

Introduction

GEORGE S. JARAMILLO AND JULIANE TOMANN

On the splash page of the BBC website Business section of June 2019, a short article warned of Ford Motor Company cutting 12,000 jobs and the closure of four automobile plants across Europe by the end of 2020. These include factories in Russia, Wales, France and Slovakia. The author discusses the economic factors leading to Ford's need to restructure its sites and plants, with the subsequent loss of jobs as key impacts on their respective communities and regions. However, in the outcome, the economic restructuring would set in motion a much broader and multifaceted process of deindustrialization that goes beyond the fact that jobs will be lost and factories will shut down. Being published on the splash page, the article had to highlight the economic situation, omitting certain details that the format did not allow for in such a condensed space. Yet, these omitted pieces are key to critically contextualizing deindustrialization. As a network of multifaceted processes, deindustrialization not only refers to shrinking production, consumption and the respective economic decline, but also entails the resulting sociomaterial and natural entanglements that form deindustrializing landscapes. Thus, if we are to frame these landscapes as complex and ongoing processes, then the closures of factories become more than distinctive episodes in economic evolution; rather, they form continuums across past, present and future engagements (Pike 2020).

This edited volume explores these multiple entanglements of deindustrializing landscapes with a focus on affective and embodied encounters, performative perspectives and speculative futures. Tackling deindustrialization through the lens of evolving landscapes inspires not only new perspectives

on the nature of deindustrialization, but encourages interdisciplinary ways to research this subject matter. The chapters of this volume can be read in response to a recent claim to ‘focus on theorizing deindustrialization and moving beyond describing [it]’ (Clark 2020: np). This introduction explores the development of deindustrialization studies from its nascent roots over forty years ago to its ongoing evolution as an interdisciplinary area of study. It then presents the two main theoretical perspectives, which are the common denominators of the case studies: a perspective on landscape (Wylie 2007) and performativity combined with an approach to studying them within more-than-representational theory (Thrift 2007). The chapter concludes by emphasizing the transregional connections between the variety of cases gathered in this volume.

Deindustrialization as an Interdisciplinary Field of Study

In its time, industrialization brought benefits to places, people and communities creating wealth and prosperity, despite the negative side effects that accompanied the phenomenon from the beginning (Clark 2020). But growth has its limits, and the process of industrialization has terminated in many regions where it used to be the main driving force for economic change and development. Deindustrialization evolved, with its accompanying processes and effects of decay and decline, as the antithesis of economic growth and development. Though industrial decline has been a part of any type of economic evolution, the term ‘deindustrialization’ was first used in the 1970s in North America and the United Kingdom (High, MacKinnon and Perchard 2017) to describe the economic loss of industrial workplaces and culture as a result of factory closures. This laid a foundation for understanding economic and social processes surrounding aspects of deindustrialization where factory closures were seen not just as ‘happening’ outside of people’s control, but as specific choices made by companies to move industries to places with cheaper labour or material (Bluestone and Harrison 1982). Therefore, these studies were rooted in the historical moment, capturing and cultivating a notion of deindustrialization strongly related to the loss of jobs in industries identified with the Industrial Age (Strangleman and Rhodes 2014).

The immense cultural and political impact that deindustrialization had was recognized by contributions from anthropology and political science with work on the labour politics of disenfranchised communities (Mitchell 1992) or the remnant culture of the former coal camps of the Appalachian Mountains (Stewart 1996). This type of ethnographic work brought about the use of a variety of methods including oral history (Halpern 1998), which made important contributions to understanding how economic displacement

was being experienced by the workers and how industrial work was remembered, as was the case for the Clydeside workers of Glasgow (Johnston and McIvor 2004). This marked an important shift of scholarly interest towards the impact of industrial decline on aspects of identity and working-class cultural representation, as well as ecological and environmental questions as results of decaying industries (Cowie and Heathcott 2003). Industrial decline, erasure and economic displacement, as well as how these are experienced by former workers as rupture and their subsequent impacts on working-class lives, are still at the heart of deindustrialization studies today (High, MacKinnon and Perchard 2017).

Recent discussions include long-term impacts, as well as legacies and shifts towards aspects of the postindustrial transformation of larger cities that go hand in hand with facets of revitalization and gentrification. This field of study has developed dynamically – it crosses disciplines and negotiates cultural representations of a deindustrializing world, as well as processes of heritagization and memorialization of the industrial past (Berger 2020). Today deindustrialization studies are perceived as ‘increasingly diverse and deeply interdisciplinary’ (Strangleman, Rhodes and Linkon 2013: 11) and even ‘cross disciplinary’ (Berger and High 2019: 1). Important contributions, impulses and inspirations towards this interdisciplinary understanding of deindustrialization come from discussions within urban and city planning (Oevermann and Mieg 2015), as well as anthropology and public history (Berger 2020; Richter 2017; Tomann 2017), where questions of renewal and urban industrial entanglements in postindustrial cities are intensely debated. Furthermore, the field of study has acknowledged this diversity by bringing scholarly attention to its manifold cultural representations – from the analysis of literature to coffee-table books, popular websites or art projects – by asking how they approach the industrial past and what narratives they convey (Linkon 2013).

The diversity of methods and topics in deindustrialization scholarship has been particularly influenced and informed by developments in the field of heritage and tourism studies. These fields of study focus on analysing aspects of preservation, protection, representation and commodification of what was left after deindustrialization began. Both fields analyse remnants of the industrial past and how, in some cases, these remnants have been transformed into heritage sites (Berger 2020; Harrison 2013; Xie 2015). Heritage, however, reaches beyond site-specific representations, and its construction in a deindustrialized space or landscape includes the transformation of memories and other traces of the past into visions and narratives about it. The formation of heritage is a complex process, influenced by many factors, including state and administrative regulations as well as the agendas of politicians, the interests of workers, social movements and the voices of academics

or intellectuals, resulting in specific ‘heritage regimes’, which become the subjects of academic scrutiny.

Despite the fruitful theoretical entanglements between heritage and deindustrialization studies, the heritagization and touristification of deindustrial or postindustrial landscapes has – on a practical level – provoked criticism within the academic discourse. Drawing attention to the museumification of industrial relicts – with its tendency to aestheticize and de-politicize narratives – High points out that ‘stories of struggle are usually excluded from public memorialization’ (2017: 423). Instead of highlighting how communities struggle to survive under conditions of a changing industrial sector, some representations of deindustrialization view the decay as a ‘spectacle’, and photographs or museum exhibits featuring abandoned plants or factories appear to seek the ‘beauty in destruction’ (Linkon 2013: 39). This aestheticization of industrial structures goes hand in hand with the marginalization of people who worked and spent their lives in such places, effectively rendering them invisible. Strangleman (2013) calls this tendency to present highly aestheticized representations and visual imaginaries as an example of ‘smokestack nostalgia’. This ‘uncritical celebration of an industrial past’ extends from the aesthetic objectification of former working class workplaces to the transformation of such sites into ‘exotic locales’ or a ‘form of “dark tourism” for the middle class’ (2013: 24–25). The desire to capture abandoned industrial spaces as a form of ‘industrial sublime’ (High, in Strangleman 2013: 24) has repercussions on its scholarly debate, as exemplified in the aestheticization of ruins (Edensor 2005).

The term ‘smokestack nostalgia’ (Cowie and Heathcott 2013) was initially used to identify the dangers of uncritical attempts that relate to the industrial past and to imbue it with a sentimental attitude. This understanding subscribes to Boym’s (2001) seminal definition of nostalgia as restorative. Restorative nostalgia is backward-looking and, in a way, transhistorical as it relates to truth and tradition (Boym 2001: xviii). While restorative nostalgia tries to ‘protect the absolute truth’, its counterpart – reflective nostalgia – calls into question the reference to an absolute truth: ‘it dwells on the ambivalences of human longing and does not shy away from the contradictions of modernity’ (Boym 2001: xviii). Reflective nostalgia is not concerned with the idea of homecoming or a collective longing for a ‘better’ past; instead, it focuses on the challenges of the present and tries to connect them to the future. This is not to say that Boym or Strangleman (2013) dismiss any sentimental recollections of the industrial past as obsolete and backward-looking; rather, critically placing ‘smokestack nostalgia’ as a ‘symbol of unease in contemporary culture’, it allows for ‘viewing a relatively stable past as offering some form of fixity’ (Strangleman 2013: 33). As such, nostalgia tells us more about the present needs and conditions of an individual or group than about

the past itself; therefore, it must be taken into account as a form of cultural expression. However, nostalgia as a cultural construct in a deindustrializing world is only one way of addressing the past and imagining the future (Berger and High 2019).

The study of deindustrialization today brings about a nuanced understanding of nostalgia, heritage and labour politics as they address the entanglements of past, present and future in processes of deindustrialization and their outcomes across Europe and beyond. As deindustrialization has the ability to destroy wealth and prosperity ‘faster than the industrialization process built it up’ (Clark 2020: 4), further interdisciplinary research perspectives are needed to reveal these transformations. These new challenges from the ‘half-life’ (Linkon 2018) of deindustrialization’s impacts, and the relationships between Global North and South processes (Clark 2020; Pike 2020) to the ongoing transitions into the future phases of postindustrial work, require new theorizing elements.

Developing Perspectives

Deindustrialization is not a phenomenon of the past, but an ongoing process that keeps having a large-scale impact on people, communities and the landscape. Processes of deindustrialization are highly complex and can be addressed from different disciplinary angles and perspectives. In order to develop and sharpen the interdisciplinary core of deindustrialization studies and move further in the direction of a comparative perspective, it is important to find a common framework for navigating the dense and complex research material. The chapters in this volume are unified by their focus not only on deindustrialization as a phenomenon of the past or as contemporary history, but also on how former industrial spaces are being (re-)created in the present day, and what entanglements and developments are at play within these processes for the future. Further, the volume is driven by an ambition to broaden ongoing discussions on how to understand the outcomes of deindustrialization in present-day European societies, as well as to add to the recently developing interdisciplinary methodological toolbox of deindustrialization studies. To this end, this volume offers three features: a nuanced understanding of the concepts of landscape (Wylie 2007) and performativity; the application of more-than-representational theory to the field of study (Lorimer 2005; Müller 2015); and a transregional perspective.

The landscape approach shifts from a concern with specific sites of deindustrialization towards a multifaceted collective understanding of emerging moments and nodes, where a landscape is a coming into being with multiple actors, including humans, animals, ecologies and affects. The idea of a

performative landscape opens up the conversation between the agency that these multiple actors have in making and remaking landscapes. The introduction of a more-than-representational theoretical approach affords broader perspectives on practices of rhetorical exploitation, discursive representations and performative approaches of dealing with the industrial past, as well as questions of loss of industrial production and recent processes of regeneration. This tactic proffers insights into current processes of reassessing and reimagining the industrial past, which are essentially future-related, and the accompanied operations of historical knowledge production and meaning making. It understands deindustrialization not as stagnant, but as a transformative and active process, changing and fluid. These ideas link multiple perspectives promoting an affective encounter without denying the intensive socioeconomic impacts that occurred in places and societies affected by deindustrialization. Therefore, the chapters in this volume move beyond both a historical analysis of processes of deindustrialization and a discourse of the politics of deindustrialization, instead attending to present-day developments in deindustrialized or postindustrialized spaces and arguing for a multifaceted perspective of experiencing landscape.

Finally, this volume attempts to further develop the transregional approach Berger (2020) advances by offering a collective of case studies focused on different European countries and regions. It aligns itself with the belief that ‘deindustrialization studies need to go beyond their traditional focus of individual case studies and move towards transregional comparison in order to understand better the respective individual case studies’ (Berger 2020: 301–2). With its focus on Europe, this volume presents a panorama of a continent that played a crucial role in the processes of industrialization across the world, as well as a first-hand experience of the effects of deindustrialization (Pike 2020). Along with its historical industrial significance, the increasing political repercussions felt throughout Europe from Brexit to the Gilets Jaunes (Yellow Vests) in France, it is imperative to explore how these actions are not just national movements, but rather are linked to wider European connections. The volume features explorations from well-researched countries such as the United Kingdom and Germany, alongside insights into less intensively studied regions such as the Western Balkans and Sweden. These fundamentally different cases must be described and analysed within their specific local, regional and national entanglements (Wicke 2018). The mixture and variety of well-known and lesser-known regions is an added value for probing a comparative view, as these territories invite a reassessment and different approach to well-established cases in the discourse, and offer new, and perhaps innovative, perspectives to ongoing discussions in the field.

Bringing new perspectives and approaches to an interdisciplinary field of study is surely a challenging endeavour. It might even be considered risky, in that it entails exploring areas uncharted in established academic disciplines. Nonetheless, it is important to provoke this area of study and enable new avenues of research. Therefore, this volume is considered a laboratory for pushing the boundaries of deindustrialization studies. The volume should be received as an invitation for scholars to engage in an open-ended conversation about how the field of deindustrialization studies could develop in the future. Extending the metaphor of the laboratory, this volume aims to provide a testing ground for new perspectives on processes of deindustrialization that transcend disciplinary boundaries and focus very much on present-day developments in deindustrial or postindustrial spaces, without neglecting the historical development of each region or place.

Making Landscapes

Landschaft, paisaje, пейзаж: all translate to the term ‘landscape’ in English. Like its many permutations, landscape is understood to be many things. It can be the impact of humans on a particular place (Sauer 1963). It can be the accumulation of layers of history (Hoskins 1955) or the materialization of social relations, values, ideologies or symbolic of identity and race (Cosgrove 1988). A landscape can also be embodied, inhabited or ‘dwelled’ (Merleau-Ponty 1962; Heidegger 1962); furthermore, a landscape can be performed and practised (Thrift 2007; Wylie 2012). Landscapes are constructed, imagined, contested and laboured. The word ‘landscape’ can be a noun or verb, as in ‘to landscape’, meaning to alter and improve aesthetically (OED 2021). Since the concept of landscape is fluid, it is useful to trace certain developments within landscape studies in order to better understand its repercussions for this collection of its collaborative efforts.

In the last twenty-five years, ongoing work has produced changing perspectives on the performative elements of body and landscape. Studies mediating on issues from enacting the landscape (Rose 2002; Wylie 2005) to the notions of ruin and memory (DeLyser 1999; DeSilvey and Edensor 2012; Stewart 1996) have shifted the lens onto an immersive landscape. Such scholarship understands the landscape as enacted and worked, moving beyond the representational and towards the experiential, where landscapes are made and remade through the relations and agency of not only people, but also animals, weather and things. Similarly, work conducted in political ecology (Mitchell 2008) has broadened perspectives towards the production of landscape. Don Mitchell (1996: 34–35) describes landscape as ‘an uneasy

truce between the needs and desires of the people who live in it, and the desire of powerful social actors to represent the world as they assume it to be. Landscape is a material form that results from and structures social interaction, and an ideological representation dripping with power'. As such, landscapes are not only products of labour, but also represent the politics of those social relations. Human beings construct and reconstruct the landscape – working it with their hands, living within it, imbuing it with significance through effort, encounter and cultivation. It is vital to identify and appreciate the forgotten relationships and the struggles between people, for it is in these encounters that we understand how landscapes are made.

Landscapes can also obfuscate the exploitative nature of labour, reifying the commodity and perpetuating particular power structures. The landscape is no simple reflection of the needs and desires of the dominant class; rather, it is shaped through settlement patterns, social relations and surface morphology or 'work to (re)produce certain identities and ways of life and become a spatial configuration of particular people's legitimacy and moral authority' (Setten and Brown 2013: 244). As such, landscapes have myriad capacities to shape the power relations within it. Likewise, the landscape is not a transcendental given, but can be considered a series of multiple projects of perceptions, bundled or stabilized through conservation efforts, policies, capitalist endeavours, agricultural forces and aesthetic practices (Cronon 1991).

Ultimately, European industrial landscapes are an embodiment of not only the labour that it took to make it (the miner, builder, shopkeeper and lorry driver) but also the social and economic relations it took to get it there, including the agricultural policies that allow for farming to be subsidized, the culling of animals to maintain a proper price, the maintenance of machinery, the power grid, the payment structures and land management practices. This approach to the landscape is therefore an assemblage of economic and social relations (Mitchell 2008; Swanton 2012) that integrate labour theories of capital, production and labour flows with performative discourses of the body, using assemblage as a way to recover the marginalized systems. This basis allows the idea of political ecology to recognize the multiple ways in which landscapes are understood and to take account of the overlooked and routine practices of everyday life.

The examples show the rich and diverse ways in which landscape can be understood, offering a productive method for appreciating it as held in 'tension' by four pairings: proximity and distance, observing and inhabiting, eye and land, and culture and nature. These tensions 'animate the landscape concept making it cogent and productive' (Wylie 2007: 214), allowing the landscape to be dwelled upon (Ingold 2007), storied (Daniels and Lorimer 2012; DeSilvey 2010, 2013), messy (Law 2004) or part of a body (Wylie 2002, 2005). This malleable definition of landscape is conducive to this volume,

affording the opportunity to work within these tensions, but not necessarily to try to resolve them. In this collection, the idea of landscape gets (re) interpreted through a variety of lenses, from a large prototypical scene to a site constituted by historical references, ecological remnants and military spaces, thereby giving the volume a breadth of new formats with which to research deindustrialization. Before discussing the ideas of more-than-representational theory, we focus on a key idea of performativity.

Performative Landscapes

Performativity is about making worlds. Originating from two schools of thought in the mid-twentieth century – a dramaturgical (Burke 1945; Goffman 1956) model of study and a change in linguistic philosophy (Austin 1962), in which words do more than say – they enact. For Goffman, as researched by Gregson and Rose (2000), ‘the self is a performed character ... not an organic thing that has a specific location ... rather this body merely provides the peg on which something of a collaborative manufacture will be hung for a time’ (Goffman 1956: 252–53). However, these dramaturgical analogies would influence further studies of performativity. Butler’s (1990, 1993) work on gender and identity advanced a linguistic argument about how our utterances and bodies produce our gender. She defines gender and sex not as a biological given, but as something performed through the body, meaning that gender norms are created through our everyday performances. She further posits that subjectivity can be influenced through the performances we do and the performances we do not do. As she explains: ‘Performance is not a singular “act” or event, but a ritualized production, a ritual reiterated under and through constraint, under and through force of prohibition and taboo’ (Butler 1993: 95). Performativity is about more than just about how we represent the world; it is about how worlds are produced by our actions and, through utterances, come into being.

Gregson and Rose (2000: 434) spatialized the idea of body and performance, defined ‘by what individuals do or say’ and performativity as the ‘citational practices which reproduce and/or subvert discourse’. They expand upon performativity by understanding its use in social identity and power, and in destabilizing and challenging preconceptions of a variety of social practices and, more importantly, the spaces that are made within. Space does not just exist, but is charged and performed by the social actors within them, be they banks, churches or a car boot sale. Performance and performativity are ‘subsumed within’ each other (Gregson and Rose 2000: 441) and within those spaces, which do not have defined boundaries where performances can slip between one and another, acknowledging the messiness of power relations.

Understanding deindustrialization through a performative lens brings to light the emergent politics from competition among the different meanings attributed to the industrial past, thereby fostering new discourses around them, including nature–human perspectives, historical perceptions and future heritage relations. In the performative, we can begin to further our understanding of our next and final theoretical approach to this collection in more-than-representational theory.

More-Than-Representational (MTR) Landscapes

MTR theory privileges the study of relations (Stewart 2015), bringing actor-network theory (Latour 1996) and assemblage (Deleuze and Guattari 1987; DeLanda 2006) into conversation with other poststructuralist thought. Initially inspired by the work of Thrift (1996, 2007) and his adaptation of the performative to what he refers to as nonrepresentational theory, Lorimer (2005: 83) defines nonrepresentational theory as ‘an umbrella term for diverse work that seeks to better cope with our self-evidently more-than-human, more-than-textual, multisensual worlds’. This idea developed towards studies about enacting the landscape (Rose 2002; Wylie 2005), which then inspired an emerging body of work interested in an immersive and embodied approach to understanding and studying landscape. Critics such as Laura Jane Smith see nonrepresentational theory as a theoretical dead-end, particularly for research that attempts to understand the ‘interrelationship between heritage and the social’ (Smith and Campbell 2016: 451). Their critique focuses on the affective components as precognitive and limiting heritage’s connection to political discourse and social construction (Wetherell 2012). Lorimer (2005) prefers to use the term ‘more-than-representational’ to afford an inclusive perspective of social and power relations. It is thus this term that we use, and despite criticism of its foundations, we believe that MTR theory provides a fruitful framework in which landscapes can be approached through multiple lenses, as this theory is grounded not only within practice and body, but also within the affective. According to Müller (2015: 410), MTR theory can be defined through five key tenets: performative practice, worlds being made, affective natures, more-than-human engagements, and multiple experimental research praxis. These five themes not only allow for a broad approach in engaging with these landscapes, but also enable the necessary interdisciplinarity of deindustrialization research.

MTR approaches acknowledge that our understandings of the world ‘are lived and embodied, inevitably tangled up with our doings and enactments *in the moment*’ (Waterton 2014: 826, emphasis in original). It can be defined as ‘a style of thinking that foregrounds explorations of feelings, emotion

and affect, and places emphasis on how these are negotiated and experienced through a re-centred imagining of the body' (Waterton 2014: 824). In this spirit, the chapters in this volume explore deindustrialized landscapes with MTR theory. Looking at more than textual or visual representations of landscape, the following chapters use all of the senses to understand the world – through the actions and interactions between ourselves and the landscape. Theorizing landscape in this way, the chapters meditate on *how* the landscape is enacted and laboured rather than just *what* it is. Therefore, they suggest an understanding of deindustrialization that moves from being represented towards a performative and embedded approach, a phase of transformation rather than just an end to a particular phase.

Structure

This volume is divided along three thematic-theoretical lines: performative narratives; postindustrial ecologies; and reimagined futures. Thematic exploration provides the opportunity to explore across landscape typologies, from a single structure to a regional interpretation of landscape. It promotes a cross-site analysis of spaces; rather than dividing by size, it offers new perspectives whereby the opportunities present in one type of space can occur in the other space. It does not deny that landscapes can occur on multiple scales and inhabit multiple places by working within that tension of landscape – where landscapes can be a building, city, farmland or regional imaginative. The need for creative approaches in MTR research is further supported by Müller where he requests for 'novel modes of presenting and presencing research' (2015: 410). New insights in these landscape practices foster the interdisciplinary nature of deindustrialization studies and each chapter supports a growing series of creative methodological approaches necessary for the exploration of this discipline (Edensor 2005; Strangleman 2008b) from autoethnographic to historical review. These are further supported by the variety of creative methods inspired from drawing, photography, participant observation and walk-and-talks, each chapter opening up new discourses towards immersive research practices.

Postindustrial Ecologies

The first theme relates to the ecological systems, be they rewilding, green sites or new hybrid industrial ecologies created through the environmental conditions present in (de)industrial landscapes. Two key chapters from the United Kingdom comment on these ecological entanglements. Davis' work explores the transient and changeable military industrial complex of Orford Ness, offering an affective and embodied account of the transitioning space

of controlled ruination. Through key components of loneliness, absence and boundaries, the space engages in temporal shifts within the landscape. Orange develops a surface theory exploration of the tin and copper mines of Cornwall. Here, through an immersive participatory walking approach, Orange reveals layers of perception of the underground and surface geographies of the landscape. In the worked ground of the former mining landscape, the ‘lost imaginations’ of the vertical spaces below are reinterpreted through its surface transformations. The case studies from the United Kingdom are accompanied by an example from eastern Germany. Pérez-Sindín looks at the remade landscapes of pit lakes near Leipzig, where the postindustrial tension between social circumstances and new green spaces produce a type of ‘green gentrification’.

Performative Narratives

The second theme acknowledges the affective and performative capacities that narratives enact within landscapes. Narrative explorations are reflected through physical remains, such as ruins and rubble, at the same time as they are influenced, constructed and authenticated by those narratives, cutting across their opacities and ambiguities. Working within visual practices, Huszka investigates Instagram communities and shows how they contribute to rethink regional narratives of the German Ruhr. Sjöholm provides a different perspective into the concept of heritagization and its application through two Swedish mining towns as land subsidence has increased due to historic mining activities. A different environmental entanglement is explored between heritage, landscape and community, where the twin towns of Malmberget and Kiruna must reinterpret significance as its physical landscape continues to impact the historic towns. This part also features two examples from former Yugoslavia. The first one shows how a performative theatre is installed within the remains of a former sugar factory in the Serbian capital of Belgrade. Šentevska describes the nexus between cultural production in a theatre, political and economic transition in a postwar situation in Serbia and deindustrialized landscapes. She focuses on the specific case of the theatre company KPGT currently based in Belgrade and its artistic ‘occupation’ of the dilapidated sugar mill in a historical working-class neighbourhood. Staying within the Western Balkan states, Lawnicki investigates abandoned buildings in her study of Tuzla in Bosnia and Herzegovina. She focuses on the relational registers between ruins, affect and the constructed identity of Tuzla. Through a series of interviews, she narrates an affective journey through the city, exposing the postindustrial landscape experienced within it.

Reimagining Futures

The third theme involves rethinking futures and regeneration, where perspectives of transformations are reflected and performed. Such a focus allows

this area of study to influence not only planning and design, but also public policy and development. The chapters in this part explore deindustrialization that does not necessarily signify perpetual downturn in social and economic form, but as a challenge towards a preferred future. In the United Kingdom, in the town of Lincoln, a different type of future is reimagined by its inhabitants, whereby transformation from an industrial core to a knowledge economy has given the city a new vision. Hunt explores how futures are reinterpreted by the establishment of a university that is repurposing, rethinking and respecting its heritage even as it is looking ahead. Gavinielli, Mastropietro and Zanolin explore how the Italian RiMaflow project engages a group of former automotive supply workers in the reinterpretations of their factory space. On the outskirts of Milan, an ongoing dialogue between the community and the workers share what it means to produce and manufacture, examining the role that territorialization has in store for the future of the region. Moving to Western Europe and the shores of the English Channel, Hein, along with Mager and Hauser, discuss the *petroleumscapes* of Dunkirk and the futures that come from critically exploring the Fourth Industrial Revolution of creative practices. The volume is then surmised and reflected upon by Waterton, whose extensive expertise in not only MTR theory and heritage but also landscape discourse put the chapters in the volume into a broader perspective. Waterton brings together the collective idea of landscape and affective encounter via shared methods, exploratory forms and ‘embodied intensities’.

As twenty-first-century economies continue to shift towards innovative forms of manufacturing service and goods, the landscapes that exist are no more forgotten than they are abandoned. This introduction has given a retrospective of deindustrialization research, placing it within a multiple landscape context and MTR theoretical framework. It has also taken stock of the term ‘deindustrialization’ and the developing perspective that enables a deeper understanding of the complexity that lies behind the term, proceeding from one abandoned venue to an understanding of these landscapes as a social process and network of human and nonhuman actors. In these chapters, we seek to move towards a holistic understanding of postindustrial landscapes in which narratives, practices and related actors all strive to elucidate what it means and how to experience life in a society that has ceased to manufacture certain things – or that produces less – and with fewer workers, yet desires to create new things.

George S. Jaramillo is Assistant Professor of Design in the School of Textiles and Design at Heriot-Watt University. With over fifteen years of professional and academic practice, his work looks at integrating transdisciplinary sociomaterial assemblages and innovation design processes.

Juliane Tömann is head of the ‘History in the Public Sphere’ research area in the Imre Kertész Kolleg at Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena. Her most recent publications include *The Routledge Handbook of Reenactment Studies* (2020), which she co-edited.

References

- Austin, J.L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Beaumont, A. 2018. ‘Dystopia and Euphoria: Time-Space Compression and the City’, in E. Pollard and Berthold Schoene (eds), *Accelerated Times: British Literature in Transition, 1980–2000*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 273–88.
- Berger, S. (ed.). 2020. *Constructing Industrial Pasts: Heritage, Historical Culture and Identity in Regions Undergoing Structural Economic Transformation*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Berger, S., and S. High. 2019. ‘(De-)Industrial Heritage: An Introduction’, *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History* 16(1): 1–27.
- Bluestone, B., and B. Harrison. 1982. *The Deindustrialization of America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Boym, S. 2001. *The Future of Nostalgia*. New York: Basic Books.
- Butler, J. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- . 1993. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. New York: Routledge.
- Burke, K. 1945. *A Grammar of Motives*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Clark, J. 2020. ‘Reframing Deindustrialization’, *International Journal of Urban Sciences*, DOI: 10.1080/12265934.2020.1843524.
- Cowie, J., and J. Heathcott. 2003. *Beyond the Ruins: The Meanings of Deindustrialization*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- ‘Coming Home: Reshoring Manufacturing.’ 2013. *The Economist*, 17 January. Retrieved 12 October 2020 from <https://www.economist.com/special-report/2013/01/17/coming-home>.
- Cosgrove, D.E. 1998. *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Cosgrove, D.E., and S. Daniels. 1988. *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design, and Use of Past Environments*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cronon, W. 1991. *Nature’s Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Daniels, S., and H. Lorimer, 2012. ‘Until the End of Days: Narrating Landscape and Environment’, *Cultural Geographies* 19(1): 3–9.
- Davis, F. 1979. *Yearning for Yesterday: A Sociology of Nostalgia*. New York: Free Press.
- DeLanda, M. 2006. *A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Deleuze, G., and F. Guattari. 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, translated by B. Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- DeLyser, D. 1999. ‘Authenticity on the Ground: Engaging the Past in a California Ghost Town’, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 89 (4): 602–32.
- DeSilvey, C. 2010. ‘Memory in Motion: Soundings from Milltown, Montana’, *Social & Cultural Geography* 11(5): 491–510.
- . 2013. ‘Object Lessons: From Batholith to Bookend’, in N. Johnson, R. Schein and J. Winders (eds), *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Cultural Geography*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 146–58.

- DeSilvey, C., and T. Edensor. 2012. 'Reckoning with Ruins', *Progress in Human Geography* 37(4): 465–85.
- Duncan, J., and N. Duncan, 1996. 'Reconceptualizing the Idea of Culture in Geography: A Reply to Don Mitchell', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 21(3): 576–79.
- Edensor, T. 2005. *Industrial Ruins: Space, Aesthetics and Materiality*. London: Bloomsbury.
- 'Ford to Cut 12,000 Jobs in Europe.' 2019. BBC, 27 June. Retrieved 19 March 2021 from <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-48787165>.
- Goffman, E. 1956. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Social Sciences Research Centre.
- Gregson, N., and G. Rose. 2000. 'Taking Butler Elsewhere: Performativities, Spatialities and Subjectivities', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18(4): 433–52.
- Halpern, R. 1998. 'Oral History and Labor History: A Historiographic Assessment after Twenty-Five Years', *Journal of American History* 85(2): 596–610.
- Harrison, R. 2013. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Heidegger, M. 1962. *Being and Time*, translated by J. Macquarrie and E. Robinson. New York: Harper & Row.
- High, S. 2017. 'Brownfield Public History: Arts and Heritage in the Aftermath of Deindustrialization', in J. Gardner and P. Hamilton (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Public History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 423–47.
- High, S., L. MacKinnon and A. Perchard. 2017. 'Introduction', in S. High, L. MacKinnon and A. Perchard (eds), *The Deindustrialized World: Confronting Ruination in Postindustrial Places*. Vancouver: UBC Press, pp. 3–24.
- Hoskins, W.G. 1955. *The Making of the English Landscape*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Ingold, T. 2007. *Lines: A Brief History*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Jackson, J.B. 1984. *Discovering the Vernacular Landscape*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Jaramillo, G. et al. 2020. 'Historical Cultures under Conditions of Deindustrialization Working Group Report', *International Labor and Working-Class History* 97: 180–84.
- Johnston, R., and A. McIvor. 2004. 'Dangerous Work, Hard Men and Broken Bodies: Masculinity in the Clydeside Heavy Industries, c. 1930–1970s', *Labour History Review* 69(2): 135–52.
- Keane, R.E. et al. 2004. 'A Classification of Landscape Fire Succession Models: Spatial Simulations of Fire and Vegetation Dynamics', *Ecological Modelling* 179: 3–27.
- Kohn, M. 2009. 'Dreamworlds of Deindustrialization', *Theory & Event* 12(4): n.p.
- 'landscape, v.', OED Online. March 2021. Oxford University Press. Retrieved 11 May 2021 from <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/105516>.
- Latour, B. 1996. 'On Actor-Network Theory: A Few Clarifications', *Soziale Welt* 47: 369–81.
- Law, J. 2004. *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Linkon, S.L. 2013. 'Narrating Past and Future: Deindustrialized Landscapes as Resources', *International Labor and Working-Class History* 84: 38–54.
- . 2018. *The Half-Life of Deindustrialization: Working-Class Writing about Economic Restructuring*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Lorimer, H. 2005. 'Cultural Geography: The Busyness of Being "More Than Representational"', *Progress in Human Geography* 29: 83–94.
- Meinig, D.W. 1979. *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes: Geographical Essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. 1962. *Phenomenology of Perception*. London: Routledge.
- Mitchell, D. 1996. *The Lie of the Land: Migrant Workers and the California Landscape*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 1992. 'Heritage, Landscape, and the Production of Community: Consensus History and Its Alternatives in Johnstown, Pennsylvania', *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies*, 59(3): 198–226.

- Mitchell, T. 2008. 'Rethinking Economy', *Geoforum* 39(3): 1116–21.
- Müller, M. 2015. 'More-than-Representational Political Geographies', in J. Agnew et al. (eds), *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Political Geography*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 409–23.
- Murdoch, J. 2006. *Poststructuralist Geography*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Oevermann, H., and H.A. Mieg (eds). 2015. *Industrial Heritage Sites in Transformation. Clash of Discourses*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Olwig, K.R. 1996. 'Recovering the Substantive Nature of Landscape', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 86(4): 630–53.
- Pike, A. 2020. 'Coping with Deindustrialization in the Global North and South', *International Journal of Urban Sciences*. DOI: 10.1080/12265934.2020.1730225.
- Richter, R. 2017. 'The Industrial Heritage in Urban Imaginaries and City Images: A Comparison between Dortmund and Glasgow', *The Public Historian* 39(4): 65–84.
- Rose, M. 2002. 'Landscape and Labyrinths', *Geoforum* 33(4): 455–67.
- Sauer, C. 1963. 'The Morphology of Landscape', in J.L. Leighly (ed.), *Land and Life: A Selection from the Writings of Carl Ortwin Sauer*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 315–50.
- Setten, G., and K. Brown. 2013. 'Landscape and Social Justice', in P. Howard, I. Thompson, E. Waterton and M. Atha (eds), *The Routledge Companion to Landscape Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 243–52.
- Singh, A. 1977. 'UK Industry and the World Economy: A Case of Deindustrialisation', *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 1(2): 113–36.
- Smith, L., and G. Campbell. 2016. 'The Elephant in the Room: Heritage, Affect and Emotion', in W. Logan, M. Craith and U. Kockel (eds) *A Companion to Heritage Studies*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons pp. 443–60.
- Stewart, K. 1996. *A Space on the Side of the Road: Cultural Poetics in an 'Other' America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 2015. 'New England Red', in P. Vannini (ed.), *Non-representational Methodologies: Re-envisioning Research*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 19–33.
- Strangleman, T. 2008a. *Ming Jue: Photographs of Longbridge and Nanjing by Stuart Whippy*. Walsall: New Art Gallery Walsall.
- . 2008b. 'Representations of Labour: Visual Sociology and Work', *Sociology Compass* 2(5): 1491–505.
- . 2013. "Smokestack Nostalgia", "Ruin Porn" or Working-Class Obituary: The Role and Meaning of Deindustrial Representation', *International Labor and Working-Class History* 84: 23–37.
- Strangleman, T., and J. Rhodes. 2014. 'The "New" Sociology of Deindustrialization? Understanding Industrial Change', *Sociology Compass* 8(4): 411–21.
- Strangleman, T., J. Rhodes and S. Linkon, 2013. 'Introduction to Crumbling Cultures: Deindustrialization, Class, and Memory', *International Labor and Working-Class History* 84: 7–22.
- Swanton, D. 2012. 'Afterimages of Steel: Dortmund', *Space and Culture* 15(4): 264–82.
- Thornton, L.E., J. Pearce and A. Kavanagh. 2011. 'Using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to Assess the Role of the Built Environment in Influencing Obesity: A Glossary', *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* 8(1): 71–80.
- Thrift, N. 1996. *Spatial Formations*. London: SAGE Publications.
- . 2007. *Non-representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Tomann, J. 2017. *Geschichtskultur im Strukturwandel: Öffentliche Geschichte in Katowice nach 1989*. Munich: Oldenbourg De Gruyter.
- Vallone, C., P. Orlandini and R. Cecchetti. 2013. 'Sustainability and Innovation in Tourism Services: The Albergo Diffuso Case Study', *Eurasian Journal of Social Science* 1(2): 21–34.

- Wacquant, L. 2009. *Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Waterton, E. 2014. 'A More-Than-Representational Understanding of Heritage? The "Past" and the Politics of Affect', *Geography Compass* 8(11): 823–33.
- Wetherell, M. 2012. *Affect and Emotion: A New Social Science Understanding*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Wicke, C. 2018. 'Introduction: Industrial Heritage and Regional Identities', in C. Wicke, S. Berger, and J. Golombok (eds), *Industrial Heritage and Regional Identities*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 1–12.
- Wicke, C., and E. Eklund. 2016. 'Historical Cultures of Labour under Conditions of Deindustrialization', *History Workshop Journal* 82(1): 293–98.
- Wylie, J. 2002. 'An Essay on Ascending Glastonbury Tor', *Geoforum* 33(4): 441–54.
- _____. 2005. 'A Single Day's Walking: Narrating Self and Landscape on the South West Coast Path', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30(2): 234–47.
- _____. 2012. 'Dwelling and Displacement: Tim Robinson and the Questions of Landscape', *Cultural Geographies* 19(3): 365–83.
- Wylie, J. 2007. *Landscape*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Xie, P. 2015. *Industrial Heritage Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.