device could have conveyed the historic uses of the freight buildings and shown what hydraulic power was harnessed for until the 1960s, when Edward Partington operated one of two hydraulic cranes inside the Shipping Shed for loading wagons.\(^{106}\)


\(^{106}\) Edward Partington, Oral History Interview for the Liverpool Road Station Project, recorded by Erin Beeston, 8 Dec 2015.
By 1983, the New Warehouse became part of the GMMSI, providing gallery space and solving problems arising from the structural instability of the 1830 Warehouse. Manchester City Council had separately purchased land including the New Warehouse from BR for £105,000 in 1981, and sold it on to GMC with eighteen months (adjacent land was sold to Granada, initiating numerous boundary complications). The drive to exhibit contemporary and ‘future’ science exhibits, inherited from the aims of the NWMSI, meant that galleries here did not relate to the history of this structure. As Crinson suggests, the postmodern urban re-use of historic buildings often leaves merely a façade. However, as this railway warehouse was re-used for museum purposes, rather than for residential or commercial space, ignoring the historical context was not inevitable. Plans swiftly formed to install textile machinery exhibits on the ground floor, again, the collections of the NWMSI led the initial gallery content.

---
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Crucially for the GMMSI, the New Warehouse was a space that could be easily adapted. This warehouse was only afforded protection as listed building in June 1994; over ten years after the museum became custodian.\textsuperscript{110} Therefore, alterations to the building could be made without consulting Historic Buildings England. Dating from 1879-80, the building was constructed with cast-iron columns and wrought-iron girders, and in better condition than the earlier buildings. Goad’s Fire Insurance Plans shows that whilst the two upper floors were vacant by 1961, the building was still used for loading and shipping freight in the 1960s.\textsuperscript{111} Plans for the warehouse were drawn up in April 1985 and show how spaces were established for temporary exhibitions and a science centre.\textsuperscript{112}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Publicity leaflet for the NWMSI circa 1969 – 1980 showing a member of staff attending the spinning mule, an object demonstrated by technicians (Richard Hills personal archive, Cheatham’s Library: 16.K.2.24).}
\end{figure}
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\caption{Publicity leaflet for the NWMSI circa 1969 – 1980 showing a member of staff attending the spinning mule, an object demonstrated by technicians (Richard Hills personal archive, Cheatham’s Library: 16.K.2.24).}
\end{figure}

states the eastern ground floor housed temporary exhibitions on textiles production, printing and papermaking.


\textsuperscript{111} SIM Archive E2019.0032: Chas E Goad Ltd., First Edition of Manchester Carriers’ Warehouse District, Showing Railway Stations and Positions of Warehouses Within 30 Miles of Manchester (Sept 1899). With annotations dated until at least 1961.

\textsuperscript{112} Manchester Archives GMC 5/Box 150: GMMSI proposed restoration scheme, Byrom St Warehouse plans by GMC Architectural Services Unit, Apr 1985.
Whilst ambitions for the New Warehouse was detrimental to a unified heritage experience for the Station, the development of the Xperiment! science centre followed on from the NWMSI’s educational principles. Dame Margaret Weston (Science Museum director and GMMSI trustee) encouraged the inclusion of a science centre in June 1984.113 Patrick Greene visited American and Canadian science museums and recalls The Ontario Science Centre was ‘a revelation’.114 Greene reflected on the popularity of existing demonstrable exhibits and the ‘principle of involving the visitor’ incorporated into displays in the ‘Microscopes in Manchester’ temporary exhibition. Greene argued: ‘a science centre would be the next logical development from the practice already observed in the Museum but extended to involve the visitor in a much greater degree’.115 Science centres remain distinct from museums owing to the absence of collections. Exhibits are usually purpose-built and interactive, involving some impetus, physical or intellectual, from the visitor. Behind each display is a lesson in science, targeted at the layperson. The science centre model presents universal scientific principles, quite deliberately without social or cultural context.116 Stella Butler, who contributed to the Xperiment! Gallery, states that the subject areas associated with Manchester science formed the basis for the interactive gallery, though she concedes that linking historical displays to the exhibits did not come to fruition.117 The approach at the Ontario Science Centre was based on broad scientific themes familiar in the traditional museum, Xperiment! followed this model as opposed to the laboratory model of the Exploratorium. A capital sum became available for the redevelopment of the New Warehouse in 1986, linked to the abolition of the GMC, with multiple funders supporting Xperiment! exhibits.118

In contrast to Xperiment!, a working-class street scene was planned alongside the New Warehouse. The idea of removing houses from elsewhere in the City and re-erecting them at GMMSI was reminiscent of earlier concepts for the NWMSI as a living history museum at

113 Manchester Archive GMC 4/BOX 44: Minutes of GMMSI Trust meeting, 12 June 1984, Weston suggests Liverpool Road would benefit from a similar venture to the Science Museum’s Launchpad.

114 Greene, oral history interview, 26 Jul 2016.


117 Butler, Science and Technology Museums, p.97.

118 Ibid., p.85; pp.97-100. Donors ranged from industry, such as Norweb and British Nuclear Fuels Ltd., to the Greater Manchester Youth Association and the Gatsby Trust.
Astley Green Colliery (see Chapter 4, Section 3) and GMC leader Arnold Fieldhouse’s vision for Liverpool Road in 1981. In 1983, Greene suggested that a pair of back-to-back houses could be erected in the yard east of the New Warehouse for a working-class housing display. To Greene, the houses presented an opportunity to convey something of the living conditions that shocked Europe. A local precedent existed in Salford Museum and Art Gallery, where, an amalgamated, fictional street was created in direct response to 1950s demolitions. Lark Hill Place, despite being the product of de-industrialisation, Crinson notes bears little resemblance to the industrial past, presenting an ‘antiquarian’ eighteenth century atmosphere akin to the Olde Manchester and Salford display at the 1887 Jubilee (discussed in Chapter 1.2.1). In contrast, Greene intended to directly address poor-living conditions, presenting a shift away from the sanitised, imagined past of contemporaneous living history settings.
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120 Manchester Archive GMC 4/BOX 44: Greene, ‘Theme and Scope of the Museum’.

121 SIM Records Management: Social History file typed transcript of ‘Machines, Manufacturers and People’ by Patrick Greene, 1 May 1984.

Plans for the street were yet to undergo a feasibility study when two houses from Dean Street were collected. The dwellings, scheduled for demolition to make way for a car park, were located between Tib Street, Piccadilly, Great Ancoats Street and Newton Street. Built in 1788 and identified as significant by the Manchester Early Dwellings Research Group (MEDReG), 36 and 38 Dean Street were secured for the Museum in February 1984.\textsuperscript{123} Greene was a supporter of MEDReG, which was formed by a University extra mural group with support from the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society and the W.E.A.\textsuperscript{124} It is unclear whether the aim of the street scene was to connect interpretation of industrial Manchester to the history of the Station. The expansion of Liverpool Road Station site had led to the removal of similar housing. The construction of the Shipping Shed led to the loss of 69 dwellings in 1854, whilst the New Warehouse was erected on the site of New Street, Garden Court, Dumbar Street and Ashton Street, all demolished in 1879.\textsuperscript{125} These do not

\textsuperscript{123} SIM Records Management: Social History file, correspondence between Jaqueline Roberts, MEDReG secretary and Mr Garston, Dean Street properties owner, 7 Feb 1984.


\textsuperscript{125} Manchester Corporation Acts, 1844-1857, ‘Manchester New Streets Act 1853’, pp. 1473-6.; TNA RAIL 791/118: Memorandum of agreement between Corporation of Manchester and LNWR for Corporation to purchase land at Camp Field, 20/4/1854; 30 & 31 Vict. LNWR New Works and
figure in Fitzgerald’s architectural survey, which focussed on the 1830s railway infrastructure. MEDReG, however, certainly made this connection, citing the suitability of the GMMSI site because of the dwellings previously located there.\textsuperscript{126}

The space earmarked for this was beyond GMMSI’s boundary on City Council land and clashed with its interests.\textsuperscript{127} According to Greene, the City Planning Department was considering the creation of a boulevard instead.\textsuperscript{128} Yet another example of the difficulties the Museum faced mediating the priorities of the City Council and GMC – who supported the venture, and initially offered £20,000 to fund the re-erection of the houses.\textsuperscript{129} By July 1984, the local planning authority accepted a revised scheme for the re-erection of these dwellings, yet, the project did not figure in museum development plans the following year.\textsuperscript{130} In 1988, the City Council considered providing land at Collier Street (just off Liverpool Road) for the project, but withdrew their offer.\textsuperscript{131} The Dean Street dwellings and the original fabric of Walker’s Buildings (collected in 1990) remain in storage at SIM, unaccessioned and with little prospect of display.\textsuperscript{132}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{126} R. S. Fitzgerald, \textit{Liverpool Road Station, Manchester: An Historical and Architectural Survey} (MUP in association with The Royal Commission on Historical Documents and GMC, Manchester, 1980); SIM Records Management: Social History file, 1984, MEDReg Report.


\textsuperscript{128} SIM Records Management: Social History file, 1984, minutes of MEDReG meeting held at GMMSI 27 Sept 1984.

\textsuperscript{129} Ibid., correspondence from J Hetherington, City Council Town Clerk, to Patrick Greene with notes of MEDReG meeting 25 Apr, 1984. Greene states £20,000 offered by GMC to the Museum Trust, however, no agreement was finalised. It is unclear when or why the offer was retracted; it is highly likely to be linked to the imminent dissolution of the GMC set out in the government’s \textit{Streamlining the Cities} white paper.

\textsuperscript{130} Manchester Archive GMC 4/BOX 44: GMMSI Trust, buildings committee minutes, 31 Jul 1984.

\textsuperscript{131} SIM Curators records, Pauline Webb/Meg McHugh, ‘The Early Workers Housing Project’ (2006).

\textsuperscript{132} The dwelling material was never accessioned due to its potential for reconstruction, although they were meticulously recorded by GMAU. This unique material is at high risk of degradation and disposal.
\end{flushleft}
Section 3.3 The 1830 Warehouse

Communication of freight heritage was achieved in parts of the 1830 Warehouse, owing to its role in the ‘oldest in the world’ narrative. Unlike other freight buildings, former use led interpretation aims, albeit confined to its nineteenth rather than twentieth century uses (which included rail to motor vehicle transhipment). The history of the 1830 Warehouse was part of Greene’s priority for social as well as industrial history. To suit his site narrative – which emphasised the 1830s at the most westward area of the museum, Bay 4 was conserved rather than restored for galleries. Yet, thematic galleries overtook most space for interpretation, particularly the National Electricity Gallery, where displays remained distinct from the surrounding historic environment. Elsewhere, some reference was made to the buildings, for example, the 1831 Station Building extension was described in a video at the ‘Making of Manchester’ gallery entrance. In ‘Underground Manchester’ (beneath the viaduct between the Station and 1830 Warehouse) the subterranean surroundings of the re-created sewer were forgotten – such as the vegetable storage and hay cutting that took place in these arches.

Funding largely influenced the sequence of gallery openings in the 1830 Warehouse, which restricted a holistic approach to freight interpretation of the building. The National Electricity Gallery, Gas Gallery, as well as Underground Manchester (which could be accessed via an archway between the 1830 Warehouse and Station Building) were all supported by utility companies. The Electricity Council collections, long sought after by Donald Cardwell in the 1970s, were the first to be assigned a gallery. The National Electricity Gallery opened to visitors in 1986 in Bay 5, which was reinforced prior to the restoration of the other four bays.

The 1830 Warehouse was presented as an ‘experience’ which demonstrated its former use for the transfer and storage of goods. Greene championed an ‘as found’ principle to interpretation, to provide a sense of authenticity to the encounter – quite a different

133 Manchester Archive GMC 4/BOX 44: Greene, ‘Theme and Scope of the Museum’.
approach to the fictional scenario established in the ‘First Class Booking Hall’. He envisaged that ‘stacks of stored goods... with figures of men unloading, loading, carrying, using a crane, could give visitors insights into how a nineteenth century warehouse operated’.

The extent of work (and funding) required to remedy decades of neglect meant that it was the final building to be restored; begun in 1991, work was completed in 1997. It was only as a result of findings from the first phase of restoration that the Warehouse was upgraded from Grade II* listed to Grade I. In 2000, ‘Warehouse for the World’, an immersive gallery on the ground floor of the ‘as found’ Bay 4 was open to public. Audio-visual technologies were integrated to create an encounter with the past: ‘visitors were invited to enter an area in total darkness and then progress following pools of light and episodes of the history and operation of the warehouse with specially shot video projected onto the brick walls, which gave it a suitably atmospheric quality’.

The ‘Warehouse of the World’ experience thus communicated the freight heritage using modern exhibition techniques and technologies. With atmosphere and experience emphasised, this approach has parallels with living history museum modes of display.

Interpretation of the 1830 Warehouse was enabled by a series of archaeological investigations. The architectural survey by Ronald Fitzgerald in 1978 provided more information for curators for this building than any other structure. The Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit (GMAU) carried out three small-scale excavations and recording work in the mid-1980s, a survey in 1991 and excavated the west gable in 1994. Research revealed significant features, particularly its design based on earlier canal warehousing and Baltic timbers used in construction. This reinforced its status as the oldest extant railway warehouse and bolstered funding bids for restoration. In contrast,
later buildings like the Shipping Shed and New Warehouse remained scarcely researched until this thesis (see Chapters 2 and 3). Knowledge of the uses of the 1830 Warehouse enabled displays connected to the building’s history. In 2007, for example, an extant jib crane and warehouse office were interpreted in the ‘Connecting Manchester’ gallery.\textsuperscript{143} The lack of knowledge about other buildings, particularly as the earliest GMMSI curators left the organisation, restricted the presentation of a longer freight narrative.

In 1991, Greene, with curator Gaby Porter, proposed a ‘Food for the City’ gallery during the 1830 Warehouse’s final phase of development.\textsuperscript{144} Greene and Porter stated the gallery would: ‘extend beyond production and processing to distribution, consumption and communication’.\textsuperscript{145} This gallery could have bridged the commodity/utility led galleries with the goods story in the ‘Warehouse of the World’ by featuring the circulation and distribution of food from Liverpool Road Station. Rodger Scola’s contemporaneous research on Manchester’s food supply provided ample material.\textsuperscript{146} Active collecting took place in anticipation, including the acquisition of a malt mill, a Kellogg’s packing line and a jam-jar filling machine.\textsuperscript{147} Ultimately, a temporary ‘Futures Gallery’ (1998) was created as a testbed for a proposed communications gallery. This reflected Greene’s ‘future’ vision and fulfilled the Museum’s contemporary science remit.\textsuperscript{148} The food themed gallery was superseded entirely with the creation of the ‘Connecting Manchester’ gallery in 2007. Like the electricity, gas and water (‘Underground Manchester’) galleries, this was led by opportunistic acquisitions and funding prospects. As the BT Museum closed in 1997, objects were distributed countrywide and funds became available through the ‘Connected Earth’ project. The Museum acquired the BT Connected Earth collection of telecommunication equipment and trade literature in 1998 (Y1999.2), followed by a further 300 objects (Y2003.22). The availability of corporate sponsorship and the growth of

\textsuperscript{143} SIM Curators files: MSIM Communications Gallery, Drawing no.MSIM/COMMS/041/R3, 14 May 2007.
\textsuperscript{144} SIM Records Management: Final phase HLF bid papers, Sunningdale Economic Consultants, ‘The Museum of Science and Industry the Final Phase, economic appraisal and business case’.
\textsuperscript{146} Roger Scola, Feeding the Victorian City: The food supply of Manchester, 1770-1870 (Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1992).
\textsuperscript{148} Manchester Archive GMC 4/BOX 44: Greene, ‘Theme and Scope of the Museum’.
GMMSI’s collection influenced the priority of galleries in a practical sense and ran in tandem with the wider restoration agenda for the 1830 Warehouse.

Conclusion

The embryonic years of the GMMSI between 1979 and 1983, and subsequent phases of gallery development, present competing concepts for the Museum. At different stages and in different spaces it was characterised as a: transport museum, railway museum, living history museum, traditional science and technology museum and an interactive science centre. As these differing approaches won and lost favour and funding, a wide range of collections and galleries were installed at the Station. The GMMSI became a hybrid museum, grounded by the science and technology collections at its core. A strong emphasis upon interactivity and scientific education was inherited from the NWMSI. Patrick Greene approached the GMMSI from a social history perspective, whilst also influenced by contemporary museological trends like the science centre model used in Xperiment! In many respects, this was the logical next step from the demonstration favoured by the NWMSI. The complexities of government and grant funding (especially the imminent dissolution of the GMC) greatly affected the opportunities available for the development of galleries. Ultimately, however, designs for science and technology galleries – the utility funded spaces and Xperiment!, obscured the history of the buildings that housed them. Beyond exterior signage, there is little sense left of the former uses of the Shipping Shed and New Warehouse.

I have argued that the dominant ‘oldest in the world’ narrative, disseminated since the early twentieth century (as outlined in Chapter 1) and the driving force behind preservation campaigns in the 1960s and 1970s (see Chapter 4) ensured the Station became a museum. Paradoxically, this collective memory hampered historical interpretation of the Station once it became a museum. Freight history, considered important by key actors, including members of the LRSS and Greene, was only highlighted when it related directly to the ‘oldest’ trope. The Station Building and 1830 Warehouse were prioritised, with the first railway station and warehouse valorised in interpretation. This had the (unintended) effect of skewing encounters of the Station’s past to the 1830s, with all later freight buildings used as purely façades for thematic galleries. Furthermore, confusing outside interpretation and routes around the Museum continue to have ramifications for visitors today.
Conclusion

This study of Liverpool Road Station has demonstrated how powerful memory can be in history. The Station as a site of memory ensured its survival, yet, fixed the Station in the historical imagination in a set period: the 1830 opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway (LMR). Pierre Nora identified the reciprocal influence of history and memory at lieux de mémoire; here, I have shown how this affected the process of preservation and the transformation of Liverpool Road Station into museum space.¹ The site narrative presented to the public reflected civic and national pride in George Stephenson and the early railway period. From the early twentieth century onwards, the ‘oldest station in the world’ narrative was perpetuated in the collective memories of distinct groups, from engineers to railway enthusiasts, civic actors and local storytellers. Ad hoc heritage activity took place at the passenger Station Building and the incumbent goods office staff maintained 1830s ‘railway relics’ prior to formal museumification. The ‘oldest’ trope ultimately drove the Museum’s establishment, its funding, research and public history. This was detrimental to communicating the longer site story and hides later social and technological transformations that influenced everyday life at the Station and beyond.

The operation of freight is a highly visible, heavy duty activity, yet, it is far less visible in perceptions of Liverpool Road, especially after the passenger service ceased in 1844. Regarded as lower status by contemporaries (such as commentators on the cessation of passenger traffic), freight is afforded less historiographical attention in contrast with passenger travel and great engineering ‘firsts’. Freight figured in the ‘oldest’ trope, but this was bound with the extant 1830 Warehouse and not related to other Museum spaces. I suggest that this is due to the novelty of railway travel experienced by contemporaries and assumptions surrounding relatability in the present. Popular historians often present railways as mover of the masses,² yet, the LMR 1830-1844 story was limited to the wealthiest and urban elite (with some exceptional excursions). Freight, however, was a vast and diverse operation bringing in foodstuffs and materials for use by a broad spectrum of society. By paying attention to things, animals, working practices and technologies, as

highlighted in chapters 2 and 3, a wider history of place can be reconstructed than is represented by the current museum, as set out in chapters 4 and 5.

1. Beyond the ‘oldest station’

Examining key moments in the freight history of Liverpool Road reveals surprising developments. We see the Station expansion planned during the economically uncertain early 1860s, not, as the existing historiography indicates, in response to the 1866 Cotton Warehouse fire. By the late the 1860s, Liverpool Road Station became one of the earliest Stations regionally to install a hydraulic power system. This reshaped spaces above and below ground and changed the pace of lifting and moving equipment for railway workers, increasing efficiency, freight traffic and danger. As the Railway’s great rival, the Manchester Ship Canal emerged, the LNWR invested in Liverpool Road with a wave of haulage improvements installing the gantry and travelling cranes. The final phase of expansion at Liverpool Road in the 1890s ensured its resilience into the twentieth century. The Station was a rail head for freight into the early twentieth century and considered for modernisation as late as the 1960s.

Considering the ‘stuff’ of Liverpool Road also provides a window into the urban experience, less restricted than the narrow social strata represented in the passenger narrative. For example, at the Station, vegetables were stored under archways and flour and butter in the 1830 Warehouse to be circulated and feed the City. We also see Irish pig traffic arriving at Liverpool Road - not merely for immediate slaughter and sale, live pigs were shared amongst residents in slum district. The Cotton Warehouse Fire documentation reveals the diversity of products stored in these buildings. A range of industrial applications beyond cotton is represented, from food processing to heavy engineering – the ingredients of Manchester’s shock city status.

Exploring Liverpool Road Station beyond its physical boundaries, as an intermediary between the industrial zone and surrounding urban area, brings the role of the Railway into understandings of municipal governmentality in the neighbourhood. Campfield was perceived as a place of ‘nuisance’, thus Manchester Corporation extended its civilising influence with the transformation of the Owenite Hall of Science into the Free Public Library in 1852. Patrick Joyce’s work on nineteenth century governmentality highlights the severance of street life from the street enacted by Manchester Corporation through market regulations. By considering Liverpool Road Station in this spatial dynamic, it became
apparent that the 1870s market enclosure was long mooted, with plans for a market hall on the Camp Field as early as 1852. The complete failure of the market halls was symptomatic of a trade proposal prepositioned on social motives: to displace the working class entertainments of Knott Mill Fair and eradicate the open meeting place for radicals.

The re-use of the Lower Campfield Market as the City Exhibition Hall at the turn of the century presents long-term continuities in the organisation of space, encompassing civilising, consumer and the ‘irrational’ working class entertainments akin to those deliberately displaced in the 1870s. Exhibitionary spaces could be encountered alongside the Station from the mid-century Free Public Library to the re-use of Lower Campfield Market; the Station transported display materials to the City Hall as it had previously served the local markets. Visitors could encounter visual displays as diverse as circuses to trade fairs and even educational exhibitions furthering Manchester Corporation’s civic narrative. These institutions organised the vision of visitors and citizens in Campfield, with depictions frequently concealing the Station and other industrial spaces close to these sites of civic (and counter-civic) seeing.

Liverpool Road Station itself had become an exhibitionary space by the early twentieth century despite its continued use as a freight Station. As early as 1912, ad hoc tourism took place, demonstrating the breadth of the ‘oldest in the world narrative’; tourists came from as far afield as America and Japan. Oral testimony, newspaper reports and the 1938 Pathé film all present Station staff facilitating a form of heritage experience. In the manager’s offices artefacts were hung and LMR ephemera displayed for visitors. Staff recollected visitors enamoured with the materiality of nineteenth century furniture in the goods offices. The ‘oldest’ trope fed directly into the self-presentation of the Station. Meanwhile, displays inside the City Hall for the Centenary of Manchester Corporation in 1938 aided the historicisation of Liverpool Road Station merely metres from the actual site. By the 1950s, steam locomotives carrying railway tour groups were driven into the passenger station area, with an ‘exhibition line’ even proposed in (unrealised) modernisation plans.

Whilst briefly considered as a location for an international freight terminal under British Railways (BR), by the close of the 1960s it was clear that Liverpool Road would neither be modernised nor preserved. Advocates of preservation publicly lambasted BR’s neglect of the listed Station Building. The Liverpool terminus of the LMR, Crown Street, which had deteriorated by the 1930 Centenary celebrations, did not survive bomb damage in 1941. The ‘first railway’/genius of Stephenson narrative was therefore translocated from
Liverpool to Manchester by virtue of Liverpool Road’s survival, which in turn was the result of continuous use of the former passenger buildings for freight staff. The façade of the Station Building and 1831 extension appealed as a neoclassical Georgian aesthetic; at street level the Station appeared as another civic building disguising the industrial space behind it (akin to Wolfgang Schivelbusch’s medieval gateway analogy). The Station was not imagined in its entirety as a 150-year-old freight complex, rather the site of the former passenger terminus. The contemporaneous 1830 Warehouse received little or no attention at this stage. Even visits by proponents of a science museum disregarded the warehouse as entirely unsuitable for a museum.

2. Museumification

As Liverpool Road Station became the focus for preservation efforts, quite independently, Manchester’s long-mooted science museum was created when staff from UMIST formed what became the North Western Museum of Science and Industry (NWMSI). Vivian Bowden, Donald Cardwell and Richard Hills carefully interwove the boosterist story of Manchester’s technological achievements with their aspirations for future science. Through looking forward (not simply backwards, as Bowden stated) the museum proponents read the zeitgeist of the ‘White Heat’ era and secured the support of neighbouring Universities and Manchester City Council. This contrast, between industrial preservation and the contemporary scientific education remit created tensions for collecting and display priorities. Nevertheless, science and technology collections were combined in national collections since the nineteenth century and provided the new institution with legitimacy.

Despite the contemporaneous preservation campaigns to re-use Liverpool Road Station as a museum, it was not intended as the ultimate location of the NWMSI. Deindustrialisation provided a plethora of possibilities for a permanent museum: from defunct mills, collieries and warehouses to the Central Station. Cardwell preferred the Central Station, with the space to install exhibits on the scale of South Kensington’s Science Museum, whilst a purpose-built modern establishment could realise his ambition to integrate ‘town and gown’ along the Oxford Road corridor. Liverpool Road Station was occasionally considered

and only became a distinct possibility with a major change in local governance: the establishment of Greater Manchester Council (GMC) in 1975.

Cardwell regarded the Station as peripheral, and, despite the prominence of the ‘oldest station’ trope, perceived the Georgian building as insignificant to the history of technology. The technological developments (such as hydraulic power) evident in the longer freight history were either unknown or disregarded. The vocal preference of NWMSI and University staff for the Central Station site also reflects the dilapidated state of Castlefield and continuities with nineteenth century views of Liverpool Road Station as outlying. With pressure from preservation proponents, especially the Liverpool Road Station Society (LRSS), GMC purchased Liverpool Road and began museum plans in 1978. The Greater Manchester Museum of Science and Industry (GMMSI) was established at the Station between 1979 and 1983. The NWMSI custodians carefully focussed their priorities for a nationally significant, yet regional museum of science and technology upon the Shipping Shed. This provided a suitable setting to display heavy exhibits, whilst interpretation of the extant 1830s structures and the recreation of a railway line were the priority of the Society and GMC stakeholders.

Competing concepts for what the type of museum Liverpool Road Station should become led to a mixture of interpretative methodologies in the final institution. With the NWMSI collections at its core, the GMMSI was simultaneously a science and technology museum and science centre with characteristics of a living history or large transport museum. The prevalence of thematic science and technology galleries focussing on utilities, despite the regional significance of objects on display, was detrimental to providing a sense of place. The New Warehouse was preserved as a convenient structure to house galleries, a treatment quite different to the conceptualisation of the 1830s buildings as objects in themselves. Patrick Greene’s aspiration to present a ‘museum of the industrial revolution’ was addressed within the historic environment surrounding the social history galleries in the former 1831 shops. Here, there were concerted efforts to connect the history of the Station to the exhibition narrative. There were practical constraints in representing the Station in its entirety, particularly as the museum site is smaller than the original Station, parts of which were occupied by Granada Television. Furthermore, the Campfield Market Hall, home to the Air and Space Hall, was originally Council owned and not overtly related to the Station. The varying interpretative treatment of key buildings and spaces has exacerbated this already complex site narrative.
A key context for social history approaches to the GMMSI was the absence of a dedicated city history museum. The Manchester Museum had to come to fulfil the role of a museum for the city; yet, with natural history and world culture collections, exhibits did not usually pertain to Manchester.\(^4\) Whilst regional ‘Greater Manchester’ promotion was an explicit aim of the GMMSI, it also provided exhibitionary space for local history in lieu of a museum of the City. The GMC’s legacy exhibit, the ‘Greater Manchester Story’, inserted into the ‘Making of Manchester’ gallery, was a blunt example of civic promotion at the GMMSI.

The 2012 integration of the current institution, the Science and Industry Museum (SIM), into the national Science Museum Group presents opportunities for re-invention. Led by the collections, the spaces at SIM can still bear strong North-West and Mancunian messages, but what might remedy the incoherent site story is to understand Liverpool Road Station as a collection of objects. Previous curators have conceptualised the 1830 Station as an object, but, crucially, the constituent parts of the freight complex require considering as objects. Interpretation would then be able to follow object methodologies – like the object biography approach, considering buildings entire life cycle in order to extract stories.\(^5\) We can encounter the City’s longer history by including the later buildings and technological innovations in parity with the oldest buildings, thus remedying the weighty influence of collective memory upon interpretation of the Station.

3. Commemoration and industrial heritage

Heritage sites imbued with histories and memories of invention and discovery, whose interpretation is often celebratory in tone, can be contested spaces. During the very process of saving historic sites for the public, a neat, strong narrative of the significance of that place is necessary to gather support and funding. As stories are told they gain personal significance to those engaged in upholding the collective memory (for example, in the case of Liverpool Road Station, the railway volunteers whose agency was challenged during the


\(^5\) For examples of this approach see: Kate Hill (ed.), *Museums and Biographies: Stories, Objects, Identities* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2012).
Repositioning the history of a place as meaningful in different ways may be contentious but is essential in providing synergy/reciprocity between academic history and active, personal heritage. Tension between collective memorial functions and museum narratives are most obviously borne out at museums of conflict. Ample work has been conducted on war museums, especially those that serve as monument or perform a ceremonial function. However, less attention has been paid to museums that also perform a celebratory commemorative function, perceived as less emotionally charged; yet, the strength of even positive collective memories can present challenges to museum governance. In the GMMSI, volunteers of the LRSS (and later Friends) were frequently in conflict with the Museum over access to spaces and jurisdiction over objects.

There are examples of defunct railway infrastructure globally given over to museum or gallery spaces that do not also fulfil a memorial role. At places without such bold claims as to be the ‘oldest’ station, there is often more direct engagement with the longer site stories and freight operations. These include institutions established (often by volunteers) to reflect the history the associated railway line: for example, at the Transport Museum in Bury a freight manager’s office is presented in situ. Elsewhere, engine sheds and warehouses house eclectic railway collections, like the those in the National Railway Museum (NRM) in York. However, even indirect relationships between gallery contents and

---


8 In the history of science museums, work has been conducted on celebratory national sites of memory, such as: Patricia Fara, ‘Isaac Newton lived here: sites of memory and scientific heritage’, *The British Journal for the History of the Science* vol.33, no.4 (Dec 2000), pp.407-426. An excellent overview of museums and memory can be found in Gaynor Kavanagh, *Dream Spaces: Memory and the Museum* (London: Leicester UP, 2000), though for the most part this deals with the process of collecting memories through oral history and reminiscence and dealing with difficult histories.
their structures presents scope for interpretation connecting objects to their surroundings, an approach currently under consideration as part of capital developments at NRM.

Art galleries have also become a popular re-use for vast railway structures. These usually occupy passenger terminals, like the grand Gare d’Orsay in Paris, which houses the Musée d’Orsay. A recent initiative of France’s SNCF railway has seen the re-use of defunct freight spaces for contemporary art installations with sixteen Sites Artistiques Temporaires.\(^9\) Yet, this style of re-use sanitises industrial spaces for contemporary contents and does little to illuminate layers of urban memory at these sites. There are parallels with aspects of SIM interpretation, such as the New Warehouse, which has been used a shell for gallery contents without consideration of its historical role. Yet, owing to the unique nature and extent of the Liverpool Road Station, the overall effect of the science and technology galleries is not as remote as art installations from the freight heritage.

A distinctive element of the re-making of Liverpool Road Station was the pre-existing science and technology collection; it is not unusual, however, for a heritage site to hold objects pertaining to other places. For example, the Big Pit at Blaenavon in Wales is a national mining collection at a colliery which was only a viable museum due to its lack of typicality: it was not too deep for subterranean visitors and had natural drainage and ventilation.\(^10\) The site therefore is distinct from the types of collieries most of the collection represents. These contrasts pose great challenges to curators, dealing with the layers of local and national memory and history. Creating connections in interpretation between the objects or artworks and the spaces in which they are encountered enriches the visitor experience. Industrial infrastructure like train station sheds, warehouses and collieries are very different to the rigid spatial organisation in purpose-built museums, and their spaces can be interpreted to bridge disconnections between the urban or rural environment and material encounters of the past.

---


4. Reflections

There is a lamentable lack of diversity amongst the people present in the thesis. Women figure only on the margins and as stereotypes, for example, as the ‘shrieking females’ attending Fergus O’Connor’s lecture at the Hall of Science or the exhausted traveller in need of brandy at the Station. As is the nature of historical research in this period, we hear the voices of middling and upper class men from outraged librarians to disgruntled Councillors. Again, only glimpses of working class lives appear, particularly, their movements on the Camp Field as protestors and trade union members. At the Station, we see individuals in Company records, although usually only in exceptional situations, like accounts of long-service or railway accidents. Unsurprisingly, little has been uncovered of cultural or racial diversity aside from evidence of the othering of performers at the Knott Mill Fair. Further analysis of census and trade directory evidence and LNWR staff records may reveal a more diverse picture of Liverpool Road: this is an area ripe for research. Genealogical approaches could also enhance our knowledge of the flow of people in and out of both railway occupations and the area, like Michael Bailey’s work on the railway guard whose family left Manchester for America after family tragedies during the cholera epidemic.11 Elsewhere, clues from the freight research show where products came from, which may be used to chart movement of things across the globe. These product and place stories could be analysed in relation to the global slave trade (particularly in cotton) thus highlighting the imperial context, which is often overlooked in favour of the less controversial domestic story of the railways.

Whilst this thesis has redressed the historiographic imbalance on Liverpool Road by examining the history and significance of the Station over its lifetime, there is scope for further scrutiny. Major developments under the LNWR received considerable attention, whilst the survey of the LMS and BR periods were largely studied in relation to modernisation and commemoration revealing surprising details, especially early twentieth century heritage activity before industrial places were generally considered historically significant. However, the First and Second World Wars did not receive even coverage with the interwar era and further research would be required for interpretation of the Station’s role. With the primary research presented in this thesis, it is hoped that curators can begin

to expand interpretation of the site beyond the privileged passenger period. Specific interpretative suggestions, aimed at museum professionals, are contained in Appendix A.
Bibliography

Primary Sources

1.1 Archival material

Bolton Library and Museum

Chadwick Museum Accession Register, 1883-1908.

Cheshire Archive and Local Studies

NPR 1/9/1-3: LNWR Correspondence: equipment and buildings, 1858 – 1900
NPR: 1/3/4: LNWR Electrical Arrangements 1890-1915
NPR 1/19: LNWR Capital Accounts: new works, 1876 – 1885
NPR 4203/30: Manchester Liverpool Road improved amenities for clerical and wages staff, 1953.

Chetham’s Library

Belle Vue Collection: ‘The railway employees’ carnival and crowning of Britain’s railway queen, railway year 135’ Belle Vue Gardens, Manchester Saturday 10th September 1960 (Manchester: Openshaw Print Works, 1960) 
<http://www.chethams.org.uk/bellevue/files/original/a96c83d8cdb13344c9f01881e4561742.pdf> [accessed 27/11/15].


Lancashire Record Office


Liverpool Archive and Local Studies Collection

Hq385.2NEI: H. H. Neilson, ‘Liverpool and Manchester Railway’ paper read at a meeting of the Society of Lovers of Old Liverpool, 25 Apr 1930.

352 MIN/FIN/ii/74: Liverpool Council Finance Committee minutes no.27, 1929 – 1931
Hf 385.2 CEN: Liverpool and Manchester Railway Centenary Celebrations Newspaper Cuttings, 1930

Hq385.094NOR: Liverpool to Manchester: Memories and Sounds of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway (North West Sound Archive, 1992) [on cassette].

File 291: Corporation of Liverpool Town Hall Department, Railway Centenary Celebrations file

942.7213 GEO: St George's Hall, Liverpool, newspaper cuttings and photographs file

Manchester Archive

GB122.A.BRB British Rail Property Board Material, File 546: Report on the Concentration of freight sundries traffic at Ancoats, Ardwick and Oldham Road, Manchester (1965)

GB127.Broadsides F1967/72 ‘Brighter Homes Exhibition’ flyer, City Hall, Manchester (1967)

GB127.Broadsides F1938/1A ‘Charter Centenary Municipal Exhibition’ flyer, City Hall (1938)


GB127. Council Minutes: Parks and Cemeteries Committee minutes vol. 23 (1903 –1904)

GB127. Council Minutes: Parks and Cemeteries Committee minutes vol. 24 (1904 –1905)

GB127.12107: Manchester Council Town Hall Committee minutes vol. 26 (1929 –1931)

GB127.m79133: Photograph showing ‘The first cheese fair at Campfield Market’(1926)


M126/5/1 Manchester and Salford Sanitary Association scrapbook of printed items


M6/3/11/50: Letter from Mr Hurry of the Engineering Department, LNWR, to Hugh Fleming Esq. Hon Secretary to the Great Exhibition, Town Hall, Manchester (1851)

M68/4/4: Manchester Town Hall trades procession (1877)

M79/1/10: Manchester Town Hall, papers of Joseph Thompson (1864 – 1895)

M723/84/6/3499: City Exhibition Hall and extension plans (c.1950-1955)

M740/1/3/1: Campfield Library Sub-Committee minutes (1858 – 1862)

M740/1/3/2 Campfield Library Sub-Committee minutes (1863 – 1868)

M740/1/3/3 Campfield Library Sub- Committee minutes (1868 – 1873)


M9/60/10/1A: Plan of timber yards near the Rochdale canal

M901/14571: Manchester Markets Committee Proceedings vol. 1 (1846 –1849)
M901/14572: Manchester Markets Committee Proceedings vol. 2 (1849 – 1852)
M901/14573: Manchester Markets Committee Proceedings vol. 3 (1852 – 1865)
M901/14574: Manchester Markets Committee Proceedings vol. 4 (1855 – 1859)
GB127.Council Minutes: Manchester Markets Committee Proceedings vol. 6 (1863-1867)
M901/32674: Manchester Markets Committee Proceedings vol. 7 (1867-1870)
M901/28476: Manchester Markets Committee Proceedings vol. 9 (1873 – 1876)
M901/28479: Manchester Markets Committee Proceedings vol. 10 (1876 – 1879)
M901/28478: Manchester Markets Committee Proceedings vol. 11 (1880-1882)
M901/28477: Manchester Markets Committee Proceedings vol. 12 (1882 – 1884)
RA1(K).1.1 – 1.3: The Liverpool Road Station Society correspondence (c.1979 – 1982)
RA1(J).1.3: Liverpool Road Station, correspondence re. County Archive (1979 – 1980)

Manchester Central Library, local studies

Census of England and Wales, Borough of Manchester, Township of Manchester (1841).
Manchester Historical Maps online, digitised by Dr Martin Dodge: <https://manchester.publicprofiler.org/> accessed 14 Dec 2019

Science and Industry Museum Archive

YA 1983.9.2.44: Dendy Marshall Collection, four LNWR postcards from the series ‘Railways in the Thirties: Rainhill Bridge’ c.1904-05
YA 1983.9.2.62: Dendy Marshall Collection, three LNWR postcards after the Ackermann LMR prints
YA 1987.634: Festival of Britain: The Land Travelling Exhibition Catalogue (London: HSMO, 1951)
YA 1996.1539: Photographs of Walter Bowman, circa 1920s.
YA 2002.28: James Nasmyth illustration of Liverpool Road Station c.1830s
YA 2005.96: Sketch of the Carriages on the Liverpool and Manchester Railway by W. Crane, 1831
YA 2007.41.1.9: Liverpool Road Station Society 1977-1986
YA 2010.16: Fuel efficiency exhibition catalogue, City Hall 22 Nov-2 Dec 1950

YA 2014-3006: Architectural drawing of the proposed new goods warehouse Liverpool Road, Manchester. Undated.

E2019.0032 First Edition of *Manchester Carriers’ Warehouse District, Showing Railway Stations and Positions of Warehouses Within 30 Miles of Manchester* (Chas E Goad Ltd. September 1899).
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Appendix A
Suggestions for the Science and Industry Museum, Manchester

In this appendix, I draw upon thesis research findings to suggest interpretative strategies for the Science and Industry Museum. As a collaborative doctoral student, working at both CHSTM and the Museum, I have held the unique position of observing current practices within the institution at the centre of my historical study. I therefore include practical suggestions for Museum staff beyond the conventional, academic thesis conclusions. This appendix may also prove useful to curators and practitioners working with similar spaces and collections. Here, I suggest wide-ranging techniques for presenting the history of the Station at the present Museum, bearing in mind the physical and intellectual constraints of managing such a vast institution, I reflect on possibilities for interpretation, ranging from minor methodological changes to current practice to those that would require major grant-funding.

Section 1: Freight stores

Addressing the absence of freight from the existing site narrative of Liverpool Road Station has been central to the thesis. I highlighted several factors that complicate the presentation of a unified site story at the Museum. SIM faces the practical constraint of how to reflect operations in their entirety when various structures sit outside the Museum’s boundaries (current buildings are outlined in Figure 1, this can be compared to Station plans in Chapter 2, figures 11 & 15). These include the cattle ramp, Water Street Stables, portions of the viaduct and bridges, the Bonded Warehouse and Accumulator Tower. A further complication of interpreting the site for visitors is those buildings that are no longer extant and spaces which have been rearranged. Yet, there are traces of these in the fabric of the surviving buildings. For example, a sense of the Cotton Warehouses destroyed by fire in 1866 may be given in the 1830 Warehouse; as described in Chapter 2, these three buildings were connected by tramway bridges. Brickwork on Bay 3 reveals where a bridge once connected the 1830 Warehouse with Cotton Warehouse 1.
Stone sleepers were used as vertical supports when the space was blocked up in the 1860s, which provides a distinctive focal point on the Warehouse wall.\textsuperscript{1} Imaginative interpretation of the outside realm could reflect the position of these absent buildings. Contemporary memorialisation of absent structures provide inspiration for this, for example, the immersive ‘Temple of Mithras’ experience at the London Mithraeum Bloomberg SPACE. Here, audio recordings, lighting and haze effects appeal to the senses to reinstate lost elements of the Temple. Light projections around the 1830 Warehouse could reflect the impact of the fire seasonally, potentially on the 23 May anniversary. This suggestion would involve development, artistic input and significant funding.

\textsuperscript{1} The Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit, \textit{The 1830 Warehouse, Liverpool Road Station, Manchester survey report} (GMAU, 1991), Section 7.2 (not paginated).
Figure 1. Museum of Science and Industry CAD Plan Review ‘Upper Yard’ by Watts Group Ltd. Scale 1: 1250, 24 Nov 2016. This shows the current extent of SIM’s 5 core buildings (Image courtesy of SIM).
There are pertinent lessons from the fire in the Cotton Warehouses that could be communicated to the public. There is scope to compare the Cotton Warehouse fire with other large-scale industrial blazes, as well as connect the story with contemporary concerns. For example, investigations into residential properties post-Grenfell and the fire at the Cube in Bolton in November 2019 point to unsafe contents causing ignition of highly flammable cladding. This thesis has shown flammable materials forbidden from storage were inside the Cotton Warehouses, which were known to be at risk due to their timber frames. Drawing visitor attention to the fire story, with devices such as storytelling in person or through an audio tour or mobile application, they may be directed towards extant structures; for example, the cast iron frame of the New Warehouse can be compared with the timber frame of the 1830 ‘Old’ Warehouse. Interpretation of the fire may also present opportunities to collaborate with the local fire service or the Friends of the London Road Fire Station. In the field of urban history, fires and the fire brigades are receiving renewed attention, providing context and analytical frameworks for curators. In terms of the Museum’s STEM remit, local universities textiles departments (such as Bolton University) work on fire retardant smart materials. Temporal comparisons between how firefighting was tackled in the nineteenth century and in the present could meet with STEM objectives and higher education institutions social responsibility goals through outreach events or exhibitionary collaborations. These proposals are relatively low-cost and could be incorporated into partnership working during the annual science festival, for example.

The outcomes of my research focus on freight have implications for the presentation of the New Warehouse; Grade II listed in 1994, this building has been modified the most and has served as the Museum’s main entrance since 1987. Due to the initial use of this space for contemporary and ‘future’ science and the ‘Xperiment!’ Gallery, there has been little interaction between displays and their historic environment. The ‘Textiles Gallery’ provides visitors with an understanding of the textiles coming in and out of Manchester, though the connection between this space – the unloading point for internal rails/platform for transhipping cotton flats has been minimal. This could be remedied with small-scale changes, for example, inclusions in the script used by the Explainer team who demonstrate

---


machinery in the former loading platform. In the process of curating a unified site narrative, the New Warehouse can be used to demonstrate the significance of cotton to the North-West into the twentieth century. I suggest this is important historical detail to aid visitors imagine Manchester beyond the ‘shock city’ phase relayed in popular local histories. SIM’s collections might also be better understood as representing twentieth century technologies of the region, as most machinery displayed in the ‘Textiles Gallery’ were manufactured in either the close of the nineteenth or opening decades of the twentieth.

Section 2 Power and technologies

As outlined in Chapter 2, the introduction of new power systems, especially hydraulic power, reshaped spaces at Liverpool Road and changed working practices. The Station’s hydraulic system pre-dated the city-wide network installed by Manchester Corporation in the 1890s. Through telling this story we can show how Liverpool Road was once again a site reshaped by recent innovations in the 1860s, highlighting the relationship between hydraulic power, the existing steam engines and mains water system. Explaining the co-existence of different methods of power provides the opportunity to counter the traditionally progressive narrative found in science museums. Visitors could be introduced to this story at several locations, though perhaps with the most detail in the ‘Power Hall’, where the Station story could be given equal footing with the Manchester Corporation system (a story most recently told through interpretation of regional pumping machinery, especially the grant-funded accumulator (Y1993.27). Although it is beyond the Museum’s boundaries, the Accumulator Tower in the St John’s development stands with no provenance or explanation – until recently it acted as a plinth to display a Granada Television symbol. With discussions currently taking place regarding a permeable museum boundary along Grape Street, there may be scope to present St John’s developers with a proposal to interpret (be it written, visual or more abstract methods) the role of the Accumulator Tower. By creating new visitor wayfinding, the role of both the Tower and the
Bonded Warehouse to the Station should be signposted to provide a fuller explanation as to how a freight station operated.4

As apparatus powered by the hydraulic system were extant when the Liverpool Road Station Society (LRSS) gained access to the Station, two capstans survive. One is accessioned: Y2000.37.3, and could be displayed as a museum object, the remaining ‘auxiliary’ capstan is not subject to core collections care standards, therefore provides the option of reinstatement in its original context outside. Their original bases are stored in arches beneath the railway line alongside the 1830 Warehouse, with damp, poor conditions for metal objects, restoration of a capstan in situ in the outside realm should be prioritised before the integrity of the bases are compromised. This would, however, be at significant cost and require fundraising. This could be included in masterplanning for the ‘Revolutionary Railroad’ project, proposed new galleries for the Station Building and 1830 Warehouse that currently also includes reinterpretation of the public realm.

Steam power is a major theme running through displays in the ‘Power Hall’ and elsewhere like the ‘Textiles Gallery’. Like hydraulic power, it is not directly related to the site story, except when volunteers recreate the steam locomotive experience on site with ‘Planet’, and then interpretation is usually confined to the ‘oldest in the world’ 1830s passenger narrative. This disconnect could be remedied by highlighting the steam engine installed at the west end of the 1830 Warehouse in 1831, the outline of which can be clearly seen on the wall, particularly on the top floor. This can also be viewed from the outside by visitors along Water Street and could be interpreted on the exterior wall for visitors exploring routes around the Station in mooted wayfinding schemes.

Section 3: Social Spaces

The Air and Space Hall is where flight, and some road transport objects have been consistently displayed since the 1980s. Briefly a museum independent from the GMMSI (explored in Chapter 5, Section 2.2), there has been little modification of the original concept for this space. This Lower Campfield Market Hall is historically significant; it was unusual in operating only briefly as a market, a failure I have explained in Chapter 3. There

4 Interpretation of outside spaces, ‘the outside realm’ and prospective wayfinding schemes were a point of discussion in the ‘Revolutionary Railroad’ Working Group (2017-18).
is enormous scope for exploring social, as well as trade history linked to the Station in this building. It also sites on the Camp Field space, a space of entertainment, markets and protest. The removal of the open meeting space of the Camp Field ties in with the severance of street life from the street by Manchester Corporation. Perhaps most pertinent to SIM’s collections was the re-use of the Market Halls as the City Exhibition Hall from about 1908. The use of this space for trade fairs, for example, showcased to the public the latest innovations in technologies such as the early motor car manufacturers shows – that link with SIM’s early Ford objects and the research outputs of Josh Butt, another SMG PhD student.⁵

The future use of the Lower Campfield Market Hall, as the building is still owned by the City Council, is in doubt. I would, however, advocate some connection of the story between this significant space for trade and fairs with the freight station story. The Shipping Shed was initially designed with plans to connect Liverpool Road Station directly with a market on Camp Field in the 1850s (see Chapter 3, Section 2.3). A brief nod to this is made in existing signage. Yet, the history of the open space and the ever-encroaching Station might be told in a more visual way. In re-imagining the boundaries of SIM, interpretative tours/talks/learning activities could make use of the visual connection with the Air and Space, alternatively, Frederick Shield’s artwork Factory Girls at the Old Clothes Fair, Knott Mill, Manchester showing the rag fair on the Camp Field may be loaned from the collections of Manchester Art Gallery. The original entrance and exit of the Shipping Shed/’Power Hall’ could be used to present an enlargement of this illustration for visitors as they face this direction (Lower Byrom Street) to give the impression of a busy, social space at the edge of the Station. There may be scope for this in the current ‘Power Hall’ redevelopment.

The public houses of Liverpool Road and Water Street were important social spaces, from places where workers went for refreshments to meeting places for the LRSS campaigners. These may seem tangential to the Station story, but one pub provides a unique window into the residential nature of the space upon which the New Warehouse was erected: The Roebuck and Newmarket Inn. Mysteriously surviving the street clearances that made way for the warehouse (despite its inclusion in transfer/title agreements), the Roebuck was

---

open until at least 1922. The museum café occupies the space where the Roebuck effectively adjoined the New Warehouse until its demolition. The café could provide space to reflect upon this, considering there is little material evidence of the Roebuck, there may be scope to display SMG artworks, images or artefacts that pertain to contemporaneous public houses as signifiers of this story. A local story of the brewing industry could be told in this space using SIM’s Boddington’s collection (although most material is late twentieth century, Y2006.4.2 is reportedly the ‘first’ barrel). Furthermore, archival research may indicate which brewery supplied the Roebuck.

Through reviewing earlier plans for a re-created street scene, there is an opportunity to represent the experience of everyday life around the site. The urgent salvage of back-to-back houses from Dean Street and Walkers Buildings in Manchester led to the acquisition of three properties in their entirety with only a tentative plan for resurrection beside the New Warehouse. The original intention, of wholesale rebuilding of these properties, would be highly problematic as highlighted in Chapter 5, this would present the challenge of interpreting buildings translocated from their historic environment (as often occurs at living history museums). The back-to-back houses do, however, present a significant body of original archaeological material from the 1790s to early 1800s and may yet be used to signify the workers dwelling that once stood all around the Station. As disposal is a current risk for this collection, there is scope to re-use some of this material in an artistic intervention at an outside space where houses once stood, highlighting the destructive consequences of railway construction without requiring the reconstruction of the buildings in their entirety. Displacement is a highly pertinent theme locally, from the destruction of post-War housing in Hulme to stories of forced migration and refugees in Manchester.

The Station Master’s House is an example of a significant domestic and social space at the Station which has not been interpreted for the public. It is probably the first example of a railway worker’s residence leased by a Railway Company. Home to Joseph Green, Superintendent (Station Master) from 1830 to 1847, Green witnessed the success of the first railway and oversaw its transition into a purely freight operation. It was Green who

---

6 Ordinance Survey, County Series 25 inches to 1 mile: Lancashire, sheet CIV.10, 1922 (no longer marked public house by the 1932 OS Map)

7 Jack Simmons, The Victorian Railway (Thames & Hudson, London, 1991), p.66 - Simmons notes the earliest contract drawings for a purpose-built station master’s house and crossing keeper’s cottage was by the GJR in 1835. The Station Master’s House, built in 1808, originally home to John Rothwell of the Rothwell Harrison dyeworks, is the earliest house re-made for a railway family.
corresponded with Company directors, reporting everything from theft on the line and staff misbehaviour to the local Chartist disorder. Green’s would be an excellent point of view through which to present the site story to visitors, but also through his family and servants we can gather glimpses of the lived experience of the women and children who effectively lodged alongside a dangerous industrial space, with the unique position of being at the top of the railway worker’s social hierarchy. The building itself spans the entire life cycle of the Station, as it was a domestic residence prior to the LMR. After Greene, a reduced space was leased to subsequent Station agents until the final occupant, Chief Inspector Fletcher, left in 1928 when the building was leased to a butcher and then became a car parts shop. R. Slate’s Butchers directly faced the Water Street cattle ramp and the Corporation’s slaughterhouse further down the road: this small area represents a microcosm of the meat industry in the City. Unfortunately, making the Station Master’s House publicly accessible would require major investment only possible through a major grant. As during the 1980s, the House is likely to slip below priorities for visitor access to the adjoining Station Building.

Section 4: Animals

With the focus of SIM’s collections on technological and scientific developments, largely across the last two hundred years, little has led gallery narratives towards animals. Horsepower was briefly employed to communicate the advancement of mechanical engineering in the ‘Power Hall’, with focus on speed rather than how and why horses were formerly employed for cartage. So, how might we tell the story of working animals, particularly horses, and the livestock of Liverpool Road? The absence of structures hinders this story; museum stores were instated in the 1980s in the former stables beneath the ‘Pineapple line’ viaduct and are due to be given over to the adjacent Factory development and SIM’s forthcoming temporary exhibition gallery (at the basement level of the New Warehouse). The 1843 ‘pig landing station’ along the Charles Street/Grape Street boundary was removed in the 1860s, and the iron roofed c.1870 Pig Station on Water Street is also lost. It may be that the ‘Power Hall’, which is currently undergoing redevelopment, is the best place to present working horse history (as I believe is under consideration). Photographs from the 1950s from the Ministry of Works give a great visual explanation of how draught horses were employed, there is also some personal material on Walter
Bowmen of the cartage department in SIM’s Archive collection (see Chapter 2, Section 3). 

By highlighting the contemporaneous use of horses and motor vehicles for goods transportation, visitors can be shown how different haulage methods and power technologies worked alongside each other and weren’t used in a neat, linear succession.

The pigs are more difficult to present, as they have left no material trace at the Station. This is a pertinent story in this era of consumer responsibility for food ‘air miles’, the pigs present the import of livestock from Ireland. Prior to the railways, the movement of live animals for consumption was problematic with pigs, which lost weight at a disproportionate rate in transit. The Irish pig traffic on the LMR was an innovation in food transport, though faced continuing competition from waterways. Interpretation of this may suit wider freight narratives addressing types of goods in the 1830 Warehouse.

A novel occurrence at the Station was the transportation of animals for circuses, like those of Bostock’s menagerie shown in Chapter 3, Figure. 15. Exotic animals can be used to show wider uses of freight transportation to visitors and provide a tangible yet unusual scene. The story provides a sense of scale, but also details such as the weight of large animals might be considered against the weight of goods usually moved on the railways – providing a route into STEM education content for younger audiences. The circus animals also provide a parallel story to the migration of people (discussed in ‘the world’ section), taking visitors beyond the local to the global in their imagining of Liverpool Road Station. The most obvious location for the circus animals’ story is outside, as the image from Railway Magazine in Chapter 3 indicated, they were unloaded from wagons in the upper yard. This might figure around the Gantry (which could provide some connection with the use of the travelling crane for lifting and unloading heavy goods) or alongside the New Warehouse. The unique and visual nature of these animals would lend themselves to a sculpture or other 3D artwork. This too may apply to the pigs and horses, which could stand in locations relevant to this story in the public realm. Again, this level of interpretive intervention would require bespoke fundraising or incorporation into a major grant-funded project.

---


9 Roger Scola, Feeding the Victorian City: The food supply of Manchester, 1770-1870 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992), p.52
Section 5: Things

There is scope for further research on goods that came in and out of Liverpool Road, although in this thesis I have touched upon many commodities omitted from current explorations of the site story. A great benefit of including more on ‘things’ or ‘stuff’ is there are many continuities between nineteenth and twentieth century products received at the Station and everyday life today.\(^\text{10}\) Certain brands are recognisable from the twentieth century; for example, Weetabix vans lined up along the lower yard to receive shipments from the 1830 Warehouse and biscuit’s (believe to be Crawford’s) occupied the ground floor of the Bonded Warehouse by the 1960s.\(^\text{11}\) These brands archives may produce further insights into how the commodities were stored/transferred at Liverpool Road, and, in a commercial sense, these manufacturers may wish to highlight their heritage and contribute to related interpretation at SIM.

Figure 2. Photograph of the interior of the Shipping Shed at Liverpool Road Station, showing staff loading vans with boxes of goods including tobacco, 1934 (NRM: 1997-7409).

\(^{10}\) There is a vast literature on material culture and objects; for examples of approaches to objects as ‘things’ see: Sandra H. Dudley (ed.), *Museum Objects: Experiencing the Properties of Things*, (Hoboken: Taylor and Francis, 2012).

\(^{11}\) Details of the Weetabix vans were gleaned from informal discussions with the public ahead of my oral history recordings and should be verified; annotations on uses of each floor detailed in SIM Archive: First Edition of *Manchester Carriers’ Warehouse District, Showing Railway Stations and Positions of Warehouses Within 30 Miles of Manchester* (Chas E Goad Ltd. September 1899) show the biscuits.
Contrasts can be drawn with things that are no longer popular or considered unusual. For example, in the mid-twentieth century, tobacco and cigarettes were unloaded in the Shipping Shed and swiftly packed into vans for circulation across Manchester and Cheshire newsagents. The commonality of vast tobacco shipments could be used to highlight changes in consumer habits instigated by changes in public health messages and legislation. There is also potential for exploring this theme with objects from the National Railway Museum, which highlight smoking culture on passenger railways. Similarly, the types and origins of alcohol stored under bond at the Station may also lend itself to interpretation of changing fashions and trends in drinking habits. Several locations across SIM may be used for these stories, from the warehouses and spaces vans were loaded to the Shipping Shed. The ‘Power Hall’ galley in the Shipping Shed is an obvious location where the circulation of consumer products can be considered alongside railway narratives. In Figure 2, staff have been captured by a photographer loading vans with goods, including tobacco boxes. The details of workers and products in this image provides source material to show how the space was used to the public through new interpretation, which curators are currently developing as a part of a major re-display project.

Section 6: Connections

The connection of Liverpool and Manchester by the railway is well trodden territory in the Station Building, yet there are many stories or networks and connectivity absent from current interpretation. The electric telegraph was a technology bound with the notions of the annihilation of time and space alongside the railway. Material uncovered researching this thesis shows that in 1849 staff were unhappy about the lack of telegraph connection between Liverpool Road and their partner stations including Ordsall Lane. LNWR General Manager, Mark Huish identified the practical advantage of the telegraph for the running of freight operations in 1854 (see Chapter 2, Section 1.3). This instance highlights the time lag between the commercial application of this technology and its use for internal operations. Telegraphy could be demonstrated in an interactive exhibit, whereby visitors generate a telegraph. A gallery inside the Station Building would be an ideal location as this story can guide visitors from the passenger period to the goods office uses of this building post-1844.

---

thus providing a longer view of the Station’s history and role in circulating goods in Manchester.

It is also easy to perceive the Station as an independent structure, the Manchester end of the bilateral LMR. Yet, as I have demonstrated, goods stations worked in micro/smaller networks within the wider railway network. Liverpool Road was the ‘parent’ station of Ordsall Lane, Cross Lane and Duncan Street. A further way in which the Station was interconnected with other places in Manchester was the onward transport methods. For passengers, the omnibuses or hackney carriages that took them into the Manchester, whilst parcel vans, mail couriers and carts of goods traversed Manchester. A significant connection was with the LMR booking offices on Market Street. In interpretation, drawing attention to the different types of transport around the Station and their routes across the Victorian city would explain Liverpool Road Station’s role as the entrance to the City (see Chapter 3, Introduction on the railway station/city gate analogy). Maps seem an obvious tool for this interpretation, though personal testimony of movement, demonstration of how the booking offices and freight offices worked can also present interconnectivity.

Of the railway network itself, there has been so much emphasis placed upon the Liverpool and Manchester line, its connection via the Grand Junction Railway at Warrington directly to Birmingham and then London Euston is overlooked. The other stations at Curzon Street and the famous Euston arch have been memorialised independently, which often serves to sever the history of stations from their wider railway networks context. Liverpool Road connection the junction line to Victoria Station in May 1844 was a link in the first rail connection between the east and west coasts (see Chapter 2 Section 1.3) as the line from Victoria linked Liverpool and Manchester with Leeds and on to Hull. Applauded at the time for connecting the country’s seaports, this resonates with current proposals to improve west to east communications in the north of England as part of the ‘Northern Powerhouse’. As the HS2 and HS3 projects develop, highlighting this heritage at SIM could provide the public with historical context to current debates. This could be achieved through exhibition content as a part of the ‘Revolutionary Railroad’ project.


Section 7: The World

Museums are becoming increasingly confident at confronting difficult histories. Racism was rife in responses to migration in the Victorian city, simian descriptions of the Irish was a common trope across the period, as were comparisons to pigs; there is connection to the Liverpool Road story here, as the first point of entry into the City for Irish pig traffic across the nineteenth century. The influx of pigs – perceived by health officials as degrading the street of the city, was compared with refugees of the Irish famine. Through bringing this story to the fore, SIM could engage with difficult histories of everyday racism and challenge current prejudices.

Global stories can also be found in the people of Liverpool Road and the surrounding neighbourhood. Records relating to the annual Knott Mill Fair held on the Camp Field (site of the current ‘Air and Space Hall’), show recurrent visits to the area of certain circuses and traveller groups, which may be further explored in collaboration with the National Fairground Archive. Racism and othering in the nineteenth century can be broached in relation to the Fair, as, for example, a version of the Hottentot Venus was displayed as a human zoo exhibit. Visitors may be shocked to discover that people as well as animals were displayed in this way, again, a difficult history, for which consultation with the public would be important to avoid tokenistic display. Museums that deal directly with the history of slavery and racism (such as the International Slavery Museum in Liverpool) may offer support and advice on how this could be incorporated into social history displays on the Station and the City in the forthcoming ‘Revolutionary Railroad’ project.

A way of de-centring the 1830s Liverpool Road Station story is through Patrick Greene’s work on the Baltic timbers used in the construction of the 1830 Warehouse: a building perceived as a local achievement had international origins. This was the starting point for the 1830 Warehouse interpretation but has been lost amongst the galleries the building hosts. The Station Building itself was the subject of fascination to international visitors for over one hundred years ago. In a narrative sparse with diversity to say the least, the significance of the Station in world history could be shown through the eyes of a visitor.

---

15 Sadiah Qureshi, ‘Displaying Sara Baartman, the ‘Hottentot Venus’’, History of Science vol.42 no.2 (Jun 2004), pp.233-257.
from the Indian State Railways, Japan or America on pilgrimage to the ‘oldest railway station in the world’, thus informing visitors of the global influence of the LMR.

Closing statement

The Science and Industry Museum’s history is littered with original, yet un-realised grand plans, including those aimed at addressing issues raised here, from global narratives to the freight story. By cross consulting this Appendix with chapters 4 and 5, the complex history of site interpretation, as well as patterns and repetitions are evident. Yet, material across this entire thesis provides curatorial, exhibitions and learning staff with unparalleled detail of the history of the Station and Museum that can feed directly into practice. I include this Appendix of suggestions, some of which are idealistic or require large capital sums to achieve, in the hope that at least some absent narrative points – particularly from the freight history the Station – might be introduced by staff interpreting the site to visitors in the future.