Original scientific paper
Submitted: 20. 6. 2024.
Accepted: 30. 9. 2024.
DOI: 10.15176/vol61no24
UDK 71
67/68

APPROACHING BMW, BAYERNHAFEN AND THE ULJANIK SHIPYARD: A BRIEF STUDY OF THE "SPATIAL PRACTICES" IN THREE INDUSTRIAL SPACES

BORIS KOROMAN
Faculty of Philosophy, Juraj Dobrila University of Pula
Centre for Cultural and Historical Research of Socialism

The aim of this article is to analyze the specific experience of visiting active industrial spaces and to describe the ways in which different industrial spaces communicate with their urban and social environment. Three examples of such interactions and spatial experiences are examined in the article: the BMW 6.10 Plant and the Danube River cargo port Bayernhafen, both located in Regensburg, Germany, and the Uljanik Shipyard in Pula, Croatia. Throughout the search for a methodological framework, certain analytical hubs are recognized and used as the foundation for and a frame of reference from which an observation, description and autoethnographic *moves* can be performed, and the analysis initiated. Following a brief introductory overview, a presentation of the experiences of visiting industrial facilities follows. This is followed by a comparison and further analysis.

Keywords: factories, industrial spaces, industrial anthropology, spatial anthropology

HOW TO APPROACH ACTIVE INDUSTRIAL SPACES

The concept of space is such a complex topic that there are many disciplines and subdisciplines from the vast field of the humanities that approach it from different positions. For instance, space is one of the key topics in anthropology, human geography, cultural studies, and also an important concept in sociology.[1] In light of this, it appears a little

[1] This article is the result of research in 2019 during the now-completed bilateral project "Unwanted Heritage. Remembering and Forgetting Industry in Istria" (Croatia-Germany, 2018–2019). Several circum-

odd that fundamental research or classic case studies on the specific subject of active industrial spaces (factories, plants, shipyards, ports, etc.) in the industrialized developed countries (of the West) are somewhat hard to find. With this obstacle and challenge in mind, it is reasonably clear that a short and schematic introduction is needed in order to clear the pathway through the disciplinary, thematic, methodological and epistemological knots within the web of research into space.

A few examples would be useful to illustrate the point: the subdiscipline of industrial anthropology focuses mainly on "1) organizational behavior and management, 2) ethnographically informed design of products, services, and systems, and 3) consumer behavior and marketing" (Baba 2006: 106); industrial spaces are therefore not in its focus. Many thought-provoking ideas on factories from Tim Ingold's works, *The Perception of the Environment* (Ingold 2000) for example, which seemed a valuable starting point for this kind of research, belong to the domains of industrial anthropology as described. Manuel Castells' studies that address the topic of industry (e.g., Castells 1978, 1996; Castells and Hall 1994), remain within the framework of a sociological methodology and his research does not address the specific (anthropological) experience of industrial spaces. There are anthropological studies of post-industrial spaces that indeed do approach the topic with a critical theory woven into its methodology (see e.g. Vaccaro, Harper and Murray ed. 2015), but again, it also seems that research into post-industrial spaces is based on completely different "field" properties than that of active industrial spaces. Post-industrial spaces are not (as extensively) restricted; they are, or can be, spaces that can be accessed relatively easily and then further reimagined (Potkonjak and Škrbić Alempijević 2023), in a successful (Acksel 2023) or failed way (Gilette 2022). They can in certain contexts be approached as "heritage" spaces (Golinowska 2021). In active industrial spaces, factories and plants, however, a set of strict rules applies to access and movement within them, and these restrictions and the policies regarding such regulations are an aspect that is considered and problematized in this paper.

Certain approaches to factories from the field of urban geography acknowledge that "[i]n contrast to the term city, the term factory is rather consistently defined throughout literature" (Herrmann et al. 2020: 765). This again reveals a problem: during the research conducted for this paper the familiarity and "ordinariness" of active factory spaces is observed, questioned, and challenged, not something considered as "consistent" and easy to describe: the research will show that factory spaces are in fact places of ambiguity and friction.

The effort to establish a methodological framework in this paper was guided by the following questions: which analytical tools would be effective to allow something that looks like a mere description and depiction could be the basis for more complex analyses,

stances are different: e.g. the status of the Uljanik Shipyard and the temporary suspension of factory tours at the BMW plant in Regensburg, which are all clearly mentioned in the article. Everything else either did not change or could not affect the results of this research.

then, what the object of observation is and how the point of view in this observation is constructed and directed, and, finally, how to interpret one's own experiences in spaces, especially contradictory, uneasy and unexpected ones. It seems that from the various methodological and epistemological focal points, some directions, signposts, certain ideas and concepts usable for analysis can be recognized.

One method is to somehow return to the "classics": De Certeau's chapter *Walking in the City* and his view of the city as a "clear text of the planned and readable city" (de Certeau 1988: 93) is an inspiring general starting position for a more profound observation of space. Augé's concept of places and non-places seems quite useful when describing levels of experiences in approaching various industrial facilities, in the attempt to identify certain characteristics of spaces that may resemble his notion of "non-places", but in this case, more importantly, the ones that may act as "anthropological places" (Augé 1995: 51), those "places of identity, of relations and history" (ibid.: 52). The latter are exactly the places that seem to be very significant for both citizens and researchers.

Henri Lefebvre's writings in *The Production of Space* (Lefebvre 1991) and his "analytical levels" introduced in *Right to the City* (1996: 104–118) and *The Urban Revolution* (2003), especially the notions of *isotopia*, utopia and *heterotopia*, also one of Michel Foucault's key ideas in his essay on "other spaces" or "different places" (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986), seem to aid in the construction of a profound web of notions usable here. These concepts, especially the idea of heterotopia, are activated due to the experiences of visiting active industrial spaces. Some of the described spaces, in their entirety, activate strong impressions of ostensible difference or discord, whereas others do so only in some of their aspects or points. Some places evoke ambivalent and uneasy feelings, feelings of spatial or temporal displacement that cannot always be characterized only as liminality. This is the point where reflection begins, and the term heterotopia is introduced.

The notion of heterotopia is important, but vague, "briefly sketched and somewhat confusing" (Johnson 2006: 75), complex and very inspiring: "the notion has provoked many interpretations and applications across a range of disciplines" (ibid.), and Peter Johnson is one of the researchers who devoted his work to the explanation of this productive concept of Foucault's. Therefore, in this paper, the concept is approached in such a way that some of the more clearly defined elements that can make space seem like heterotopias, which Foucault lists and describes in his famous essay, are recognized in the analyzed examples. Heterotopias are "counter-sites" (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986: 3), "places [that] are absolutely different from all the sites that they reflect and speak about" (ibid.: 4), they "draw us out of ourselves" (ibid.: 3; Johnson 2006: 84) and "display and inaugurate a difference and challenge the space in which we may feel at home" (ibid.: 84). These quotes aim to clarify why, despite the vagueness, heterotopia is used here.

In David Harvey's notable study, *The Condition of Postmodernity*, the complex "grid" of spatial practices is introduced (1991: 218–222). This complex network overlaps and extends Henry Lefebvre's model of the three "dimensions of space" ("material spatial

practice", "representation of space", "spaces of representation") from his canonical book, published in 1974, *The Production of Space* (1991). David Harvey also adds to Lefebvre's dimensions four aspects of spatial practices (also crossing them and thus forming a grid): "Accessibility and distance", "Appropriation and use of space", "Domination and control of space", and "Production of space" (Harvey 1991: 219–222).

This grid is a kind of roadmap that summarizes different ways in which spaces can be analytically approached and through which even basic, material descriptions of spaces can be made meaningful. For example: "[m]aterial spatial practices refer to the physical and material flows, transfers, and interactions that occur in and across space in such a way as to assure production and social reproduction" (ibid.: 218), or: "[r]epresentations of space encompass all of the signs and significations, codes and knowledge, that allow such material practices to be talked about and understood" (ibid.). At the intersections of "material spatial practices", which Harvey takes from Lefebvre, and, for example, "domination and control of spaces", which is Harvey's addition, Harvey sets the following terms as illustrative examples of what the grid is about: "land uses and built environments, property, state and administrative divisions of space, production of physical infrastructures and so on" (ibid.: 220). In this way, descriptions of spaces, and their basic features, such as land property, divisions or designations, invoke and relate to the more complex ones, such as "representations", "imaginary", experiences and emotions ("fear", "familiarity – unfamiliarity") (ibid.), and, further, they activate, or are activated, within more complex analyses that include history, economic and social relations.

The paper is structured as follows: the first section briefly introduces the industrial areas and the cities where they are located, with their differences and similarities presented, as well as the reasons for their comparison. This is followed by three examples of visits to industrial spaces, where the emphasis is on descriptions of "material spatial practices" along with a presentation of personal experiences of the visits. The concluding section highlights certain aspects of these industrial spaces resulting from the approach and visits to them, especially the experiences of otherness, difference, discordancy and displacement. The concepts of "anthropological place" and "heterotopia" will be used in these concluding remarks. It will be attempted, within the scope of the analysis, to refer to the relation of the historical, social and economic context with the way in which spatial practices are organized in the specific examples.

TWO CITIES, THREE DIFFERENT PLACES

The aim of this paper is to undertake a description of how three different industrial spaces communicate with their urban and social environment; more specifically, how the communication between industrial places and a non-industrial environment, both urban and human, is organized. Although industrial spaces are restricted areas that are frequently

gated, guarded, fenced, and closed off to non-employed citizens, a variety of interactions between those urban spaces and regular citizens can occur in either structured or informal ways. Examples of such interactions are provided in a brief description of those spaces, followed by a depiction of organized visits to those industrial facilities and finally through the other forms of communication between the industry and citizens.

The three industrial locations described in this paper are situated in two very different cities in two countries in the EU. The first industrial space is the Uljanik Shipyard in Pula, Croatia, almost 170 years old, a historically significant industrial facility, which has been thoroughly researched from various perspectives. The Uljanik Shipyard with its specialized factories and with a wide net of subcontractors was a tremendously important company, the decline of which in the last few years has transformed it into a sad, faded symbol of the entire city of Pula.

Bearing in mind Uljanik's significance, the task of this research was to look for comparable examples, close enough to enable comparison but also somewhat different. The other two facilities analyzed in this article are situated in one of the most industrially developed countries in the European Union, Germany, but it seems that they do not hold as much symbolic value and significance for their community as Uljanik. The symbolic significance of Uljanik can be revealed already from the basic knowledge about the place, which can be derived from the abundant "discursive representation" (Harvey 1991: 220–221) of Pula's shipyard. In many publications on the history of Pula, the establishment of the navy shipyard is recognized as a crucial point in the development of the city (cf. Balota 1960; Dukovski 2011), a number of research articles have been written about Uljanik (that will be referred to below), and in many of them, the significance of Pula's shipyard in forming the identity of its citizens is highlighted. Moreover, Uljanik can integrate its identity as one of the symbols of Pula into the representation aimed towards the visitors, with shipyard's cranes used as a popular tourist attraction, and so on. Such a "discursive representation" and basic knowledge cannot be recognized or confirmed for either of the Regensburg examples. Although they are historically part of the century old industries that emerged around World War I (Götschmann 2010: 292, 524), the very spaces and facilities analyzed here are part of a bigger chain of industry (Bavarian cargo ports and BMW automobile factories) (ibid.), and they somehow seem "generic", heavy, stable, both with significantly less symbolic burden than Uljanik.

This marked difference, the difference in the significance of the industry, can stand as a solid argument for the possibility of comparison. The search for similarities and differences that can be observed between such two types of spaces, in their organization of material spatial practices as well as in the actual experiences of those industrial spaces, can lead us in several directions. It might reveal and point to a complex and dynamic network of relations between aspects of the economy, public sphere, urban organization of space, and identity, and it can also show that most industrial spaces, regardless of their symbolic burden, share some common elements.

While searching for industries and industrial spaces that could be compared with Uljanik, several aspects were in focus, the first being obviously, the topic of the essay – the opportunity to approach them, through organized visits as the main possibility. In the case of the BMW plant, the most pronounced comparable element was that of the heavy manufacturing industry, and in the case of Bayernhafen Regensburg it was the location of the industry in a coastal and port area.

Furthermore, the cities in which the industrial spaces are located are also hardly similar or comparable. Pula and Regensburg are indeed both medium urban centers within the larger regions of their countries. This is the point: if one can exclude the two cities' rich past on the Roman imperial periphery, then almost all the similarities they share seem exhausted. They are cities with an entirely different historical urban development. Pula, once an unimportant town on the edge of a great South European center – the Venetian Republic, owes its growth and development to another, Central European empire – the Austro-Hungarian one (see Dukovski 2011). The Habsburg empire had and implemented an ambitious plan to develop and create Pula, in the "Pula experiment" (Nefat 2004: 190), as its most valuable military port with its military navy shipyard.

It is important to note here that Pula based its growth and historical development in both the 19th and the early 20th century in its strong relation with very closed spaces and restricted areas, both industrial and military (Falski 2019; Petrović 2021). It is one of the fundamental layers of Pula's identity and in a Lefebvrian model of the "city as an *oevre*" (Lefebvre 1996: 101), these "prohibited" (Lefebvre 1991: 294), forbidden places are the core of Pula's spatial urban identitarian formation.

Regensburg developed as a mercantile, manufacturing, cultural center and, at particular points in time, it was even the capital city of another empire – the Holy Roman Empire (1594–1806). Urban development in Regensburg was structured, built on complex feudal relations in early modern Bavaria and based on mercantile economic relations, transport, and communication.[2] While industrialization in Bavaria was solid and thorough (see Götschmann 2010), Regensburg was left out of this process, it was not part of "the Munich phenomenon"[3] (Castells and Hall 1994) and was excluded from the industrial significance of Upper Bavaria. Interestingly, this fact certainly contributed to its recognizable urban preservation – as a target of minor importance, Regensburg was largely spared from the Allied bombings during World War II, which contributed to the preservation of its famous medieval town, now

[2] The notable 19th century private postal service has its origin in Regensburg where it was established by the town's main aristocratic family, the Thurn und Taxis. This alternative postal service was a great inspiration for the American postmodernist writer Thomas Pynchon in his novel *The Crying of Lot 49* (1966).

[3] In the book *Technopoles of the World*, Hall and Castells (1994) analyze the phenomenon of technopoles, cities that become centers of high-tech industry after the World War II. One of their examples of cities that are transformed in this way is Munich, which, after World War II became the "high-tech capital" of Europe (ibid.: 177). Such a development occurred due to a series of "unusual circumstances" and not by "conscious planning", as the authors explain in the chapter on this "Munich phenomenon" (ibid.: 172–182) (in relation to the "Cambridge phenomenon"). While this progress strongly affected certain regions of the Federal State of Bavaria, Regensburg was, however, left out of this process.

a UNESCO World Heritage Site. It was in the last few decades of the 20th century (from the 1980s onward) that an industrial surge occurred in Regensburg with the opening of the BWM facility, and later other high-tech companies (Köhler ed. 2007: 95–97). Today, culture and tourism may be recognized as important and valuable branches of the economy of both cities, accompanied by specific elements that such an urban identity produces.

The three industrial spaces approached and analyzed in this article are located in different parts of the two towns. The location of the Uljanik Shipyard and the Bayernhafen Regensburg are comparable: both are situated relatively near the center of their respective towns and at the waterfront (the seacoast in Pula and the riverbank in Regensburg). This is an important similarity but there are also significant differences: the Uljanik Shipyard, although situated at the very center and visible from the city center – the public Roman square in the old town – is a structure that is contiguous to the public urban structure, it does not belong to the urban fabric. Uljanik is fenced, walled, and closed, while the Regensburg port is not walled and is accessible (with the exclusion of certain dangerous cargo points). The BMW plant, on the other hand, is located outside the city of Regensburg, in a designated industrial area with an excellent traffic connection by road and rail, outside the reach of the historical urban fabric. The BMW plant is a secured location, with its fence mitigated by roads and concealed by bushes and trees.

The main thing that connects all three industrial spaces is that they are vast. This quantitative fact was also what motivated the analysis in this paper. These industrial spaces cannot be unseen – they consume a great area of urban or suburban space and therefore one's relation to such grand spatial features is unavoidable.

In addition to their vastness, there were several additional motives that led to the idea of comparing these three spaces. The first is simple researcher curiosity focused on the possibilities of comparing places from two different contexts – the German examples come from the very core of capitalism, while Uljanik is located on its periphery, founded and formed within different socio-economic circumstances and closed down during the post-socialist era.

Furthermore, strong motivation for comparing these three spaces derives from my own specific position. On the one hand, Pula is a space that I know very well, being familiar with the city, its history and the society where Uljanik is situated. On the other hand, I am encountering the two remaining spaces for the first time. Their characteristics might be comparable to Uljanik, but they are situated and part of a society to which I have only recently started partially belonging, if the EU is taken to be the context of belonging. And that, again, is a perspective from the periphery. The view from the periphery is complex and burdened with various contradictions: it represents the position of simultaneous belonging and non-belonging; it is a position of being the object of peripheralization (often in Balkanist or CEE[4] frame of reference) while at the same time being part of the First World.

[4] Central and Eastern Europe.

It is a position of "instability, deprivation, constant change on the margins of power" as well as a position that has certain "strategic advantages" that can be interpreted as a "privilege" (Obad 2014: 35–36). It is a view that must acknowledge the "dialectical construction of ideas" and assume "asymmetrical relations" (Kojanić 2020). In an effort to articulate the "theory from the peripheries", Ognjen Kojanić suggests a "relational approach" to the concept of the periphery, supporting abundant possibilities of post-socialist anthropology that "can be one of the foundations for the anthropology of European peripheries that studies geographies of capitalism characterized by constantly shifting centers and peripheries" (ibid.: 59). This is the latent "privilege" of a view from the periphery – the position of a specific experience that is both well researched and self-reflected can produce new insights, but: "it is not enough to locate oneself on the periphery; one has to look back at the center and the way that the peripheral position itself is produced, too" (ibid.: 61). The attempt to direct the view at the center is one of the ideas in this paper and I believe that at the meeting points of these complex personal focuses with the actual industrial places, something analytically interesting could occur.

Bearing all this in mind, the question at issue in this cultural comparative field research is: how can "a common citizen", a "civilian", a non-authorized person, approach industrial spaces in Pula and Regensburg? In this context, the term "approach" is both literal and symbolic; it refers to a physical approach as well to aspects of communication between the industrial areas and their urban environment and the communication between industry and the citizen. The research introduces additional questions: what kind of experience is produced by an encounter with the industrial space? Which company's policies influence the possibilities of approach to their industrial spaces? Are such practices in any way related to the company structure and the organization of each company, i.e., to their ownership and management, or are they related to the urban development overall? These questions guiding the research in this article are mainly influenced by Harvey/Lefebvre's "grid of spatial practices" (Harvey 1991: 220–221), as mentioned earlier. And some of them will be left open and unanswered.

THE ULJANIK SHIPYARD, PULA, CROATIA
ULJANIK BRODOGRADILIŠTE D.D., FLACIUSOVA 1, P.P. 114, 52100 PULA, HRVATSKA

The Uljanik Shipyard, located near the very center of the Old Town in Pula, was a place of great significance to the local community. Pula's urban growth and development was closely intertwined with the founding of the military shipyard in 1856 by the Austro-Hungarian empire. After a century and a half of different historical and socio-economic circumstances, from the Austro-Hungarian empire, the Italian fascist state, the Socialist Yugoslavia to the Republic of Croatia and the restoration of capitalism, Uljanik remained the town's largest industry, with changes in its situation, owners and forms of manage-

ment. In Croatia, Uljanik was a shareholder company but with various, very different equity shares. At the time, the company was primarily managed by a network of managers and representatives of political power (see Hodges 2019). Today, in 2024, Uljanik is a company in bankruptcy searching for a way to survive.[5]

A significant development of Uljanik took place after World War II, due to the importance of Pula in the new Yugoslav socialist state (Nefat 2004). During that period, Uljanik was continuously a pillar of Pula's industrialization. Production as well as employment surged in the 1960s and 1970s (Dukovski 2011: 259–262), when Uljanik began handling more ambitious projects such as gigantic tankers (Matošević 2023). The complexity of the shipyard's system, as described in the ethnography of the organization in the case of Rijeka's Treći maj Shipyard (Puljar D'Alessio 2018), was something that also pertained to the Uljanik Shipyard. In Uljanik's case, "the city within the city" produced a distinctive identity construct – that of the "Uljanikovac" (a worker in Uljanik). This identity was thoroughly represented in the notable documentary *The Rust Years* (*Godine hrđe*, 2000) by Andrej Korovljev – Uljanik's workers often refer to the Uljanik "wall" and the Uljanik "gate" (*kapija*) which represent both a real, formal as well as a symbolic and psychological border[6] that divides these two cities, these two different spaces – the industrial and the civil. In the documentary the harsh double identity of Uljanik's workers is emphasized: "to the outer world we are unapparent and unnecessary", says one of them.

This Uljanik's situation is thus unique: it has a recognizable contradictory identity. In this particular case it may be important to notice that despite Uljanik's strong interconnections with Pula and its development, despite the fact that a significant percentage of its citizens were working or were somehow connected to the shipbuilding industry (at times approximately 30,000 (Dukovski 2011: 261)), Uljanik was always a special "place", yet distinct and inaccessible, almost forbidden – the "other" place. Following this logic, it is not unusual that there were only a few circumstances when the common citizen could approach the specific industrial space of Uljanik: the two main official occasions until 2019, the year of Uljanik's closure, were the launching of ships and the Uljanik Run.

The launching of ships occurred periodically and depended on the shipyard's building dynamic. Contrary to the expectations that take into account the importance and complexity of Pula's shipbuilding industry, in the 21st century these particular events that simultaneously represented the culmination and the epilogue of the shipbuilding process with a public show(ing) of the final product, were neither well organized nor exclusive nor highly formal, and were not even adequately advertised to the public. From a citizen's point of view (the author included) this event would appear as a massive public walk of citizens, often accompanied by their children, through the famous Uljanik gate, a symbolic border. It was a walk of a few hundred meters to the launching site, situated on the docks, uncharted and undecorated, with no special security measures or seats, even without the launching

[5] Links to the documents on Uljanik's owner structure and recent changes are listed in the bibliography.

[6] Note that there is an article on the "ontological status" of the Uljanik Wall (Wegenschimmel 2020).

site specially marked. A visitor would simply find themselves in some random area in the industrial site, among rails, cranes, huge machines (switched off, obviously), boxes, tools, rigs, bolts and scraps – and at the edge of the waterfront. The event's culmination was the ship being pushed to sea, and after cheering and applause, visitors would leave the area in an anticlimactic closure of the event. This was exactly my experience on such occasions, which I was able to share with a variety of my fellow citizens.

A different type of event was the Uljanik Run, an annual sporting event initiated in 1983. A prominent and agile Sport and Recreational department of the Uljanik Shipyard – The Composite Organization of Associated Labour (COAL), thus named during the socialist era, organized the event during the 1980s. The race soon became a tradition, surviving political and economic transformations during the decades. The last marathon was a very modest affair, held in October 2019, with the permission from Uljanik's insolvency administrator. Only one year prior, the Uljanik Run was a routinely well-organized sporting event with participants competing in different categories, from school children, amateur sports enthusiasts from athletic clubs to senior citizens and disabled persons.[7] The citizen's approach to the industrial area during the Uljanik Run followed clear organizational parameters: a registration area, info sites, the podium, signage, barricades, a marathon route etc. The race as a sporting event was in focus and the industrial space was only its background and its stage. I can however confirm from personal experience that the race produced emotional responses, and as parents were able to share with their children their previous experiences of racing through the shipyard that had clear community importance, the marathon grew into an extraordinary event. It felt almost like a sort of initiation into the "secrets" of the city, an exclusive approach to the "forbidden" place, which was, at the same time, the workplace of many fathers, uncles, neighbors and other close people. With almost four decades of continuity, the Uljanik Run was a transgenerational experience with a role in shaping the citizen's identity in relation to the shipyard.

Besides the example of the Uljanik Run, the shipyard communicated with the citizens and the city of Pula in several other ways. The most notable media was probably the factory newspaper "Bilten Uljanik" (The Uljanik Bulletin), (1954–1966, again from 1981–2019). The company publication followed the usual concept of Yugoslav socialist factory papers – information about production, company policies, topics on self-management, essays on company and state cultural policies, with workers' contributions, cultural production and humorous articles and columns (Koroman 2017). The Uljanik Bulletin took into account the double identity of the worker and the socialist citizen, and used this media to communicate with the workers and the public (or at least with the workers' families), especially by including the workers' artistic contributions. Later, from the mid-1990s to the company's bankruptcy in 2019, the Bulletin followed a generic corporate PR publication in form and content. As bankruptcy unfolded in 2019 and a new owner structure was introduced,

[7] Information on the 2009 race in the Uljanik Bulletin: http://www.utrke.net/utrke/upload/File/rezultati/2009/uljanik09_Bilten.pdf.

Uljanik's communication primarily took place through the social media or, interestingly enough, by means of radio (Matošević 2020).

There was another important and oft-mentioned means of Uljanik's communication with the city and its residents – the traffic and aural sensations. The factory siren, which marked the end of working hours (most often at 15.00), could be heard in the city center and after the signal, visually discernable groups of workers in blue working uniforms flooded the nearby streets (Matošević 2020, 2023: 123–132).

'Lighning Giants', shipyard cranes illuminated with a number of LED lights that changed color depending on the occasion, emerged in 2014 and soon became a striking nocturnal attraction. At first, they were a living monument to an ongoing and important local industry, which communicated well with the nocturnal urban visuality of Pula, following various occasions in the public calendar. However, with the shipyard's liquidation on the way, they became an almost frightening and threatening monument to the not-so-distant deindustrialization of the city of Pula, a reminder of the loss of many jobs, of knowledge and knowledge transfer, and a warning sign of an uncertain future.

BMW 6.10 PLANT, REGENSBURG, GERMANY
THE BMW PLANT 6.10, GROUP WERK REGENSBURG, HERBERT-QUANDT-ALLEE, 93055 REGENSBURG, DEUTSCHLAND

The BMW factory stands as a proud example of the famous German, particularly Bavarian, automobile industry, although the facility and the industry are not "native" to the Regensburg area. Regensburgian urban development was not based on industrial modernization and the BMW plant 6.10 emerged in 1986 with the 1980s wave of industrialization of the Regensburg area (Köhler ed. 2007; Götschmann 2012). Bayerische Motoren Werke AG is a well-known German multinational corporation based in Munich, home to the prestigious Bavarian vehicle brand, which originated immediately after World War I (Götschmann 2010: 524). The abbreviation AG stands for *Aktiengesellschaft* – a corporation owned by its shareholders with shares available for trading at the stock market. In the case of BMW, the major share of the company is owned by the heirs of the German industrialist Quandt family, the founders of BMW.[8]

In a case study dealing with the approach to the BMW Plant in Regensburg, it is useful to begin with a few notes on the factory's urbanist properties. The BMW Plant is well connected to the city center, with a direct public transport bus line. It is situated in an industrial metropolitan area, surrounded by agricultural areas. The plant area, with its four main facilities and a test track, is surrounded by roads, and one can notice rows of trees along

[8] Note that the plant's location is at the address named after industrialist Herbert Quandt, who rebuilt the BMW companies after World War II (Götschmann 2010: 525–526), and after the Quandt World War II controversies on slave labor (see *Das Schweigen der Quandts*, 2007).

the roads that surround the plant, as well many rows of trees in the inner factory circle that serve as a visual and auditive barrier. The plant has a rail connection, a direct bus connection from the city center, a vast parking space at the north entrance, all of which highlight the notion of industrial and urban planning, organization and industry needs for the efficient mobility of workers, goods, materials and products.

There is, however, only one occasion when the plant area can be accessed by a non-worker, a common citizen – during an organized and guided tour of the BMW 6.10 Plant. At the time, the tour was advertised on the factory's website and was relatively simple to access and attend. While the majority of tours offered are in German, based on the supposed interest of "domestic" visitors, tours in English were organized once or twice a week. It seems that after the Covid 19 pandemic, organized tours were no longer available in any of the BMW facilities, the Regensburg one included.[9]

The tour began at a small waiting room area in front of Gate 4, an entrance for employees with an access ramp. This space is a buffer, a sort of a neutral place, a border between the public space outside the factory and the highly controlled space within. At this point one can notice (and take) leaflets and the translations most likely correspond to the visitors' demographics – I took note that there was a leaflet in Croatian.

The tour continued to the visitor center, and this was the point where and when controlled conditions took place: cell phones were stored and vaulted, and tags, safety glasses and guides assigned. The tour consisted of visiting four factory halls and facilities: the press shop, the robotized and automated body shop, the paint shop and the assembly line. Walking was directed by a line marked orange throughout all the facilities.

Organized, very informative and thorough, the tour began with a promotional video mostly stressing the significance of the BMW brand followed by a two-hour walk through the four facilities with a guide. Questions were welcomed but one could, at best, ask the guide to clear up some detail, as a significant amount of information was provided by the tour guide on nearly every aspect of factory organization, including working hours, breaks, health issues, sick leave, worker demographics and so on (see Otgaar et al. 2010: 33 for a comparable Wolfsburg experience). Of course, BMW production and impressive factory production statistics, the power of the machines, facts about robotization and innovation, production numbers, were all evidently the main theme.

The extensive tour, however, provided several ambiguous and conflicting points and experiences that require further explanation, and these will be further analyzed in the conclusion. Firstly, there is a "tense" relation between the public space, historical spaces, and the private enterprising industrial area. In the visitor center there is a small exhibition of objects of archaeological value, dating from the prehistoric to the Roman period, that were found, excavated and preserved during the construction of these industrial facilities. Similarly, in the middle of the open industrial area there is a plot that has different purpose

[9] https://www.bmwgroup-werke.com/muenchen/en/our-plant/plant-tours.html.

– an *in situ* archeological exhibit – well preserved Roman walls administered and curated by the public institutions outside the factory.

Another impression from the tour experience worth mentioning was the Facility 4 – the assembly line. After visiting three other factory halls, where automatization and robotization are the primary construction modes, the visitor is faced with a deeply striking Fordist experience. Until then, the visitor could learn from the guide that workers work in 9-hour shifts, and may work no longer than three hours at any specific point of the assembly line, no longer than 4 days a week. One can learn much about safety issues, help buttons, health standards, proposed exercises for different points of the assembly line. Yet, nevertheless, the sight from the high platform to the slowly moving lines of hundreds of car structures, every one of them with an assigned worker, on the immense zig-zag structure of the assembly line, alongside the information that the worker has 53 seconds to attach a specific vehicle component, is an intense experience, an experience of displacement, and one that is a little disturbing. There is a sense of (a certainly privileged and probably class) voyeurism at this particular point of the visit, followed by the commonsense reasoning that this is indeed what more than a hundred years of Fordism actually look like, and that this is in many ways the best, or probably the least disturbing example of it. Finally, there is a feeling of dislocation, somehow "out of this space and timeline", a sense of the strong and solid, unchangeable and extremely organized continuity of the assembly line in motion that somehow takes place beyond human existence.

After this strong apprehension of the assembly line, as a conclusion to the overall story, the final product – shiny luxury vehicles – are on display in front of the visitor's eyes. This is a reality check; a customized and uniquely assembled car of a familiar brand emerges in front of the visitor as a reminder that this final scene, a product, is what this is (was) all about. But this is not the end: the conclusion of the tour is just before the exit, where the guide suggests that visitors take a look at the last factory wall in sight: it is painted sky blue with white clouds – these are the colors of Bavaria. A brief and single mention of the national or regional identity within the context of a multinational company with an international market sounds both logical and a little discordant.

THE REGENSBURG RIVER PORT, REGENSBURG, GERMANY BAYERNHAFEN GMBH & CO. KG, LINZER STR. 6, 93055 REGENSBURG, DEUTSCHLAND

The cargo river port on the Danube in Regensburg has its origins in the late 19th century and its realization from the period around World War I (Götschmann 2010: 127–128). At that time, it was the State Port Administration and became Bayernhafen Gmbh & co. KG in the 21st century (ibid.: 292–293). Bayernhafen Regensburg is an unusual space of industry. First of all, the approach to the area of Bayernafen Regensburg is very easy and plain. The port itself is situated on the eastern part of the town, but there are no barriers

or wires – a boundary is set on the northern side with the river Danube, and other borders are defined by roads or rails, green or free walking areas. There are streets through which one can drive and walk freely. This main difference, as it will be shown, is a significant point when analyzing Bayernhafen, because it is a space deliberately imagined so that aspects of "material spatial practices" avoid the dimensions of "domination and control of space" (Harvey 1991: 220).

The ownership and managerial structure of Bayernhafen GMBH is also specific. The German abbreviation GMBH stands for a limited liability company. In this case it means that Bayernhafen is a privately run corporate group, with the Bavarian State as a 100% general partner with unlimited liability. Bayernhafen GMBH itself is the main shareholder of several other companies, in fact, it is a company that is comprised of six river ports: Schaffenburg, Bamberg, Nuremberg, Roth, Regensburg and Passau.[10] Despite the large area of the port in Regensburg and all other ports, the Bahernhafen company is only a mid-sized company with around 210 employees, but in all six ports 400 companies are situated, with around 20,000 jobs directly related to the ports. The Bayernhafen GMBH Centre is located in Regensburg and it is a company that deals with infrastructure, strategy and logistic development. Workers at the port are contractors for other production or transportation companies. In this regard, the river port is somehow different and produces different worker relations than those in many seaports. The port workers identity here is not a strong one, as one would expect among dockers and those in a union organization, as most of them employed here are part-time contractors and do not perceive themselves as dockers.

As in the case of the BMW plant, tours around the area are advertised on the company's website, with an emphasis on school visits.[11] Given that I introduced myself as a researcher via a common channel on the website, asking for a tour, the response to my request was personal, thorough, and very informative. I was introduced to the vice CEO of the company, who prepared a customized and informative presentation, was very attentive in answering many questions, and who finally provided a personalized tour in a car through the port area. Much of the information and facts used here come from this meeting and the interview.

Apart from free movement through the area of Bayerhafen Regensburg, there are several other occasions when visitors and citizens can approach other, fenced points of the Regensburg River port. There are organized tours for school children, groups and individuals, and there are "open port days" – *Hafenfeste*, when school pupils mostly, with teachers or parents, visit the port and cargo areas, river ships etc. This is the result of company policy: it is important for the Regensburg River port to nurture the image of the

[10] The owner and managerial structure were a part of reforms that took place during the 1990s and 2000s, mainly led by the CSU party, in which the state was withdrawing from the owner structure. During this time, Bayernhafen was consolidated as the company, prior to this it was a State Port Administration (Götschmann 2010: 292–293).

[11] https://www.bayernhafen.de/discover/guided-tours/.

cargo port as an important, vivid and integral part of the urban city area. Dealing with certain suspicions from the community due to the port's vicinity to residential areas and the city center, the port authorities pay a lot of attention to several issues: emphasizing the positive ecological impact of river transport and the direct ecological benefit from low landed port areas that can be "activated" in case of floods. Furthermore, river transport is presented as a significant industry based on logistics and logistic thinking – something that can lead to better career opportunities. With an understanding that residential areas border on unattractive and noisy port areas, a series of buffer zones, small commercial services, bars, restaurants and such are planned to be built on the bordering port lots.

But this is where certain conflicts with this idea of avoiding dominance and control are revealed. Being oriented towards and communicating with the community, being open and integrated into the local industrial tradition define the spatial politics in Bayerhafen. Nonetheless, Bayernhafen Regensburg remains to be a port, which means that the community does not actually see the port, so close to the city's center, as an integral part of the city. The experience of the space there also seems a little discordant, but at the same time expected – the roads and paths are indeed intended for driving and walking (usually without walkways) but they take place between clearly industrial lots on both sides of streets (real "Straβen" that do have a name). There are huge warehouses, containers, silos, cranes, areas with different types of fences, and clear markings prohibiting movement. There are also intense auditory moments, when the space is experienced through the sounds of industry, and all this produces an experience that is in stark contrast with the other urban spaces of Regensburg nearby.

As *Hafenfeste* is an event organized periodically or on the occasion of an anniversary, I was not able to attend such a public gathering. There are, however, videos of several *Hafenfesten* available on the Bayernhafen website and YouTube channel.[12] Of course, these videos are edited and adapted to their purpose but they nevertheless provide some insight into the occasion. The *Hafenfeste* looks exactly as expected – it is a public event with the purpose of presenting the port to its citizens. All props for family visits can be identified there: stands, tents, children's corners, visits to cranes and ships, various vehicles, food and fun, a lot of visitors, many with children. These videos follow the logic of public interest as they are produced and edited in the documentarian genre of public TV videos: people and their activities in the foreground, workers and middle management giving statements, the port space in the background.

It seems that the space of Bayernhafen Regensburg tries to operate within the gap between the forces of "material spatial practices (experience)", that shape the experiences of citizens, and the dimensions of "spaces of representation (imagination)" (Harvey 1991: 220–221), which its administration tries to implement with their spatial policies, from urbanistic features all to the media representation of the place.

[12] https://www.youtube.com/user/bayernhafengruppe.

CONTROL AND FRICTION, HETEROTOPIA AND LIMINALITY

The three examples described in this article show how approaches to different industrial spaces can be articulated in very diverse ways. The examples can also reveal that the experience of those places is carried out from different positions: the experience expected from the previous knowledge of social and economic context of those places, the "representation" of those spaces, the spatial politics of companies that tend to direct the experience, and, lastly, the actual (autoethnographic) experience of the industrial spaces. And there is a certain friction between them that needs to be addressed. The first case, the Uljanik Shipyard, seems to stand out not just because it is located in a different country. It can be argued and verified that the Uljanik Shipyard is exceptional because it seems to be a generally important and significant place, and not just in a local or national, Croatian context. There is strong evidence for this: there is a considerable number of academic research papers on the Uljanik Shipyard, not only by local or national researchers.[13] As there has been much academic research, there are also a significant number of documentaries, ranging from the industrial to the social, that were made in and about the Uljanik Shipyard. And this very production is the main theme of the Andrea Matošević's recent study *An Adriatic Colossus* (*Kolos Jadrana*) (2023). Uljanik is thus a well-researched, documented and interpreted industrial space.

This is not at all the case in the other two examples. One may note that the Uljanik Shipyard is an old, historical industry, but in a certain sense so are the network of Bavarian river ports and BMW as part of the historically significant automobile industry in Bavaria. Even a brand as attractive and with as strong an identity as BMW does not encourage humanities research or the production of documentaries dealing with controversies. Although, in fact, BMW's significance has been articulated in the processes of musealization, this has simultaneously not led to the same interest among researchers as garnered by Uljanik.

Obvious differences in the production of the "discursive representation" (a spot at the intersection of Lefebvre's dimension of "production of space" and Harvey's "appropriation and use of space") of these three spaces can be noted here. Certainly, the most significant reason for them is the mentioned distinct relation of the shipyard from Pula with the development of the city from its beginning and then especially during the socialist period. The shipyard defined the city of Pula in many ways, while the relationship between Regensburg and the industrial sites of Bayernhafen and the BMW factory was formed in a different way. Pula evolved in continuous cycles of ups and downs, with the shipyard reviving and defining the city in the 19th century, while Regensburg developed constantly, steadily, even "organically", mainly as a "transport and trade center and regional center" (Köhler 2007: 94), so that today it could be presented as a "hub for Central and Eastern

[13] While many are cited in this article, in recent texts by Andrea Matošević many other recent research papers are listed and enumerated, thus providing a proper bibliography on the Uljanik Shipyard (see Matošević 2020, 2023).

Europe" (ibid.: 95). Regensburg did not develop from or because of industry, instead it developed systematically and through planning. As an already defined urban environment, it managed to attract industry due to political decisions, all from the 1970s, with a big leap in the 1980s (ibid.: 94–95). The industry in Regensburg is a later addition to the development of the city, resulting from the need to create new jobs and diversify the economy, which, therefore, did not produce strong identitarian symbolic meanings and affections.

Furthermore, Uljanik stands out as a very complex space, one that carries entirely contradictory forces. At the levels of Lefebvre/Harvey's material spatial practices, Uljanik can be observed as vast in the area – yet inaccessible. Moreover, it is located very close to the city's very center, dominating the coastline, both visually and auditorily incorporated into the city (Matošević 2020), and it is still closed, fenced and divergent. Its land property is mixed as well as its property as a corporation. If we refer to Harvey/Lefebvre's dimensions of "representation of space (perception)" and "spaces of representation (imagination)" (Harvey 1991: 220–221), Uljanik can be seen as a derivative, hard, dirty industry,[14] while also being of utmost historical and significance for the identity of the community, evoking "soft" affects of nostalgia and familiarity in its citizens. One can argue that ultimately Uljanik does not bear the characteristics of a derivative, ahistorical, impersonal and unrelatable industry (although in reality, at a certain point, it is). It is perceived and experienced as one of the "places of identity, of relations and of history" (Augé 1995: 52), a "principle of meaning for the people who live in it, and also a principle of intelligibility for the person who observes it" (ibid.); it is a *real* "anthropological place", as Augé would point out (ibid.: 51). And this also gives Uljanik a certain distinctive quality, at the same time representing its contradictions.

The basic spatial organization of Uljanik originates from the time of its planning and establishment. The walls and fences, the closed and restricted organization of space, originate, among other things, from the security considerations with which Austro-Hungarian Empire constructed a navy shipyard and the arsenal, being in constant tension with Italy, which was moving towards unification by the middle of the 19th century (Balota 1960: 44–45). Such a basic configuration of this industrial space persisted in all the subsequent articulations of the shipyard. Already at the time of the first decades of Uljanik, a particular identity of those working in the naval shipyard and arsenal was emerging, a complex, nationally and professionally very divided and stratified, but still a common identity of the arsenal workers ("*arsenalci*") (ibid.: 62–75).

In the period of socialism, the continuity of Uljanik's closedness and restrictiveness as a space can be interpreted by the "characteristic feature" of the socialist societies, "the overlapping of State structures and company structures" (Wegenschimmel 2020). As the factory or any other workplace should reflect and respond to all social needs of the workers, particularly in Yugoslav self-management socialism, it produced places that act

[14] Again, the extremely difficult working conditions and an unromanticized view of the shipyard operation is the theme of the documentary *The Rust Years* (2000).

as the miniature systems that reflect society as a whole. In this way Uljanik could act as "a city within a city", while remaining spatially inaccessible. On the other hand, it is only during the socialist period that Uljanik communicated intensively and in a thoughtful and structured manner with the city and its citizens, especially through the medium of print (Koroman 2017) and film (Matošević 2023) – what was happening behind the factory walls largely belonged to the public, civil sphere as well. But the enclosed world of the shipyard also supposed that there was still something behind the walls that what was not intended for the public, such as hard work and dangerous working conditions. From this perspective it is possible to interpret the double identities of those who worked there, and this was an explicit or nuanced element in several films in and about the shipyard (ibid.). For citizens who did not work in the shipyard, this duality of what was public and covert meant that many sorts of stories and topics could have been inscribed into a space that they could not access, but which they knew a lot about. Uljanik became a space where the imaginary was inscribed and the symbolic was growing.

Referring to the element of Uljanik's wall in the 21st century, Peter Wegenschimmel notes in his research: "One of the tasks of the management after the re-establishment of Uljanik as a company was to clearly draw the line between the company and its local and State environment, i.e. hardening the factory wall as a border" (Wegenschimmel 2020). That Uljanik was an exclusive and a "forbidden" space was related to the conditions of its origin and foundation, but this fact remained fixed, unquestioned, it endured throughout the management regimes, as well as different social, economic and historical circumstances. Uljanik never became an open and accessible space, however it was able to continuously produce strong identity forms. Delving deeper into this complexity and contradictions, it might be useful to explore whether Uljanik bears certain characteristics of a heterotopia, as Foucault described and listed them (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986). Uljanik is a place that can, of course, be "localizable", and it also acts as the reflection, as one of those places that is "something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites […] are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted" (ibid.: 24). Uljanik is a real place, one that once enacted Habsburgian and socialist utopia, and a place from where the whole story, an entire narrative of a city's development (and decline) finds its reflection and is represented. At the same time, it is "absolutely different from all the sites that … [it] reflect[s] and speak[s] about" (ibid.: 4), it is in strong contrast to the rest of the city of Pula. All these features could be recognized making this place a Foucauldian heterotopia. Therefore, those rare moments when citizens approached the industrial shipyard area were important and formative, an example of a rare or unique, exceptional and contradictory (a sacred and, in a carnivalesque manner "upside down") experience, which was presented through the autoethnographic experiences of the ship's launch and the Uljanik Run. That strong notion of invertedness can be interpreted as Lefebvrian heterotopias – "places that are prohibited (holy or damned heterotopias)" (Lefebvre 1991: 294), where Uljanik can simultaneously be perceived as both "holy" and "damned". All this: Uljanik's functioning as a real "anthropological place", its complexity, the charac-

teristics that evoke the notion of a heterotopia, the simultaneity of the oppositions, may be additional reasons why Uljanik is so interesting to researchers.

Tanja Petrović argues that "specific forms of liminality and ambiguity experienced by local residents" (Petrović 2021: 4) were not exclusively spatial experiences of the Uljanik Shipyard. Both military and industrial infrastructure were the reason to see "Pula [as] an ambiguous and liminal place, a city that simultaneously belonged and did not belong to its inhabitants" (ibid.: 3). I would argue that this sense of ambiguity and "non-belonging" is indeed something that is historically incorporated into Pula's identity. However, ambiguity, liminality, and this out-of-space experience are notions that could be perceived and experienced in other, perhaps occasionally unexpected, and certainly more well-adjusted, places, such as the industrial areas of Regensburg would be, or are intended to be.

At first glance it seems that the case of BMW seems easy to analyze.[15] It is corporate-driven; it is interconnected with a world-famous brand and communicates from and with it, and it is carefully controlled and facilitated. When the factory communicates with citizens via online media this communication is directed by the corporation and brand identity.[16] In addition to factory tours, BMW has its own museums and in all cases the level of representation is in the command of the corporation. Few scholarly analyses that explore BMW museums are mostly descriptive, yet, considering that these are within the field of museology, they reveal certain poignant issues. One analysis begins with the statement that there is "a new type of museum – the corporate museum" (Piatkowska 2014: 29), and these "museums occupy a difficult and often misunderstood position" in which "visitors might be perceived as the actual client prolonging their contact with the brand" (ibid.: 33). In the case of the BMW museum in the USA a "tour and a museum are meant to both maintain as well as grow the brand" (Ramshaw 2017: 57). BMW communicates with citizens, probably successfully, mainly through the BMW brand i.e., through the level of the "identity" of the cultural product – a net of produced and accepted ideas that are generally attributed to the BMW brand that come into play in the "circuit of culture" (du Gay and Hall 1997). The entire phenomenon is directed by the product and its symbolic meaning, the brand. The logic is capitalist, more specifically, late capitalist. While analyzing the space of the BMW facility, one can notice that its location and surroundings, and its spatial organization are immediately recognized as practical, studiously managed, utilized, as the aspect of space management is its main characteristic. The industrial complex is fenced, secured, and surrounded by heavy transportational infrastructure and its border is mitigated with plants and trees. A brief sample from Harvey's reflections on the capitalist "overcoming of space", factory plants and industrial urbanization are worth quoting here:

> Capital and labor power must be brought together at a particular point in space for production to proceed. The factory is such an assembly point while the industrial form

[15] It should be noted that this way of approaching the industrial space of a well-known brands is not uncommon. Other industries also manage to organize and offer similar tours of plants. In Croatia, too, there is, for example, a tour around the facilities of the "Kraš" confectionery industry, popular among school pupils.

[16] https://www.bmwgroup-werke.com/en.html.

> of urbanization can be seen as a specific capitalist response to the need to minimize the cost and time of movement under conditions of inter-industry linkage, a social division of labor, and the need for access to both labor supplies and final consumer markets. Individual capitalists, by virtue of their particular locational decisions, shape the geography of production into distinctive spatial configurations. (Harvey 2001: 328)

In the case of the BMW factory, the logic of spatial organization is fully determined by the elements that can be recognized in this paragraph as BMW 6.10 factory is a prime example of the capitalist logic of spatial organization. The flow of goods, products, workers, – and, also, occasionally, visitors – to the factory is directed, controlled, guided, and optimized. The surroundings and all other "material spatial practices" are shaped by the "capitalist response". Unlike in Bayernhafen, the symbolic play here is not centered on the contradictions between public and private domains, or between enclosed and restrictive spaces and the city. Harvey's aspect of "domination and control of space" (Harvey 1991: 220–221) is what dominates here.

Several aspects inside the industrial area of the BMW plant reveal, however, some negotiated and ambiguous characteristics that are initiated immediately from the entrance to the buffer room. The example of the Roman ruins is particularly interesting, given that a historical archaeological site is situated in a highly unusual spatial context. It is, of course, an example of a "best practice" of the corporation, but the actual experience is a bit surreal: to be present in a highly controlled space, one that is non-historical, and to be simultaneously forcefully reminded of history, produces a sense of non-belonging, ambivalence and, in fact, liminality. It can also be interpreted as an example of the "third principle" of Foucault's heterotopia: "The heterotopia is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible" (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986: 25). This is one of the points where the logic of organizing the space within the capitalist way of production reveals "cracks" that open the possibilities of recognizing certain features of heterotopias.

The Fordist voyeuristic experience of the conveyor belt is another contradictory and ambivalent example. It produces one's simultaneous admiration for the complex organization of work and one's participation in its dehumanizing aspects. Regardless of the amount of information about the care for the workers that one can obtain during the tour, the view of the conveyor from the platform above the belt is distressful and uneasy, as any encounter with a liminal place. At this point the Foucauldian heterotopia again comes to mind; the timeless feeling of the assembly line recalls the "fourth principle" of heterotopia, one that incorporates "heterochronia": [t]he heterotopia begins to function at full capacity when men arrive at a sort of absolute break with their traditional time" (ibid.: 26).[17]

[17] It is noteworthy that David Harvey relates his notion of postmodernism with this crucial aspect of the transformation of time experiences, through his terms "annihilation of time" and "space-time compression" (Harvey 2001). Late capitalism, therefore, affects the experience of time, and this is also felt in the experiences of space.

Finally, there is the multi-symbolically coded ending of the tour in which the international corporate symbolism of the brand alternates ambivalently with the one of region, the state of Bavaria. It seems that it strongly refers to the different possible aspects of the functioning of capitalism, especially to the limitless co-optation potential that capitalism has shown in many other areas, notably cultural (see. e.g. Hromadžić 2011). Paraphrasing earlier authors, Hromadžić describes co-optation as a "a typical phenomenon of capitalism", "a strategy of bringing the opposition to the negotiating table, giving the illusion of power, but with the intention of controlling them in such a way that they are given a sense of belonging to the process" (ibid.: 209), it is an action of neutralizing or "taming" a weaker partner or the strong opposition. Capitalism in its stellar moments – which the BMW facility certainly is – can absorb, obtain, and display everything, even visible ambivalences: both the simultaneous care for the worker and a display of dehumanization, both an emphasized internationality and a declared locality. However, this does not mean that these ambivalences and frictions are not felt in the actual experience of space, quite the opposite. This recognition of *particular points* in otherwise well-organized industrial spaces – those that produce strong experiences of "otherness", heterotopia, heterochronia or liminality – emerges as one of the concluding remarks in this research, inviting further research.

If we refer only to expected experiences of spaces, to the representation of those spaces, and the spatial politics of companies, Bayernhafen and especially the BWM Plant seem to be places that are not contradictory or complex. They may even be recognized as instances of Lefebvrian *isotopia* – "the analogous spaces" (Lefebvre 1991: 366) or "the same place" (Lefebvre 2003: 38), as they are meant to act as they are represented, and, in addition, they are parts of the chain or network of similar, "homologous" places (Bayernhafen Regensburg being a part of Danube port chain, and BMW plant being one of many company's plants). But this is not the case here, and in the case of the BMW plant this was verified in the analysis; certain points of this industrial place do produce clear heterotopic experiences.

One may argue that the case of Bayernhafen has the least potential to be described as a heterotopia – its politics and practices of space are analogous with its representation and, at first glance, everything that can be seen there seems to fit into the described politics and practices of the space. But only at first glance, and only from the position of the expected experience of space: the discordance that can be felt in that industrial area reveals a discrepancy between the actual experience of space and its representation and imagining directed by its administration. In this way, even the port of Bayerhafen cannot be experienced as an ordinary and common space. Precisely because of the fact that the management of Bayernhafen tries to make the port area a "familiar" place, it acknowledges and emphasizes its discrepancy. While discordance was clearly felt by the observer that is not from Regensburg, the Bayernhafen administration understands well that this is also the case with the local community. The mitigation and negotiation, the idea of "softening the borders", is the spatial policy at work here (which, interestingly, is the exact opposite to

Uljanik's spatial policies). In Bayernhafen's case, it could be related to the development of the company itself, which evolved from a public company to a special combination of state and private venture. It should be recalled here that its current organization structure does not produce strong identities of dock workers among the employees, which may also be linked with the lack of identity among the citizens as well.

Bayernhafen is thus also a space that is real but "mirrors" its imaginary, in this case, the imaginary of its administration, not the one of the citizens. It is a space which is, to a certain extent, "capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces" (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986: 6) and it is precisely in this sense that we could try to connect it with some features of a heterotopia. In all its "tension" between representation and experience, Bayerhafen is actually a space that at the same time belongs and does not belong to the city – it is a liminal place. And finally, there is, as the very illustrative example of liminality, the area of a large meadow that exists only to be submerged in the event of a flood. It indicates logical, public and important use for the community, but the experience that this place produces is liminal, precisely because of this use.

The most significant distinction between the Uljanik and Regensburg examples might be that the latter cannot be perceived as a real "anthropological place". While the elements of historicity can be recognized at Bayernhafen in Regensburg, since it is indeed a very old river port that grew during the age of modernization alongside the expansion of the railway network in the 19th century, there is a lack of a profound relation with the identity of the city and the citizens. As Augé would put it: "a space which cannot be defined as relational, or historical, or concerned with identity will be a non-place" (Augé 1995: 77–78).

Several concluding remarks could result from the analysis that has been presented here. The first is that the complexity and contradictions of Uljanik as a space are somehow expected given its complex history and the symbolic burden of the place. Uljanik's chaotic, organic and semi-organized experience of space may be related to its turbulent history as an industrial facility, from its imperial Habsburgian roots and the dream of making the Austrian navy, followed by a totalitarian fascist interlude, to the example of the success of the socialist economy, and, finally, to the unwanted child of the social and economic transition at Europe's south-east periphery. The second remark, which partially follows from the first, would be that there are expected, even predictable, indications of relations between the socio-economic conditions and the context of industrial spaces and the spatial politics involved in their organization and representation by those who manage them. It is expected for the BMW factory as a space to be organized exactly in the ways that David Harvey describes factories in capitalist societies, and that the new BMW 6.10 factory is just as safe, thoughtful, and almost routine extension of the established world-known brand. It is expected that Bayernhafen's spatial practices and politics are organized in a way that makes it noticeable that they arose from the way of its continuous development from a public port authority to the specific partnership of private and state sector. The third concluding remark would be that the socio-economic conditions and the (historical) context are able to produce an experience of industrial spaces only to a certain extent.

This is where the true significance of the actual experience of visits to the industrial spaces comes into play in the analysis. One can clearly discern a certain ambiguity and friction in those spaces; a controlled, guided and well-tuned organization of the space of the BMW factory produces complex and contradictory experiences, liminal and heterotopian, in several places. It is as if corporate control, guidance with emphasized elements of the aspect of "dominance and control of space" (Harvey 1991: 220–221), simultaneously initiates and produces a kind of loss of control over the experience of space. Bayernhafen Regensburg, on the other hand, implements active spatial policies in order to avoid domination and control, but nevertheless also produces contradictory and liminal effects. These, it seems, are observations and remarks where it would be useful to stop and check in more detail to see if something similar is happening in other places controlled and directed in similar ways, i.e., in various other active industrial plants.

One basic commonsense note should also be mentioned here. All these experiences of space within the factory facilities would not be possible if there were no conditions for their occurrence. It should be kept in mind that the point of view in a visit to a factory is directed by a "common citizen", a "civilian", a non-authorized person, it is the view that takes place in specific circumstances. It is a view from the "outside" of what is fenced, forbidden, inaccessible, outside of the places that are meant to keep something out of the sight. This is why this view is different from the view of the anthropology of work in factories. This view from the outside can sometimes lead to unexpected experiences and may reveal all these points and moments where dissonance, friction, contradiction, discomfort occurs.

And vice versa, these experiences are possible precisely because of the specific position of the citizen. It is precisely this position that determines the possibility of the "approach". In this sense, some aspects of spatial organization in industrial spaces seem to be meant to communicate with citizens "outside": the location, fences, walls, markings, plates, and other "material spatial practices" send messages to those who do not work in the factories. The organization and conditions of visits are intended precisely for them, they are aimed at them. Industrial spaces communicate with citizens and visitors, with all those who carry their own specific experiences of living in a civic urban space and who possess living knowledge about it. Therefore, in the approach and encounters with them differences, discrepancies and incongruities in these experiences must be present: the experiences themselves are different from the ones in a civic urban space.

That is the case in all the examples. BMW 6.10 seeks to produce an exclusive space, one that is detached from the urban fabric, dominated by corporate control, and it succeeds only to a certain extent, as long as it is a space that cannot be accessed. Inside the factory, one can see that the control dissolves. The port of Bayernahfen focuses its organizational energy on achieving border permeability (creating a network of free civic spaces), but it achieves a contradictory spatial effect and in fact manages to reveal its own contradictions. Since its establishment, Uljanik was embedded in the urban fabric of the city center while carefully preserving its spatial inaccessibility, but because of its

significance for the development of the city and because of its strong ties with the identity of the citizens, it became a space for inscribing the imaginary and symbolic, it evolved into a real anthropological place. It seems that the extent to which social and economic conditions organize industrial spaces has its limits, and that views from the "outside" can challenge these limits and transform the solid walls of factories and their controlled and organized inner spaces into something permeable and of a different quality.

REFERENCES AND SOURCES

Acksel, Brita. 2023. "Good Stories… Un/Making Transformations of Post-industrial Cities". *Narodna umjetnost* 60/1: 59–75. https://doi.org/10.15176/vol60no104

Augé, Marc. 1995. *Non-places. Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. London, New York: Verso.

Baba, Marietta. 2006. "Anthropology and Business". In *Encyclopedia of Anthropology*. H. James Birx, ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 83–117.

Balota, Mate. 1960. *Puna je Pula*. Zagreb: Izdavački zavod JAZU.

Castells, Manuel. 1978. *City, Class and Power*. New York: Macmillan Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-27923-4

Castells, Manuel. 1996. *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Castells, Manuel and Peter Hall. 1994. *Technopoles of the World. The Making of Twenty-first-century Industrial Complexes*. London, New York: Routledge.

de Certeau, Michel. 1988. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

du Gay, Paul, Stuart Hall, et al. 1997. *Doing Cultural Studies. The Story of Sony Walkman*. London: Sage Publications.

Dukovski, Darko. 2011. *Povijest Pule*. Pula: Istarski ogranak društva hrvatskih književnika.

Falski, Maciej. 2019. "Who Has the Right to Decide? Pula and the Problem of Demilitarized Urban Zone". *Philological Studies. Literary Research (PFIT)* 9(12)/1: 135–148. https://doi.org/10.32798/pflit.113

Foucault, Michel and Jay Miskowiec. 1986. "Of Other Spaces". *Diacritics* 16/1: 22–27. https://doi.org/10.2307/464648

Gilette, Howard Jr. 2022. *The Paradox of Urban Revitalization. Progress and Poverty in America's Postindustrial Era*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812298338

Golinowska, Karolina. 2021. "Post-Industrial Sites and the Clash of Narratives. The Case of the Gdańsk Shipyard". Analele Universității din București. Științe Politice [Annals of the University of Bucharest. Political Science series] 23/2: 245–269. https://doi.org/10.54885/TOKT1449

Götschmann, Dirk. 2010. *Wirtschaftsgeschichte Bayerns. 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet.

Götschmann, Dirk. 2012. "Economics (after 1945)". In *Historical Lexicon of Bavaria*. Available at: https://www.historical-lexikon-bayerns.de/Lexikon/Wirtschaft_(nach_1945) > (April 2024).

Harvey, David. 1991. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Harvey, David. 2001. *Spaces of Capital. Toward a Critical Geography*. New York: Routledge.

Herrmann, Christoph, Max Juraschek, Peter Burggräf and Sami Kara. 2020. "Urban Production. State of the Art and Future Trends for Urban Factories". *CIRP Annals* 69/2: 764–787. https://doi.org/10.-1016/j.cirp.2020.05.003

Hodges, Andrew. 2019. "Psychic Landscapes, Worker Organizing and Blame. Uljanik and the 2018 Croatian Shipbuilding Crisis". *Südosteuropa. Journal of Politics and Society* 67/1: 50–74. https://doi.org/10.1515/soeu-2019-0003

Hromadžić, Hajrudin. 2011. "Co-optation as an Intrinsic Phenomenon of the Capitalist System. An Example of Alternative Subcultural Practices". *Socijalna ekologija* 20/2: 207–221.

Ingold, Tim. 2000. *The Perception of the Environment. Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*. London, New York: Routledge.

Johnson, Peter. 2006. "Unravelling Foucault's 'Different Spaces'". *History of the Human Sciences* 19/4: 75–90. https://doi.org/10.1177/0952695106069669

Kojanić, Ognjen. 2020. "Theory from the Peripheries. What Can the Anthropology of Postsocialism Offer to European Anthropology?". *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures* 29/2: 49–66. https://doi.org/10.3167/ajec.2020.290204

Köhler, Stefan, ed. 2007. *Wachstumsregionen fernab der Metropolen. Chancen, Potentiale und Strategien*. Arbeitsmaterial der ARL, No. 334, Hannover: Verlag der ARL – Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung.

Koroman, Boris. 2017. "Nacrt za povijest tiska namijenjenog radnicima. Slučaj istarske radničke periodike". In *Stvaranje socijalističkoga* čovjeka. *Hrvatsko društvo i ideologija jugoslavenskoga socijalizma*. Igor Duda, ed. Zagreb, Pula: Srednja Europa, Sveučilište Jurja Dobrile u Puli, 123–152.

Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford, Cambridge: Blackwell.

Lefebvre, Henri. 1996. "The Right to the City". In *Writings on Cities*. Oxford, Cambridge: Blackwell, 63–181.

Lefebvre, Henri. 2003. *The Urban Revolution*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Matošević, Andrea. 2020. "Zvuk deidustrijalizacije. Brodogradilište Uljanik i *soundscape* štrajka 2018. godine". *Studia ethnologica Croatica* 32: 259–282. https://doi.org/10.17234/SEC.32.12

Matošević, Andrea. 2023. *Kolos Jadrana. Industrijski film i brodogradilište Uljanik u drugoj polovici XX. Stoljeća*. Zagreb: Srednja Europa.

Nefat, Bruno. 2004. "Prostorni razvitak Arsenala i brodogradilišta u Puli u 19. i 20. stoljeću". In *Pula 3000. Prilozi za povijesnu sintezu*. Elmo Cvek and Attilio Krizmanić, eds. Pula: CASH, 189–196.

Obad, Orlanda. 2014. "On the Privilege of the Peripheral Point of View. A Beginner's Guide to the Study and Practice of Balkanism". In *Mirroring Europe. Ideas of Europe and Europeanization in Balkan Societies*. Tanja Petrović, ed. Leiden: Brill, 20–38. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004275089_003

Otgaar, Alexander H. J., et al. 2010. *Industrial Tourism. Opportunities for City and Enterprise*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Petrović, Tanja. 2021. "Heritage of Liminality. Remnants of the Military in the Istrian City of Pula in the Aftermath of Yugoslav Socialism". *Colloquia Humanistica* 10: 1–21. https://doi.org/10.11649/ch.2536

Piatkowska, Ksenia. 2014. "The Corporate Museum. A New Type of Museum Created as a Component of a Marketing Company". *The international Journal of the Inclusive Museum* 6: 29–37. https://doi.org/10.18848/1835-2014/CGP/v06i02/44436

Potkonjak, Sanja and Nevena Škrbić Alempijević. 2023. "Rethinking the City in the Industrial Aftermath. Socio-industrial Memory and Environmental Fallouts". *Narodna umjetnost* 60/1: 9–24. https://doi.org/10.15176/vol60no101

Puljar D'Alessio, Sanja. 2018. *Mi gradimo brod, brod gradi nas. Etnografija organizacije brodogradilišta 3. maj*. Zagreb: Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku.

Ramshaw, Gregory. 2017. "Assembling Heritage Tourism. The BMW Museum and Factory Tour". In *Automobile Heritage and Tourism*. Oxon, New York: Routledge, 49–59.

Škrbić Alempijević, Nevena, Sanja Potkonjak and Tihana Rubić. 2016. *Misliti etnografski. Kvalitativni pristupi i metode u etnologiji i kulturnoj antropologiji*. Zagreb: FF Press, Hrvatsko etnološko društvo.

Vaccaro, Ismael, Krista Harper and Seth Murray, eds. 2016. *The Anthropology of Postindustrialism. Ethnographies of Disconnection*. New York: Routledge Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315672311

Wegenschimmel, Peter. 2020. "The Ontological Status of a Factory Wall. The Social Boundaries of Uljanik". *Unwanted Heritage: Remembering and Forgetting Industry in Istria*, 9. 1. 2020. Available at: https://www.istria.ios-regensburg.de/2020/01/09/the-ontological-status-of-a-factory-wall-the-social-boundaries-of-uljanik/.

FILMS

Godine hrđe. 2000. Directed by: Andrej Korovljev. Factum.

Das Schweigen der Quandts. 2007. Directed by: Eric Friedler. NDR.

INTERNET SOURCES

3. MAJ Brodogradilište d.d. Vlasnička struktura per 31. 3. 2019. Available at: https://www.uljanik.hr/images/odluke_i_dokumenti/dokumenti/3._MAJ_Brodogradiliste_d.d._per_31012019.pdf (accessed April 2024).

27. UTRKA "DAN ULJANIKA". Available at: http://www.utrke.net/utrke/upload/File/rezultati/2009/uljanik09_Bilten.pdf (accessed April 2024).

Bayernhafen: Guided Tours. Available at: https://www.bayernhafen.de/discover/guided-tours/ (accessed April 2024).

Bayernhafen: Youtube Channel. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/user/bayernhafengruppe (accessed April 2024).

BMW Group Plants. Available at: https://www.bmwgroup-werke.com/en.html (accessed April 2024).

BMW Group: Plant Tours. Available at: https://www.bmwgroup-werke.com/muenchen/en/our-plant/plant-tours.html (accessed April 2024).

PUBLIC CALL to express interest in purchasing 88.27% of the shares that the company ULJANIK d.d., in bankruptcy holds in the company 3. MAJ BRODOGRADILIŠTE d.d. Available at: https://www.uljanik.hr/images/odluke_i_dokumenti/dokumenti/Public_call_to_express_interest_in_purchasing_shares_3MAJ_Brodogradiliste_17082022.pdf (accessed April 2024).

Uljanik d.d. Vlasnička struktura per 28. 2. 2019. Available at: https://www.uljanik.hr/images/odluke_i_dokumenti/dokumenti/ULJANIK_d.d._per_28.02.2019.pdf (accessed April 2024).

Uljanik d.d. Vlasnička struktura per 31. 3. 2019. Available at: https://www.uljanik.hr/images/odluke_i_dokumenti/dokumenti/Uljanik_d.d._per_31.03.2019.pdf (accessed April 2024).

KAKO PRISTUPITI TVORNICI BMW, LUCI BAYERNHAFEN I BRODOGRADILIŠTU ULJANIK: KRATAK PREGLED "PROSTORNIH PRAKSI" U TRI INDUSTRIJSKA PROSTORA

Namjera je ovog rada analizirati specifična iskustva posjeta i boravka u aktivnim industrijskim prostorima te opisati na koje načine različiti industrijski prostori komuniciraju sa svojom okolinom, urbanom i društvenom. Tri se primjera istražuju u članku: Tvornica BMW 6.10 i teretna riječna luka mreže Bayernhafen, obje smještene u gradu

Regensburgu u Njemačkoj, te brodogradilište Uljanik iz Pule u Hrvatskoj. U potrazi za čvrstim metodološkim okvirom u prvome dijelu rada određena analitička čvorišta su prepoznata i upotrijebljena kao temelj i referentni okvir s kojeg je moguće pristupati promatranju, opisivanju te provoditi autoetnografske *poteze* i kretati u analize. Nakon kraćeg uvodnog pregleda slijedi predstavljanje iskustava posjeta industrijskim postrojenjima, a usporedba tih iskustava je istodobno i zaključna analiza.

Ključne riječi: antropologija prostora, industrijska antropologija, industrijski prostori, tvornica