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Chapter 1: Introduction

Industrialized cities around the world feature derelict factories, mills, warehouses, and refineries. Once behemoth structures at the social and economic heart of industrialization, these buildings now lie in ruins. The scale of these ruins echoes the grandeur of fallen past civilizations, yet industrial ruins were produced within a much shorter time frame. Abandoned industrial buildings have captured the aesthetic and sociological imagination of scholars, travellers, artists, and journalists. Across the globe, they have been occupied by artists, musicians, and squatters; appropriated for cultural or consumption uses; and photographed, painted, and documented. Yet old industrial sites are invested with more than cultural meanings: they are the remnants left behind in the wake of deindustrialization. Despite their state of disuse, abandoned industrial sites remain connected with the urban fabric that surrounds them: with communities; with collective memory; and with people’s health, livelihoods, and stories.

Industrial ruins are alternatively left abandoned, re-used, regenerated, sold, or demolished. They are never static objects, but are in a constant state of change across time and space. Thus, this study of industrial ruins is framed in terms of “ruination” rather than “ruins,” because the word “ruination” captures a process as well as a form. This book is concerned with the relationship between industrial ruination, community and place, specifically, the landscapes (socio-economic and cultural geographies) and legacies (the long-term socio-economic and psychological implications for people and places) of the interrelated processes of industrial ruination and urban decline. These complex relationships and processes will be explored through three paradigmatic case studies in Niagara Falls, Canada/USA; Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom, and Ivanovo, Russia. The case studies are of old industrial communities in different national and political contexts that have experienced significant deindustrialization in the latter half of the twentieth century.
Deindustrialization in the 1970s and 1980s in North America and Western Europe attracted considerable academic attention across a range of disciplines, with debates on the role of the state versus the market, the importance of manufacturing versus services, and the antithesis between “community” and “capital” (see Alderson 1999; Bluestone and Harrison 1982; Cowie and Heathcott 2003; High 2007; High 2003; Rowthorn and Ramaswamy 1997; Staudohar and Brown 1987). The devastating social costs of deindustrialization for communities are vividly illustrated in *Capital Moves* (Cowie 1999), which follows one company as it pursues cheap and flexible labour from Camden, New Jersey to Bloomington, Indiana in the 1940s, to Memphis, Tennessee in the 1960s, and finally to Ciudad Juarez, Mexico. In a similar vein, Bluestone and Harrison (1982) describe the negative impact of economic restructuring on income distribution in the United States as an “hourglass economy,” comprising many high-skilled IT and knowledge sector jobs that generate high income, few jobs that produce middle income, and many low-skilled service jobs that generate low income. By contrast, other scholars locate deindustrialization within “inevitable” processes of economic change in a market economy, downplaying its negative impacts on people and places (cf. Alderson 1999; Rowthorn and Ramaswamy 1997).

The research discussed in this book highlights the impacts of deindustrialization on place-based communities (as contrasted with communities based on interest or identity), focusing on residential areas that are adjacent to sites of industrial ruination. Community studies of place have a long and varied history of scholarship, including a number of classic studies of disadvantaged communities in particular (cf. Bell and Newby 1971; Lassiter et al. 2005; Mumford and Power 2003; Stacey 1969; Winson and Leach 2002; Young and Willmott 1957). As Crow (2002, 3.2) argues, community studies have the potential to ground, test, and challenge abstract theories of social change, “allowing researchers to explore what processes like globalization and de-industrialization actually mean for the everyday lives of ordinary people at a local level.” However, many authors have criticized the term “community” as problematic because of its relationship to romanticized and nostalgic notions of social cohesion, and its tendency to represent neighbourhoods as “relatively class-homogenous, small-scale, easily delineated areas with clear borders, hosting relatively cohesive communities” (Blokland 2001, 268). While I use the concept of “community” within this work, I recognize that it is a contested term.

Some studies have gone beyond the politicized antithesis between capital and community to examine the shifting values, expectations, and lived experiences of deindustrialization and post-industrial change. For example, in *Industrial Sunset: The Making of North America’s Rust Belt*,...
Steven High (2003) draws on a wide range of sources, including songs, poetry, archival material, and oral history interviews with displaced workers, to explore the complex meanings of job loss in Canada and the United States. High (2003, 17) argues that Canadian workers were more successful than American workers in softening the blow of job losses through adopting an ideology of Canadian economic nationalism, which prevented both the image and reality of the Rust Belt from entering the country. In another study, Ruth Milkman (1997) explores the social and cultural impacts of job losses on factory workers at a GM plant in New Jersey. Contrary to many accounts of deindustrialization, which portray workers as nostalgic about factory work, she shows that many workers in the GM plant welcomed the possibility of change because they disliked the old factory system, especially abusive and degrading treatment by supervisors. Similarly, Kathryn Dudley’s (1994) anthropological study of deindustrialization and transition to an uncertain “post-industrial” future in an American Rust Belt company town highlights complexities in the lived experiences of blue-collar workers. Dudley argues that the American dream, based on the belief that anyone who is willing to work hard is able to be successful, often proves false under conditions of economic contraction. This book follows High in its concern with comparing Canadian and American experiences of deindustrialization within the Rust Belt, and follows both Milkman and Dudley in its concern with cultural meanings and lived experiences of deindustrialization. My analysis also broadens the scope of study to encompass different industries and geographies, and remains anchored in economic as well as political, social, and cultural dimensions of industrial ruination.

The shift in advanced industrial countries from manufacturing to services has been theorized in various ways as a qualitative shift to a new type of economy and society. My own analysis is situated within the context of a key socio-economic shift or transformation, whether it is framed in terms of a shift from manufacturing to services, from the industrial to the post-industrial, from Fordism to post-Fordism, from the old economy to the new economy, from modernity to postmodernity, or from the international to the global (Beck 1992; Bell 1973; Boyer and Durand 1997; Giddens 1991; Harvey 1989; Jessop 1991; Leadbetter 1998; Lipietz 1992). Of course, the extent to which any one of these processes of change is accurate or complete is debatable, and many theorists would concur that elements of “older” structures coexist within the new. Perhaps more controversial than the scale or extent of these changes is the value attached to them: some perceive the new, flexible economy as a space for greater opportunity, social mobility, and advancement, whereas others argue that it is characterized by greater risk, socio-economic polarization, uncertainty, and instability. Some lament the demise of older social
and economic arrangements, while others celebrate the change or accept it as inevitable. By focusing on the people and places that have been “left behind” in the new economy, my stance is more critical of the broad implications and assumptions of post-industrial transformation.

Research on deindustrialization and economic restructuring has primarily concentrated on the industrialized West, yet these trends are increasingly visible throughout the world.1 By focusing on case studies in different national contexts, this book explores both global and local dimensions of industrial decline. While most studies of deindustrialization focus on the immediate impacts of plant closures on labour, capital, and communities, this research analyses the same processes through a broader historical, geographical, and theoretical lens. Borrowing insights from “contemporary archaeologies of the recent past” (Buchli and Lucas 2001), this book aims to “read” the past within the present in order to better understand the present, and to better explore the long-term material, social, and psychological implications of industrial decline for people and places around the world.2

Methodologically, this research is guided by the notion that the study of waste, of what is discarded, is sociologically important. My concern is with landscapes of industrial ruination and urban decline as “wasted places” that have, for various reasons, yet to be transformed. There are many stories of “winners” in the literature on cities and regeneration, following the model of arts-led regeneration exemplified by the gentrification and urban redevelopment of SoHo in Manhattan in the 1980s (Zukin 1982). According to O’Connor (1998, 229), this model of urban regeneration “was based on a conscious and explicit shift of the economic base from manufacturing to services industries, symbolized by the redrawing of the old historical industrial areas in terms of leisure and consumption.” Recently, many old industrial cities have adopted the “creative cities” approach, which involves coordinated urban attempts at arts- and culture-led regeneration and branding (Florida 2005; Landry and Bianchini 1995). Ironically, many cities copy creative models, for example, through the fashionable conversion of old industrial buildings into museums, art galleries, studios, or lofts. With the increasing number of cities adopting this approach, creative cities are becoming competitive (Doel and Hubbard 2002; Hall and Hubbard 1998) as each vies for government funds, corporate investment, and to become a symbol of arts- and culture-led regeneration. One city that has been widely recognized as a success in regeneration is Manchester, which consciously adopted a place-marketing strategy in the 1990s that commentators termed the “entrepreneurial city” or “competitive city” approach (Quilley 1999; Ward 2003).
But not all cities can succeed in a competitive model. There are many stories of those that do not — of cities stigmatized by social and economic deprivation, poor infrastructure and public services, dilapidated housing, depopulation, and unemployment. These stories tend to be overlooked in the interest of a progress-oriented view – of moving on in the capitalist process of “creative destruction” (Schumpeter 1965). Schumpeter argues that in order for capitalism to remain dynamic and innovative, it has to undergo both creation and destruction:

The opening up of new markets, foreign or domestic, and the organizational development from the craft shop and factory to such concerns as U.S. Steel illustrate the same process of industrial mutation – if I may use that biological term – that incessantly revolutionizes the economic structure from within, incessantly destroying the old one, incessantly creating a new one. This process of Creative Destruction is the essential fact about capitalism. It is what capitalism consists in and what every capitalist concern has got to live in. (Schumpeter 1965, 83)

The concept of creative destruction helps to explain economic processes of deindustrialization and economic decline within capitalist development, but it also informs the market-based rationale of urban development and regeneration policies. This economic perspective focuses on growth, innovation, and selective renewal, rather than dwelling on the “inevitable” waste left behind.

My research focuses on the people and places that have been left behind within the context of an uneven geography of capitalist development. According to several critical geographers (Harvey 1999; Massey 1984; Smith and Harvey 2008), capitalism produces an inherently uneven geography of development whereby industries, people, and places are constantly abandoned in capital’s search for new sites and cheaper inputs (a geographical manifestation of creative destruction). In The Limits to Capital, Harvey (1999) argues that capital has inherent tendencies towards concentration, crowding, and agglomeration, and thus encounters physical, social, and spatial limits. The tendency for capitalism to produce crises of over-accumulation, or surpluses of capital and/or labour, is periodically offset or absorbed by a “spatio-temporal fix”: temporal displacement through investment in long-term capital projects or social expenditures, or spatial displacements through opening up new markets or production capacities elsewhere. The geographical relocation of industries to places with cheaper inputs (absorbing surpluses of capital and labour) is an example of a spatio-temporal fix, but so too are
efforts to regenerate old industrial areas with new development centred around services, real estate, and finance.

Harvey’s work is an important theoretical starting point for investigating the uneven and contradictory ways in which capitalism produces and reproduces landscapes of industrial ruination. Similarly, this research draws on Zukin’s (1991, 5) argument that post-industrial places are “sharply divided between landscapes of consumption and devastation,” and that landscape is the cultural product of institutions of power, class, and social reproduction. Although my research was inspired partly by the theories of both Harvey and Zukin, I found that the distinctiveness and complexity of landscapes and legacies of industrial ruination cannot be accounted for by the binaries of success and failure, creation and destruction, or consumption and devastation. There are many tensions, contradictions, and contingencies within the lived experiences of people who occupy these “wasted places.” As Doreen Massey (1984, 299–300) argues:

Capitalist society, it is well-recognized, develops unevenly. The implications are twofold. It is necessary to unearth the common processes, the dynamic of capitalist society, beneath the unevenness, but it is also necessary to recognize, analyse and understand the complexity of the unevenness. Spatial differentiation, geographical variety, is not just an outcome: it is integral to the reproduction of society and its dominant social relations. The challenge is to hold the two sides together; to understand the general underlying causes while at the same time recognizing and appreciating the importance of the specific and the unique.

In other words, the role of capital in shaping uneven geographies does not always conform to a straightforward pattern of capital flight, massive job losses, and burdened communities: it is important to look at both the general and the unique to understand these processes. This book seriously considers Massey’s insistence on recognizing the complexity of the unevenness of capitalist development. Each case study in this book reveals complex social, cultural, and economic dynamics that relate both to wider processes of uneven development and to local dynamics.

This book advances a new theoretical framework for analysing the complex relationships between deindustrialization and industrial ruins: “industrial ruination as a lived process.” Working within this framework reveals two related insights. First, industrial ruins are not simply
forms, but rather, they are embedded within processes of creation and ruination. Each phase of industrial ruination is situated along a continuum between creation and destruction, fixity and motion, expansion and contraction. Over time, landscapes of industrial ruination will become landscapes of regeneration, reuse, demolition, or ruination once again. Second, forms and processes of industrial ruination are experienced by people. Many people experience industrial ruins indirectly, from a distance: from the window of a moving car, bus, or train; during a visit to an unfamiliar city, neighbourhood, or stretch of road; though the lens of a camera; or as an act of tourism through deliberately seeking out ruins as sites for art, play, or mischief. However, as this book will show, many people also experience industrial ruins more directly, from inside rather than from outside: they live in and amongst industrial ruins and identify them as home.

**Industrial Ruination**

The concept of ruins implies finality, beauty, majesty, glorious memory, tragedy, loss, and historical import. According to Jakle and Wilson (1992), ruins reflect the past, romance, and nostalgia, while at the same time representing risk, commodification, and neglect. The authors hit upon a crucial point about the spatially uneven violence of capitalism in the management and treatment of ruins: certain buildings are maintained or renewed, whereas others are left to fall into disrepair. This has more to do with patterns of capitalist accumulation and expansion than it does with any natural structural life-cycle. Similarly, Walter Benjamin (2000, 13) wrote of the “ruins of the bourgeoisie” as the necessary but unfortunate outcome of the progress of history, modernity, and capitalism. Industrial ruins are produced by capital abandonment of sites of industrial production; the sites that are no longer profitable and that no longer have use-value can be read as the footprint of capitalism. A number of authors have described derelict landscapes as wasted cultural, social, and economic spaces (cf. Berman 1983; Cowie and Heathcott 2003; Harvey 2000; Jakle and Wilson 1992; Stewart 1996; Zukin 1991). However, industrial ruins as material sites of investigation have been studied primarily in relation to art, photography, and culture (Edensor 2005; MacKenzie 2001; Stewart 1996; Vergara 1999).

Aesthetic and cultural studies of industrial ruins simultaneously mourn and celebrate the landscape of industrial ruins, on the one hand as sad beauty, and on the other hand as the genuine cultural ruins of civilizations. The celebration of industrial ruins is most obvious within dereliction tourism, represented by a number of websites devoted to virtual tours of derelict buildings across the globe. Three notable examples of dereliction tourism are Paul Talling’s
“Derelict London” website, which is devoted to derelict spaces in London and has over 800 photographs with subjects such as disused railway lines, cemeteries, shops, pubs, waterways, and public toilets, among others (www.derelictlondon.com); Lowell Boileau’s “Fabulous Ruins of Detroit” website, which displays photos of decrepit buildings as evidence of the glorious past of the American industrial age that is meant to parallel the great ruins of Europe, Africa, and Asia (www.detroityes.com); and Uryevich’s “Abandoned” website, which highlights the aesthetic, cultural, and spiritual importance of “abandoned things” in the former Soviet Union and includes 559 photographs of abandoned buildings, plants, and industrial sites (www.abandoned.ru). Another celebratory example is the book *Industrial Ruins* (Edensor 2005), which encourages people to enjoy industrial ruins as spaces of leisure and imagination, and criticizes the notion that industrial ruins are wasted spaces. There are more mournful and ambivalent examples in photojournalist studies of urban and industrial ruins, including *Manufactured Landscapes: The Photographs of Edward Burtynsky* (Pauli et al. 2003) and *American Ruins* (Vergara 1999), with stunning photographs accompanied by social commentary on the implications of industrial ruins for society and the environment.

My research of industrial ruination as a lived process brought me towards a criticism of artistic and cultural studies of industrial ruins, particularly studies that ignore the lives of the inhabitants of ruined landscapes. Nonetheless, the rise of dereliction tourism and artistic interest in abandoned industrial sites is sociologically interesting because they show that these sites are formidable enough in their presence to capture the popular and artistic imagination. The staggering social, economic, political, and geographical impacts of industrialization spurred profound sociological and artistic inspiration through the writings of Dickens and Engels and the paintings of Turner and the Futurists, to name a few examples. It is not surprising that the impacts of deindustrialization should spark their own sociological and artistic response. This book was also inspired by the visual impact of industrial ruins, but my interest is in the complex stories that stretch beyond mourning and celebration.

To view something as a ruin is already to have a perspective. Urban planners see industrial ruins as potential sites for redevelopment into museums, art galleries, or trendy apartments. Political economists see industrial ruins as the waste products of an uneven geography of capitalist development. Dereliction tourists, artists, and photojournalists see industrial ruins as beautiful yet tragic physical reminders of mortality and finality. But where some people see ruins, others see homes that are situated within painful processes of transformation. Rather than framing industrial ruins as fixed forms with implicit meanings
related to economic or aesthetic value, my analysis focuses on industrial ruination as a lived process. At any given moment, an industrial ruin appears as a snapshot of time and space within a longer process of ruination. Later, the ruin will inevitably undergo processes of demolition, reuse, or rebirth. Snapshots of industrial ruination can reveal a great deal about socio-economic processes, but they cannot be separated from the residential, commercial, community, and natural spaces in which they are located, or from the people who make up these surroundings. Thus, my analysis of industrial ruination as a lived process is framed within the broader context of landscapes and legacies.

**Landscape and Place**

The concept of “landscape” is a useful way to situate both processes and forms within “place” in the context of industrial ruination and urban decline. Landscape studies have encompassed a range of possible approaches including material, empirical, visual, and cultural approaches, and thus landscape provides a good framework in which to combine socio-economic and cultural analysis of industrial ruination. The cultural geographer Zukin (1991, 16) provides a useful definition of landscape:

> Landscape, as I use the term here, stretches the imagination. Not only does it denote the usual geographical meaning of “physical surroundings,” but it also refers to an ensemble of material and social practices and their symbolic representation. In a narrow sense, landscape represents the architecture of social class, gender, and race relations imposed by powerful institutions. In a broader sense, however, it connotes the entire panorama that we see: both the landscape of the powerful – cathedrals, factories, and skyscrapers – and the subordinate, resistant, or expressive vernacular of the powerless – village chapels, shantytowns, and tenements.

Following Zukin, I define landscapes as an ensemble of material and social practices, and as symbolic representations of these practices. However, Zukin’s stark division between the powerful and the powerless in her landscapes of “consumption and devastation” misses some of the complexity of landscapes, particularly in the context of lived experience. Moreover, the analysis does not apply to places of production because they always involve a mixture of labour, capital, and power and powerlessness.
There are some key tensions within the broad literature on landscape (which straddles art history, geography, archaeology, and cultural studies): tensions between distance and proximity, observation and inhabitation, and culture and nature. Wylie (2007) argues for an understanding of landscape which emphasizes lived experience rather than detached observation, derived from the work of the phenomenologist Merleau-Ponty (1989) and the cultural anthropologist Ingold (2000). In the phenomenological approach, “landscape is defined primarily in terms of embodied practices of dwelling – practices of being-in-the-world in which self and landscape are entwined and emergent” (Wylie 2007, 14). This approach contrasts with studies that neglect the human or “inhabited” dimension of landscape. Cresswell (2004, 10–11) is critical of the concept of landscape for this reason: he argues that “place” is a more inclusive concept, for place is inhabited, whereas landscape lacks people: “In most definitions of landscape the viewer is outside of it. This is the primary way in which it differs from place. Places are very much things to be inside of ... We do not live in landscapes – we look at them.”

One of the aims of my research was to read landscapes of industrial ruination and urban decline as the products of social, economic, and cultural processes. The process of reading involved analysing snapshots of industrial ruination and physical evidence of urban decline across different moments in time, in order to discover what these material traces could reveal of wider social and economic processes. For example, certain clues were evident in landscapes of industrial ruination as to the time scale and degree of industrial decline, level of contamination, degree of state regulation, public uses, type of former industry, national context, and function within the wider social geography, among other indicators. Similarly, boarded up houses, run-down shops, pocked roads, and other markers of urban decline are clues to the history of each place. The methods, process, and implications of reading landscapes of ruination, deprivation, and decline are explored in detail in chapter 5.

While my research examines the spatial, material, and economic dimensions of landscapes of industrial ruination, it is also concerned with landscapes as inhabited places in which people live through processes of change. In addressing the latter theme, my research interrogates the relationship between people and places of ruination and decline over time. The concept of landscape does not adequately capture a sense of temporality, nor, according to Cresswell, does it necessarily encompass people. The related concept of “legacies” addresses this ambiguity and tension within the concept of landscape. Legacies of industrial ruination and urban decline refer to enduring features, both social and material, of former industrial and urban eras. The concept of legacies adds a stronger temporal dimension to the analysis.
Legacies

If landscapes of industrial ruination and urban decline are slippery and unfixed, then legacies are even more difficult to map. Legacies of ruination and decline are related to inheritance, historical traces, and generational change: the diffuse social, economic, cultural, psychological, and environmental impacts of industrial and urban decline on people and places. In all three case studies, I located people who were related to sites and processes of industrial ruination, either directly or indirectly, through residential or commercial proximity, present or former employment, interpersonal relationships, or involvement in community development. The most obvious and direct relationships between people and places of industrial ruination could be understood through examining the current uses of derelict sites. However, since most of the sites were abandoned or partially abandoned, relatively few people interacted with them physically. Some people worked in remaining industries, while a greater number of people had formerly worked in industrial sites in each case. Most reports of site uses were of informal activities, such as vandalism, arson, drug and alcohol use, and theft of materials. One of the most important ways in which I explored people’s relationships with sites was through their memories and perceptions, which – far from being merely subjective accounts – reflect divisions within social groups and between generations and classes. Perhaps most importantly, they reflect much of the unease and difficulty experienced by people coping with transitions from an industrial past to an uncertain post-industrial future.

My analysis of memory and industrial ruination draws on the concept of collective or social memory. Collective memory, a term first coined by Maurice Halbwachs (1980), describes the shared and socially constructed memory of a group of people, as opposed to individual memory. The notion of collective memory has since been used in studies of national and public memories of traumatic histories, such as that of the Holocaust (cf. Williams 2007), as well as more generally in relation to complex processes of historical change (Blokland 2001; Nora 1989; Samuel 1994). Other scholars (Connerton 1989; Fentress and Wickham 1992) prefer the term “social memory” to “collective memory,” which suggests a less homogenized, more complex interplay between the individual and the collective. Critiques of the heritage and museum industries have also discussed the concept of collective memory. For example, Boyer (1994) argues that the contemporary postmodern city of collective memory is an artificial “museum” that consists of reinserted architectural fragments and traditions from the past. Some authors
frame the split between official and unofficial memory in terms of an artificial divide between history and memory: Nora (1989) is critical of the split between “true memory” and historical studies of memory, and Samuel (1994) argues for a synthesis between history and memory and links the concept of memory to contemporary ethnography. My analysis of memory follows Nora and Samuel through conceptualizing memory as a dynamic and embodied force, but in the particular context of industrial ruination as a lived process.

Much of the literature on memory, and on industrial ruins in particular, relates to the social production of meaning and memory, both official and unofficial, and to the commodification of memory in various forms of commemoration (Cowie and Heathcott 2003; Edensor 2005; Sargin 2004; Savage 2003; Shackel and Palus 2006). In an analysis of the relationship between social memory and industrial landscapes in the case of Virginius Island, part of Harpers Ferry National Historical Park in West Virginia, Shackel and Palus (2006) emphasize the struggle between labour and capital to control the meaning of the past. Another account of post-industrial conflict over meaning explores the contested politics of official memory-making and forgetting in Ankara, Turkey, since the 1950s (Sargin 2004). In an analysis of monuments to steel in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Savage (2003) argues for the poetic and symbolic superiority of a slag pile (the waste product from the process of making steel) as a monument over officially sanctioned structures. Edensor (2005) also contrasts official memory with alternative memories. He highlights the recent trends towards “museumification” in the conversion of industrial ruins to homogenous sites of tourism and consumption, and goes on to explore “counter-memories” and “involuntary memories”: multiple memories and forms of remembering stimulated by the “objects, spaces and traces” embodied in ruins.

I use the concept of “living memory,” defined as people’s present-day memories of a shared past, as opposed to official memory or collective memory. Living memory has diverse expressions across generations and social class, manifested through local experiences and practices in communities that are steeped in legacies of industrial ruination. Sites and processes of industrial ruination are deeply connected with the past and with the memory contained within them, as they are physical reminders of industrial production and decline, and of the lives connected to them. The literature on nostalgia also suggests that memory is an experience of the present; nostalgia always tells us more about the present than it does about the past (Davis 1979; Shaw and Chase 1989).

Legacies include not only memories and perceptions but also numerous socio-economic, cultural, and health long-term impacts of industrial decline. In each case, I focus on the
connections between the material landscape of decline and the adjacent neighbourhoods, communities, and cityscapes, and in particular on how these landscapes interrelate with social, political, and economic life. Landscapes and legacies of ruination and decline are deeply interconnected and cannot be separated. For this reason, I will address both landscapes and legacies together in the chapters that follow, focusing on the relationships between community, place, and social and economic change. At the heart of this analysis is a criticism of prevailing Western models of post-industrial development. “Post-industrial” refers to a socio-economic stage following the destruction of an industrial base, and is associated with decline in manufacturing in advanced capitalist countries and with the growth of knowledge, information, creative, and service economies (Bell 1973; Coyle 1998; Leadbetter 1998). However, this association is often more of an ideal than a socio-economic reality; many old industrial cities struggle to find new sources of employment and take divergent paths from the post-industrial mold. None of the case studies in this book are strictly post-industrial spaces; rather, they are in the process of moving away from an industrial past towards an uncertain post-industrial future.

**Methodology and Background to the Case Studies**

The research for this book draws on three case studies of industrial ruination and urban decline, including the following methods: site and ethnographic observations; analysis of archival, documentary and photographic materials; “mobile methods” (see Büscher and Urry 2009) of spatial analysis, such as walking and driving tours of old industrial areas with research participants; secondary analysis of statistics; and, in each case, twenty to thirty in-depth qualitative interviews with a range of local people, including workers, residents, ex-workers, trade unionists, government officials, pensioners, urban planners, activists, and community and voluntary sector representatives. I conducted the research between 2005 and 2009, and devoted approximately two months of field research to each case study. I have kept all interviewees confidential or given them pseudonyms to protect their identities, and conducted all research in accordance with the ethical guidelines of the Canadian Sociological Association, the British Sociological Association, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

My methodological approach was inspired in part by Burawoy’s (1998, 7) concept of the “extended case method,” a reflexive and ethnographic approach to case study research which “thematizes our presence in the world we study” and explores connections between local contexts and global processes. According to Yin (1994), case studies are particularly useful for
examining the complexities of contemporary real-life situations and processes, which corresponds to my interest in lived experiences of deindustrialization. I chose multiple case studies rather than single case studies to highlight the complex interplay between the local, regional, national, and global, and to draw out unique as well as cross-cutting themes. However, the rationale for selection of multiple case studies in my research was not strictly comparative, at least not in the “comparative methodology” sense related to the scientific method of experimentation (see Ragin 1987). A more accurate way of describing my selection of case studies is “paradigmatic,” a term Flyvbjerg (2001, 79) applies to describe a case study used “to develop a metaphor or establish a school for the domain which the case concerns.” I selected three paradigmatic case studies of industrial ruination and urban decline from three different regions of the world where deindustrialization has been most pronounced: the Rust Belt of North America, the North of England, and the old industrial regions of post-Soviet Russia. Each case study is in some ways typical of deindustrialization, yet each is also contextually specific or unique. The cases as a whole, through their combination of locally specific and typical features, are exemplary of cases of industrial ruination in an uneven geography of capitalist development.

My first criterion for selecting case studies was that each had to have experienced deindustrialization, but not full post-industrial transformation, and had to still have physical evidence of industrial ruins. This relates to my methodological choice to study places that have been “left behind” rather than the “success stories” of post-industrial transformation, such as Barcelona and Bilbao, which have been widely lauded as models of regeneration (González 2011). This choice also makes problematic the idea of “successful” post-industrial examples; the city centres of Newcastle upon Tyne and Niagara Falls, Ontario, are also commonly seen as success stories, yet a closer look at particular old industrial communities within both cities reveals evidence of industrial and urban decline. Each of the cities I selected was associated with a different iconic heavy industry: shipbuilding in Newcastle, textiles in Ivanovo, and chemicals in Niagara Falls. Each case was at a different phase of deindustrialization: Ivanovo was at an early phase; Niagara Falls was enduring a prolonged phase; and Newcastle was at a phase of impending regeneration. At the same time, the focus on old industrial sites and the communities surrounding them, rather than on the cities per se, grounded the research. The North American Rust Belt and Northern England were appropriate choices because both were from classic areas of industrial decline. The third case counterbalances the Anglo-American focus of (English language) academic literature on deindustrialization, and is situated in what one might call a rising star in the literature: post-Soviet Russia. The scale of industrial ruination in Russia is vast and
much of its post-industrial geography undocumented, although this (documentation as well as geography) is rapidly changing. Cities such as Detroit and Manchester have become global symbols of deindustrialization, and of the limits and successes, respectively, of post-industrial transformation (Dicken 2002; Peck and Ward 2002; Persky and Wiewel 2000; Ward 2003; Zukin 1991). By contrast, my three cases have been relatively under-studied (but see Hang and Salvo 1981; Hudson 1998; Madanipour and Bevan 1999; Richardson et al. 2000; Shields 1991; Treivish 2004). Thus, this research contributes to specific knowledge about the social and economic geography and particularities of each case study in this context. By working comparatively, it also contributes to a wider theoretical discussion on how specific old industrial areas are connected to wider processes of social and economic change.

To summarize, the rationale for selection of case studies was based on the criteria that each case study would be: (1) an old industrial area that had experienced significant deindustrialization and had visible industrial ruins within its physical landscape; (2) on a different manufacturing-based industry, to show similarities and contrasts across industries, particularly different working cultures, gender dynamics, relationships with communities, and skill sets; (3) located in a different national context, to broaden the scope and potential for global comparisons of industrial capitalism; (4) at a different stage of deindustrialization, to reveal the complexities of deindustrialization as a temporal process; (5) located within a medium-sized conurbation, as these are more common than larger locations, yet are more heterogeneous than small mono-industrial towns; and (6) not as widely researched as other cities of industrial decline.

The research was theoretically driven, with the aim of generating ways to understand processes of industrial ruination throughout the globe. Together, the cases provide insights into how people cope with post-industrial transition in different national, political, social, and cultural contexts. With three case studies, it is possible to draw a range of comparisons: themes common to all three case studies; themes common to two case studies (with three possible combinations); and themes distinctive to each one (see table 1.1). If the study had used only two, distinctive insights would have been lost: the pernicious dimension of toxic contamination in Niagara Falls; the impacts of state regulation and protracted decline in Newcastle; and the post-Soviet context and the tenacity of old industries in Ivanovo. This research not only contributes to specific knowledge about the social and economic geography of each case, but also contributes to a wider theoretical discussion about common features, issues, and challenges in the landscapes and legacies of industrial ruination and urban decline.
I developed, adopted, and adapted the mixed qualitative case study methods of this research throughout the course of my investigation. On one hand, I wanted to explore the theories of Harvey and Zukin on uneven geographies of capitalism, and to follow Smith and Harvey’s (2008) invitation to examine uneven geographies of capitalist development at more varied and complex spatial scales. On the other hand, I wanted to remain open to what emerged from the data once I was in the field. As I moved through the different case studies, my work became increasingly ethnographic in focus. I asked research participants questions about the changes in the past twenty to thirty years in relation to jobs, housing, education, and social services; how they related to and identified with these processes and more specifically with the sites of industrial ruination; and about their individual and collective roles within change, contestation, redevelopment, or daily life. The ethnographic shift in my research occurred gradually as I started to incorporate material collected outside of the context of formal interviews, such as informal meetings, and driving and walking tours with informants. The analysis also shifted towards a focus on people’s stories, and to the value of the narrative interview. The findings that emerged from the field data all came from the ethnographic observations and in-depth interviews, and included themes of: conflicted place memory and nostalgia; attachment to homes and community; visions of community solidarity and contestation; uncertainty and stress; and legacies of industrial ruination that were particular to different forms of industry (toxic chemicals, shipbuilding, or textiles).

There were some limitations to the depth and scope of my case study research and analysis in these three sites. I was not able to spend an extended period in each location, so my information presents only a snapshot of time and space, and does not incorporate changes over a long period of time. However, this limitation fits with my analytical approach: to read slices of space and time in order to understand socio-economic processes at particular moments of industrial ruination. Each of the case studies had different challenges and specificities in terms of access, practical constraints, and richness of material, so they are not completely even, as in strictly comparative methodology (Ragin 1987), but rather illustrative and paradigmatic, with some scope for reflexivity, intuition, and adaptability within different contexts. Given the large amount of empirical data that I collected during my fieldwork, I had to be selective in which narratives I represented, particularly given the international and comparative scope of this study. I aimed to cover a wide range of perspectives and sources, yet I also had to be careful to maintain the richness of the qualitative material. In my data analysis, I reviewed all of the interviews and ethnographic field notes and identified key themes within and across case studies.
Finally, I selected illustrative interview examples and ethnographic observations related to key themes within and across the case studies to discuss in greater depth. The narrative ethnographic approaches of Richard Sennett (1998) and Burawoy and Verdery (1999), which focus on particularly revealing or illustrative narratives from a selection of their research participants, inspired this methodological choice.

<Insert Table 1.1: Key themes of case studies.>

**Case Study I: Niagara Falls, Canada/USA**

The cities and highways along the North American Rust Belt were the original inspiration for this book. I selected Niagara Falls as a case study based on my memory of driving through the city as part of a cross-country road trip from Ontario to my home province of British Columbia in 2002. I was struck by the looming industrial ruins around Hamilton, Detroit, and Chicago, but I was even more astounded by the contrasts within Niagara Falls. In the public imagination, Niagara Falls is primarily a tourist destination, associated with honeymoons, casinos, and tawdry amusements. My parents spent their honeymoon there in the late 1970s, and I remember a childhood family visit in which I wore a plastic yellow raincoat and stood next to the falls. However, as I was to discover later on, beneath the myth of Niagara Falls on both sides of the border is a Rust Belt story of toxic contamination, boarded-up cities, and industrial decline.

Niagara Falls, Ontario, and Niagara Falls, New York, are twin cities built around the spectacular natural falls that straddle the international border between the United States and Canada. The Niagara region has almost two million regional inhabitants and seventeen million yearly visitors (Schneekloth and Shibley 2005). However, the twin cities themselves are relatively small: approximately 82,000 people live in Niagara Falls, Ontario (2006 Canada Census), and 51,000 live in Niagara Falls, New York (2008 US Census estimates), with opposing population dynamics of growth in the former city and depopulation in the latter. Although Niagara Falls is best known as a tourist destination, the region has many other identities, as described in the following passage:
Niagara certainly has its share of representations: the honeymoon capital of the world, one of the most lucrative gambling sites in North America, the great source of hydro power, the snowbelt of the US and the southern border in Canada, the rustbelt in the US and the wine country in Canada. Each of these imagined Niagaras sits in uneasy juxtaposition with the others; and each has consequences for the structure of governance, investment, and quality of life. (Schneekloth and Shibley 2005, 105–6)

The theme of “uneasy juxtaposition” is important when considering the social and economic landscape of the falls. Historical industries in the area include: tourism; steel; aircraft, mechanical, and electrochemical products; aluminium goods; and hydroelectricity, among others. Tourism – through casinos, honeymoons, cruise boats, and Disney-like amusements – has played a significant role in the historical and economic development of the region. Niagara Falls has been the focus of many studies in relation to its tourist industry, natural beauty, cultural significance, and position as an international border (Berton 1992; Irwin 1996; McGreevy and Merritt 1991; Shields 1991). The tourist industry has been more successful on the Canadian side of the border since the mid-twentieth century, partly because it has a better view of the falls, but also because of various political and economic factors. A physical landscape of abandoned and toxic industrial sites persists on both sides of the border, but is more prevalent in the US side. Tourist industries, abandoned and remaining heavy industries, dilapidated downtown centres, and vast stretches of natural beauty, amongst other contradictory features, comprise Niagara Falls. The case study of Niagara Falls, unlike the other two cases explored in this book, represents a “nested” or “embedded” case study of two cases within one case (Yin 1994) in order to capture the wider dynamics of industrial decline within the international border city-region.
The falls have long been exploited as a resource, both by the tourist industry, which has promoted them as a natural wonder of the world, and also by heavy industry, which once thrived on the energy generated by the waterfall. The historic over-exploitation of Niagara Falls has been noted in the literature as a “tragedy of the commons,” a phenomenon in which a public resource is subjected to overuse and underinvestment (Healy 2006; Ingram and Inman 1996). This theory describes the history of the tourist industry in Niagara Falls, which was unregulated in its early days in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. There were warring hotel entrepreneurs, spectacles such as tight-rope walking, circus animals, a museum of curiosities from around the world, and “peddlers, hucksters, con artists and sideshow men on both sides of the falls” (Ingram and Inman 1996, 632). The tragedy of the commons is not invoked in this literature, as it could be, in reference to historical industrial over-exploitation.

The main reference point in the Rust Belt history of Niagara Falls is the infamous 1978 environmental disaster at Love Canal on the Niagara frontier in New York, when a toxic chemical dump was discovered underneath a residential neighbourhood and had disastrous
health consequences for the community (Colten and Skinner 1996; Gibbs 1998; Mazur 1998; Newman 2003). However, Love Canal is just one of many examples of toxic contamination from the chemical industries in the Rust Belt. There are numerous contaminated “brownfield” sites on both sides of the border in Niagara Falls. The twin cities are situated in different national contexts of deindustrialization – the American Rust Belt and the Canadian industrial heartland – which are sometimes referred to collectively as the North American Rust Belt (High 2003), as they form a vast region around the Great Lakes of rusted steel, car, and other heavy manufacturing plants. Canadian manufacturing activity, according to Lawrence McCann (cited in High 2003, 34–5), is concentrated in “a crescent between the western end of Lake Ontario from Oshawa to Niagara Fall [...] a broad belt extending from Toronto to Windsor. These two zones comprise the Western Axis Manufacturing Area.” The American Rust Belt is a familiar case of deindustrialization (cf. Bluestone and Harrison 1982; Cowie 1999; Cowie and Heathcott 2003), whereas the Canadian Rust Belt is less well-known.

My focus in Niagara Falls was on two abandoned chemical industrial areas – one on each side of the border – located in close proximity to low-income residential areas. I chose chemical industries from both countries to highlight cross-border parallels, particularly the relationship between contaminated sites and adjacent communities. Issues of social exclusion relating to race and ethnicity also emerged more strongly in this case than in others, for example in the case of the segregated African-American community of Highland in Niagara Falls, New York. The case study of Niagara Falls offers distinctive insights into the legacies of toxic contamination as an aspect of deindustrialization. The inclusion of Niagara Falls, Ontario, in addition to the more apparent case of Niagara Falls, New York, as a single nested or embedded case study (Yin 1994) demonstrates the multiple manifestations and unevenness of industrial decline and its legacies within different national contexts. Ambivalent nostalgia and traumatic memory were key themes in the living memories of people in Niagara Falls, due to the impacts of job losses and toxic pollution, and the difficulty of separating positive and negative memories. The lingering health effects of pollution, combined with the continued socio-economic effects of unemployment and economic decline, produce a double burden associated with industrial ruination.

Case Study II: Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom

It took me some time to select Newcastle upon Tyne as a United Kingdom case study, and I spent several months in preparation, researching different cities and taking train journeys to
those I had short-listed as potential cases, including Liverpool, Manchester, Stoke-on-Trent, Sheffield, Leeds, and Glasgow. I chose Newcastle partly because some of its old industrial areas remained untouched by regeneration, and partly because its deindustrialization had been studied less than that of other Northern industrial cities. I was also captivated by the atmosphere of the old industrial city built on the River Tyne: there was still a strong sense of local pride and collective memory based on shipbuilding. During my first visits to the city, I was struck by the juxtaposition between the regenerated quayside in the city centre and the abandoned shipyards to the east and west.

Newcastle upon Tyne is a city of approximately 220,000 people in the North East of England. Newcastle upon Tyne, Gateshead, North Tyneside, South Tyneside, and the City of Sunderland are the five local authorities that comprise Tyne and Wear, a conurbation of approximately one million people (see map 1.2). The 2007 English Indices of Deprivation reported that “the Region which has the greatest percentage of its LSOAs [Lower Layer Super Output Areas] that fall in England’s most deprived 20% is the North East (34.2%)” (Noble et al. 2007, 12).

![Insert Map 1.2: Newcastle upon Tyne, North East England](image-url)
The North East was built on coal mining, steel, engineering, and shipbuilding along the rivers Tyne, Wear, and Tees. The region, with Newcastle as its capital, reached its technological and industrial highpoint in the early twentieth century. It was one of the first regions in Britain to experience massive deindustrialization, yet this process has been prolonged. Newcastle’s economy first suffered a major downturn in 1910 during a national slump that hit the coal and engineering trades particularly hard. Its economy revived during World War I, suffered again in the 1930s, revived briefly during the 1950s post-war boom, and has been in decline since the 1970s (Tomaney and Ward 2001). The abatement of manufacturing has been accompanied by limited service sector growth, and jobs in shipyards and factories have been replaced by jobs in call centres, night clubs, and shopping malls. A number of factors of decline in the North East are cited within the literature, including strong foreign competition, overcapacity, labour conflict, government-led national economic restructuring (under Margaret Thatcher), the north-south divide in the United Kingdom, underinvestment and disinvestment, and poor business management (Charles and Benneworth 2001; Hudson 1998; Robinson 2002; Tomaney and Ward 2001). The majority of shipyard closures in Newcastle occurred between the 1960s and 1980s, but closures continued through the 1990s and into the 2000s. During that time, lifelines were offered by the National Government to United Kingdom shipyards, such as Swan Hunter in Newcastle, in return for building government warships (Hilditch 1990), as well as for ship dismantling. Swan Hunter, the “last shipyard of the Tyne,” closed in 2006.

In the 1990s, Newcastle attracted new industries, including call centres and inward investment branch plants (Tomaney et al. 1999; Tomaney and Ward 2001). This “new economy” has been the subject of much debate. Some critics have argued that the low-paid and female-dominated call centre jobs lack long-term prospects for economic growth (Richardson et al. 2000). Others have observed that the party culture in Newcastle and the Metro Centre, “one of Europe’s largest indoor shopping and leisure centres” in neighbouring Gateshead, offer only limited regional economic growth, as they are based on consumption rather than production and much of that consumption is regional (Hollands and Chatterton 2002). The longevity of the new economy has also been questioned: the city experienced a wave of plant closures of new inward investment branch plants during the economic crisis of 1998, and many of the call centres that opened in the 1990s have since moved to India and other places in Asia.

In 1999, Newcastle City Council attempted to address some of the problems in the city related to deindustrialization, including significant depopulation, unemployment, and social and economic deprivation, by branding itself as “competitive Newcastle” and launching a
controversial ten-year economic redevelopment plan entitled Going for Growth. This city-wide initiative sought to replace older housing with middle class homes in an effort to retain the middle-class population, which raised concerns that working class populations would be pushed out (Byrne 2000; Cameron 2003). With funding from the government’s National Lottery and collaboration with the municipality on the opposite side of the River Tyne (Gateshead), Newcastle was remarkably successful at physically regenerating the city centre and the quayside area with riverside flats, restaurants, art galleries, and night clubs. However, other efforts were complete failures, such as the city council-led regeneration of Newcastle’s West End, a deprived and disadvantaged former industrial area (based on engineering, armaments, and small-scale industries) that had been subject to repeated urban renewal policies since the 1960s (Madanipour and Bevan 1999; Robinson 2005).

When I first asked local residents about old factories in Newcastle, a typical answer was: “There are not many left. You should have come a long time ago.” After many walks along the Tyne, metro journeys to North Shields and the neighbouring rival city of Sunderland, and many queries with local residents, academics, and city council economic development officials, I decided to focus my research on the Walker Riverside industrial area and the adjacent community. Walker was one of the few remaining old industrial sites in Newcastle that was not regenerated at the time of my research, and it remained symbolically important as the former site of famous shipyards, such as the Neptune Yard and Swan Hunter. Deindustrialization in Walker has been long and protracted, processes of both decline and renewal have been mediated by the state, and the local community has resisted the City Council’s attempt at housing-led regeneration since 2001. This contrasts with the West End of Newcastle, which had already undergone several waves of demolitions and redevelopments over the previous forty years, and which no longer faced significant community resistance (Robinson 2005). Imminent regeneration was a defining theme of the legacies of industrial ruination and urban decline in Walker. Many people no longer related to the shipyards directly, but instead felt connected to their homes and the community that had been built on, but was no longer itself related to, shipbuilding.

The case study of Walker, Newcastle upon Tyne, reveals social, economic, and spatial juxtapositions between sites of deprivation and regeneration within old industrial cities, and explores the uncertainties embedded in lived experiences of post-industrial change. Furthermore, it offers distinctive conceptual insights into the social impacts of protracted, government-regulated processes of change, as opposed to processes of unmitigated capitalist abandonment
and redevelopment. To employ an analogy with the terms of post-socialist transition, this approach resembled “gradualism” rather than “shock therapy” (Dehejia 1997; Grindea 1997; Stephan 1999), which is ironic given the overarching context of Thatcherism in Britain. One of the criticisms of shock therapy with post-socialist transition was the lack of new institutions to replace those that had been dismantled overnight. In the case of post-industrial transformation in Walker, despite the long process, there was nothing to replace the industry that left. The proposed regeneration of Walker hinged entirely on property-led development rather than on local employment strategies. Even at the level of the city of Newcastle and the North East region as a whole there was no substantive post-industrial economic engine to replace industry. This has strong parallels to the lack of post-industrial opportunities facing the post-Soviet textile city of Ivanovo, although the scale, scope, and speed of industrial ruination in Ivanovo were far greater, in part due to different starting conditions.

Case Study III: Ivanovo, Russia

Ivanovo is a post-Soviet textile city marked by extensive industrial ruination, urban decline, and deprivation. I selected Ivanovo as my third and final case study because the post-Soviet context offers a counterpoint to the Anglo-American focus of the other case studies, and to the broader English-language literature on Western deindustrialization. The study of post-Soviet landscapes of industrial decline provides a way to test the insights of political economy: how does a newly capitalist geography compare with older capitalist geographies? Does the analysis of an uneven geography of capitalism still hold? The textile industry had been heavily concentrated in Ivanovo, which was the primary textile manufacturer within the centrally-planned economy of the Soviet Union. This concentration of industrial activity in one city-region as a starting condition before deindustrialization resulted in a much larger scale of industrial ruination than that in Western cases. The historic lack of economic diversification and Soviet logic of non-market-based enterprises also led many textile factories to re-open without hope of profits, through barter exchanges based on the financial backing of suppliers and local political connections (see chapter 4).

In researching Ivanovo, I felt the most like a dereliction tourist: this was a source of unease when I spent my first days in the city wandering through a vast and unfamiliar urban landscape of industrial ruination. In fact, a description of Ivanovo in the “Way to Russia” online
travel guide, written by a team of Russians to encourage tourism, describes “ruins” as the city’s only worthwhile tourist asset:

Ivanovo is a grey and gloomy city, with relics of the Soviet times on every step. It'll be enough to pass it through by bus going between Vladimir and Kostroma, just keep your eyes wide open: the central noisy and dirty street with grey residential buildings and a big red church in the middle of all the mess; the faded impressive mosaics to glory [sic] the Soviet heroes, left here from the 1970s; a dirty and noisy bus station with an old man playing accordion to cheer his fellow babushkas. (Way to Russia 2009)

The region of Ivanovo has a population of 1,148,329, and the city of Ivanovo, which is the region’s administrative centre, has a population of 431,721 (Russian Federal Service of State Statistics 2002). Located approximately 300 kilometres northeast of Moscow, Ivanovo forms part of the “Golden Ring” railway network of ancient cities around Moscow (see map 1.3). However, unlike the other cities in the Golden Ring, such as Yaroslavl, Kostroma, and Vladimir, which have fortresses, monasteries, and centuries-old white stone churches, Ivanovo is a modern industrial city with semi-abandoned textile factories and Soviet architecture. The only references to its pre-industrial history are dilapidated wooden country-style houses and old wooden churches. In 1871, Ivanovo-Voznesensk was formed as an administrative unit through the amalgamation of two villages, and it rapidly industrialized as a textile centre and earned fame as the “Russian Manchester.” The population exploded from 17,000 in 1870 to 170,000 in 1917, making it the fastest growing city in Central Russia at the time. The city was populated by wealthy manufacturers and weavers in addition to a new working class, and the growing antagonism between labour and capital led to the first Soviet of Workers’ Deputies in 1905 (Treivish 2004, 14). Ivanovo-Voznesensk reached the height of its textile production in the 1910s, but it only gained official city status in 1918, and was renamed Ivanovo in 1932. The revolutionary Soviet and industrial spirit of the city earned Ivanovo status as “the third Russian proletarian capital after Leningrad and Moscow,” designated by Lenin himself. The city was also nicknamed the “City of Brides” or “the town of single women” (Browning 1992) because of its predominantly female workforce.
During the Soviet era, textile production in Ivanovo continued despite a steady decline in output, bolstered by the control of the centrally planned economy. In the 1960s, crane-building and machine-building plants were established in the city to improve the gender balance of labour and to diversify its mono-industrial structure, but this strategy was not very successful. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, the textile workforce gradually declined. Ivanovo was one of the first cities in the former Soviet Union to experience deindustrialization. Within the literature, reasons cited for this include a dramatic decline in domestic demand and the low competitiveness of Russian industries, particularly light industries, in global markets (Kouznetsov 2004). The era of perestroika, or “restructuring” – a policy introduced by Gorbachev during the late 1980s that has been widely associated with the collapse of the Soviet Union – was a difficult period of social and economic transition in Ivanovo and in Russia as a whole. The social and economic impacts of the transition to market capitalism lasted for several years, with food shortages throughout the early and mid-1990s. During this time, 60 per cent of the Ivanovo population had to live on food from their gardens, a survival strategy in post-Soviet Russia known as the “dacha movement” (Burawoy et al. 2000; Sitar and Sverdlov 2004). Textile
production in Ivanovo came to a complete standstill in the early 1990s. One of the largest textile plants, the Eighth March Textile Factory, closed in the 1990s and was converted into Silver City shopping centre. Russian textiles made a significant recovery after the 1998 crisis, but there were doubts about the long-term survival of the industry in the early 2000s due to growing competition from China and other emerging economies and to the persistence of Soviet management practices within factories (Morrison 2008, 7–8).

Despite its proximity to Moscow, Ivanovo has fared poorly since the 1990s in relation to indicators of social and economic deprivation, even in comparison with cities in other Russian regions. The problems include housing shortages despite depopulation, high poverty rates, crime and alcohol use, lower life expectancies, low quality of dwellings and infrastructure, and high levels of informal (“grey”) business. Although there has been a nominal decrease in unemployment since the economic crisis of 1998, the figures are inaccurate, since a number of people work for factories that are only open one month per year, wage arrears are still common, and the informal economy accounts for a large degree of peoples’ livelihoods (Burawoy et al. 2000; Kouznetsov 2004). The average wage in Ivanovo is very low, and only a small number of people are affluent. In 2000, 10.9 per cent of people in Russia (on average) had an income of more than 4,000 roubles per month ($205), as compared with 0.1 per cent of people in the Ivanovo region (Kouznetsov 2004). The employment structure changed significantly with the collapse of industry (58 per cent of jobs were lost between 1980 and 1998), and available jobs are often given to men over women. Between 1990 and 2002, the city experienced depopulation of 6.8 per cent (Sitar and Sverdlov 2004), and this trend continues today as young people relocate in search of better employment opportunities.

One of the most extensive contemporary English accounts of the social and economic situation in Ivanovo is a Shrinking Cities Working Paper (Kouznetsov 2004; Sitar and Sverdlov 2004; Treivish 2004). Ivanovo was one of four urban centres that the Shrinking Cities Working Papers focused on, including Detroit, Ivanovo, Manchester/Liverpool, and Halle/Leipzig, in a project funded by Germany’s Federal Cultural Foundation. The project included exhibitions and publications about contemporary cities that have experienced “shrinkage” in population terms or decline in social and economic sectors, and had input from architects, academics, and artists. According to Treivish (2004), Ivanovo has three main stories: the paradoxical story of being located in the heartland of Russia, yet remaining marginalized; the Soviet and post-Soviet story of political ideals versus reality; and the typical deindustrialization story of long-term decline. Treivish describes a historical shift in Ivanovo from industrial growth to industrial ruins, from
social revolution to social apathy, and from Soviet industrialist and constructivist urban planning to general decay and selective market-oriented renovation. Sitar and Sverdlov (2004) underline the specificity of the “Soviet socio-cultural model” as one of accelerated urbanization from an agricultural to an urban society which still maintains a level of continuity with the traditional principles of the “peasant world” and with the socialist past. My research is most concerned with Treivish’s third story of “typical deindustrialization,” although the other stories, particularly the specificity of the post-Soviet context, are deeply connected with this case.

Industrial ruination in Ivanovo was abundant and pervasive, as abandoned textile factories were scattered throughout the city, in addition to derelict and vacant houses and commercial buildings. At the same time, the landscape of ruination in Ivanovo was in a process of “reversal,” as shown in the phenomenon of partially working and partially abandoned textile factories throughout the city. I decided to focus on the textile industries throughout the city as a whole, rather than those within a particular area, because the ruination of that single industry is widespread throughout the city. Pragmatism and functionalism emerged as themes that showed how people related to spaces of ruination, and how they lived and worked within a city characterized by significant industrial decline and limited urban renewal. Another theme that emerged was the tenacity of the textile and Soviet identities of the city. After the closure of virtually all textile factories in the city during the early 1990s, many factories gradually re-opened at a fraction of their original capacity. Despite the industry’s ongoing struggle for viability, Ivanovo is still described within the official city literature as the “Russian Manchester”. The case study of Ivanovo offers important insights into landscapes and legacies of industrial ruination and urban decline because of the significant scope and scale of its ruination and decline, because it is a recently deindustrialized city, and because of its post-Soviet context.

The Structure of This Book

This chapter has introduced the broad aims of this research project; the existing literature on landscape and place, legacies, deindustrialization, and industrial ruins; the theoretical framework of industrial ruination as a lived process; the mixed-method multiple-site case study research design; the background to the three case studies; and the methods of fieldwork and research analysis. The first part of this book – chapters 2, 3, and 4 – present each of the case studies of industrial ruination, community, and place. Rather than aiming for a comprehensive overview of a wide range of themes, these chapters highlight some of the most important and distinctive
insights within each case while hinting at common themes. The second part of the book explores
the conceptual themes that emerged in the research through comparative analysis of the different
cases. Chapter 5 considers the theme of “reading landscapes of ruination, deprivation, and
decline,” and explores how one can read socio-economic processes within landscapes of
industrial ruination and adjacent urban communities through a combination of spatial, visual,
and social analysis. Chapter 6 explores the theme of “devastation, but also home” – many people
who live in areas of industrial decline are attached to their homes and communities despite living
among devastation. Chapter 7 expands the discussion to consider “imagining change, reinventing
place” – how people cope with change and uncertainty, how they engage with the local politics
of community and development, and how they imagine possible futures. The concluding chapter
summarizes the central themes of the book, connects both distinctive and cross-cutting themes
with theoretical debates, and reflects on some of the policy implications of this research.

Landscapes and legacies of industrial ruination and urban decline are evident throughout
the industrialized world, and represent enduring and complex contemporary realities for people
living through post-industrial change. Although my research is limited to three case studies, I
could have selected many other examples. In fact, each person I tell about my research has a new
story that relates to industrial decline; I have heard stories about the steel in Sheffield, the tin in
Malaysia, the Ruhr area in Germany, the coal mines in British Columbia, and the vast industrial
cities of China. It is my hope that the questions and themes explored in this book will resonate
with myriad other places around the world.

Notes

1 Beyond the industrialized West, deindustrialization has occurred in countries throughout the
globe, including in areas of Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, Russia, and Central and
Eastern Europe. While a great deal of research has explored global economics of development
and transition, particularly in the “newly industrialized countries” of Brazil, Russia, India, and
China, there have been limited attempts by Western scholars to account for the different impacts
and experiences of deindustrialization around the world. One interesting exception is the case of
the Zambian Copperbelt, once described as “the wave of the African future,” which flourished
in the 1960s only to experience serious deindustrialization in subsequent decades (Ferguson
1999). However, between 2005 and 2007 world copper prices rose, and corporations that had
purchased the Zambian copper mines at rock-bottom prices during the late 1990s in the height
of industrial decline made considerable profits without reinvesting in community infrastructure
(Walsh 2007). This case shows that patterns of industrialization and deindustrialization do not
necessarily follow the same timelines around the modern world, and that corporations can be
negligent not only during deindustrialization and capital abandonment, but also during re-
industrialization.
Approaches in contemporary archaeology that attempt to read the materiality of objects and practices in the recent past to learn about socio-economic processes and cultural meanings inspired the methodology in this book. In chapter 5, I use this approach explicitly and draw on a combination of visual, spatial, mobile, and ethnographic methods to read the social and spatial landscapes. The concept of legacies of industrial ruination also involves a temporal dimension and is another way of excavating the recent past. There are no fixed or clearly defined methods of contemporary archaeology, and my approach borrows insights from this perspective but adopts a reflexive, intuitive, mixed-method case study methodology.

I conducted research in Niagara Falls between March and April 2007, including nineteen in-depth interviews, several group interviews, local archival and documentary material analysis, walking and driving tours with informants, and site and ethnographical observations. In Newcastle upon Tyne, I conducted field research between June 2005 and March 2006, including thirty qualitative interviews, site and ethnographic observations, walking and driving tours, and document analysis, with five additional follow-up interviews in July 2009. This field work took longer than in the other two cases because it was the pilot case study during which I tested the research design and methodology, and, unlike in the other two case studies, I made a series of trips to the city of three to seven days’ duration rather than spending an extended period in the field. I conducted research in Ivanovo between August and September 2006, with follow-up correspondence with key informants in December 2007, including eighteen interviews, three group interviews, document analysis, and site and ethnographic observations.

According to Yin (1994, 46), the rationale for choosing multiple cases rather than single cases in social research is generally based on “replication,” – either literal, in which similar results are predicted, or theoretical, in which contrasting results are predicted but for particular reasons. In the multiple case studies that I selected, I expected to find a combination of Yin’s types of replication, literal in the general sense and theoretical in the specific sense.

The concept of paradigmatic case studies is derived from Thomas Kuhn’s theory of paradigm shifts within scientific thought. Paradigmatic cases “highlight the more general characteristics of the societies in question” (Flyvbjerg 2001, 80).

The 2000 English Indices of Deprivation (Noble, Wright, and Dibben 2000) ranked Newcastle at 20 of out 354 Local Authorities in England, where 1 was the most deprived area and 354 the least deprived. The 2004 English Indices of Deprivation (Noble, Wright, and Dibben 2004) analyse multiple deprivation data on the basis of the smaller spatial scale of Super Output Areas (SOAs), rather than cities. The 2004 Indices note that the pattern of severe multiple deprivation in the North East remained similar to the pattern reported in 2000, and was concentrated around old steel, shipbuilding, and mining areas. The Indices report that 355 of the 10 per cent most deprived SOAs in England are located in the North East.

In September 1991, there were riots in the West End of Newcastle related to severe problems of social exclusion in the area, which highlighted the failures of previous regeneration policies. After the riots, the city feared that the area would become a place of lawlessness and anarchy.
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