

EPILOGUE

A Coda for the ‘Left Behind’

Heritage and More-Than-Representational Theories

EMMA WATERTON

Prologue

It is 3 March 2010, a Wednesday evening, exactly twenty-five years since the year-long miners’ strike of 1984–85 in the United Kingdom officially ended. I am sitting in the Forum Theatre in the Cultural Quarter of Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire, as an audience member for a twenty-fifth anniversary event that has adopted a format similar to the BBC’s live debate series *Question Time*. Much like *Question Time*, the evening’s event is guided by a Chair, Oliver Speight, and revolves around the perspectives put forward by a panel of five public figures: Edwina Currie, a Conservative Member of Parliament (MP) for South Derbyshire from 1983 to 1997; George Galloway, an MP for four constituencies between 1987 and 2015; Ken Loach, an English filmmaker who directed *Which Side Are You On?*¹ in 1985; David Hencke, an investigative journalist and author of *Marching to the Fault Line: The Miners’ Strike and the Battle for Industrial Britain*; and Mike Nattrass, a Member of the European Parliament (MEP) for the West Midlands from 2004 to 2014 and Deputy Leader of the UK Independence Party (UKIP) from 2002 to 2006. I am in the audience because I am fairly new to the region and I want to better understand the impacts of deindustrialization, as well as its enduring legacies, some of which I have come to recognize through my engagement with the

Notes for this section begin on page 250.

city's distinctive heritage, which has created a landscape dotted with derelict bottle ovens that continue to haunt with their visual intimations of the past.

Though I have only resided in Stoke-on-Trent (located in a region affectionately referred to as 'the Potteries') for four years, I know that the miners' strike occupies a prominent position in the area's collective memory and is recalled as being long and bitter, triggering a process of systematic colliery closures, job losses and associated socioeconomic ruination from which the region is yet to recover. It is therefore a fitting backdrop for tonight's debate; abundant coal, alongside lead, salt and clay, supported the development of a robust and prominent centre of ceramic production here – the largest in Britain. Skilled labour associated with that industry stretched across generations, with entire families making a living in the mines, working on the canal systems to shift goods in and out, and labouring in production facilities, mixing slip, stacking saggars, glazing, decorating and gilding by hand. The resultant pottery has been used to 'set the table' in an unfathomable number of homes across the globe for centuries, and although the industry itself has all but disappeared, it is an area that still strongly affiliates itself with prominent manufacturing companies like Wedgwood, Minton, Spode and Royal Doulton. It is also an area that has struggled to come to terms with the pit closures, which in turn saw the wider collapse of pottery manufacturing. Following the cessation of the strike, jobs that had at one point been badged as 'for life' disappeared, taking with them a sense of family and community stability, as well as a belief in the ability of strong unions to agitate for workers' rights. Slipping away at the same time was confidence that any of the United Kingdom's major political parties would remember those left behind.

Though precisely twenty-five years have passed since the Conservative Party claimed victory over the strike under the leadership of Margaret Thatcher, tonight's debate is proving to be a dramatic and emotional disruption for the audience. Initially quite relaxed, the atmosphere is now fierce and tense. Panel and audience members who at first took turns to provoke and ask questions are interrupting, pushing back, expressing their distress and raising their voices. Edwina Curry's presence in particular seems to produce a feeling of rage that rips through the theatre like wildfire (see Thrift 2009). Her time as a Conservative MP and her legacy live on this evening as a roomful of people confront their material fears of survival in an area where rates of employment and salaries remain significantly below the national average. In the space of 45 minutes, the debate pushes the strike and subsequent industrial closures from the background to the foreground of so many individual lives, bringing with them a palpable and collective force of feelings: despair for the crippling of livelihoods; a mourning for the perceived death of communities; and fury at the way in which the area has

been silenced and forgotten ever since. The history of the strike continues to haunt and disrupt, crossing generations and enduring in ‘bodies, materialities and memories’ (Emery 2018: 80). But there is a clear sense that those in the audience – a predominantly white working-class group that is a mix of ages and genders – want to do things differently, driven by a complex and troubling history that continues to fuel their concerns in the present.

It is now 13 December 2019. It is a Friday, the morning after the United Kingdom’s General Election. Looking at the results, I can see that a lot has changed in Stoke-on-Trent, though plenty has stayed the same. I no longer live in the area, but I have kept track of its political moods from afar. It is, after all, one of those places – those with ‘raw charm’ and ‘rough edges’, as DeSilvey (2012: 46) describes them – that remain with you even when you leave. Remain and Leave: these are two words that have taken on profoundly new meaning in the decade since I left the United Kingdom. Both were key to the discourses anchored to yesterday’s election, and they have relentlessly peppered the everyday lives of those living in the United Kingdom and abroad since the United Kingdom European Union Membership Referendum of 2016,² surfacing ‘in school playgrounds, on public buses and at the dinner table’, as Anderson and Wilson (2017: 294) argue (see also Evans 2017). The use of ‘Leave’ by so many on 23 June 2016 sent a powerful message to Westminster: something wasn’t quite right. With a 65.7% turnout, Stoke-on-Trent became Britain’s ‘Brexit Capital’ in the aftermath of the Referendum, an area overwhelmingly in support of exiting the European Union with 69.4% of the vote. The crisis of disaffection, delegitimization and discontent so palpable in the Forum Theatre almost ten years ago continues to resurface and remains a key component of the area’s legacy of deindustrialization. It surfaced in 2016 and it has resurfaced again. Looking at the 2019 election results, I am reminded of Bright’s (2016) interpretation of the concept of social haunting: ‘Often manifest only through “barely visible, or highly symbolized” means’, he writes, ‘a social haunting ... “registers the harm inflicted or the loss sustained by a social violence done in the past”’ (Bright 2016: n.p., citing Gordon 2008: 50 and xvi). Drawing on the work of Avery Gordon, he goes on to argue that such harm or loss simultaneously produces a present imperative where something different, ‘different from before, seems like it must be done’ (Gordon 2008: xvi). Once a core component of Labour’s ‘heartland’, yesterday’s election saw the party wiped out in the Potteries, a simmering anger prompting ‘something different’ in the form of a change in political allegiances. All three parliamentary constituencies for the area, created for the General Election in 1950 and each represented by a single MP, are now held by the Conservative Party. Stoke-on-Trent South, a safe Labour seat since its creation, had already fallen in the 2017 election,

at which time Jack Brereton was voted in as the Conservative MP. He held on to his seat in 2019 and now works alongside Jo Gideon, the first ever successful Conservative candidate for the Stoke-on-Trent Central constituency. Stoke-on-Trent North has likewise historically always been held by Labour. In 2019, it too swung to the Conservatives, with candidate Jonathan Gullis securing victory with 52.3% of the vote. After three years of political wrangling, misinformation, false starts and internal bickering, Stoke-on-Trent, along with the rest of the country, is now on track to 'get Brexit done'.

These election results act as a reminder that heritage – or our shared use of the past in the present – is always part of a complex assemblage that links individuals with the politics of 'larger' assemblages: a community, a region or the state (Dittmer and Waterton 2021). Such assemblages often collapse the time and space between 'pasts' and 'presents', and, as Hetherington argues, produce a sort of agency that is 'performed not only around what is there but sometimes also around the *presence* of what is not' (2004: 159, emphasis in original). This is an argument that borrows from Derrida's (1993: 48) notions of the spectre and spectrality, both of which disrupt a linear understanding of time, placing in doubt the 'reassuring order of presents and, especially, the border between the present, the actual or present reality of the present, and everything that can be opposed to it: absence, non-presence, non-effectivity, inactuality, virtuality, or even the simulacrum in general, and so forth' (see also Waterton and Saul 2021). As Stoke-on-Trent so clearly illustrates, the past itself 'is always already present'; it 'both passes and does not pass' and thus is never 'exclusively past', as Hill (2015: 420) has argued. In other words, the great dualism of 'past' and 'present' is collapsed, along with the attendant state of being 'other' (see Buchli and Lucas 2001: 9). The highly emotional events in the Forum Theatre in 2010 were a powerful reminder of this for me. In that example, the industrial past was rendered present by its absence, surviving and rearing up as an integral part of the experience. The evoking of the miners' strike, along with its emotional-affective potency, unsettled, to borrow from Hill (2015: 423), 'any linear understanding of time, disturbing our sense of place and self through the arrival of haunting memories' (see also Maddrell 2013; Drozdowski et al. 2021). This sense of a haunting past, as Jones (2015: 1) argues, may be 'provoked by something overheard or a scene, a place, an object, a tune, a scent even. It is inescapable' (Dittmer and Waterton 2021). But part of that 'something' will also always be held in reserve – there, but not quite there, understood, as Hill (2015: 423) describes it, as 'the impossibility of the fullness of presence' (Lawnicki, Chapter 7 in this volume). As Dittmer and Waterton (2021) have argued, work must be done to render those absences present, which is, of course, precisely the purview of heritage and history.

Rethinking Deindustrialization through More-Than-Representational Landscapes

Though initially the concern of Marxist scholars and labour historians, an interest in the study of industrial pasts has been with us for quite some time. Those working in the academic field of archaeology in Britain were among the first to turn their attention to such pasts, with the term ‘industrial archaeology’ initially introduced by Michael Rix in 1955 largely in response to the destruction he had personally witnessed to the landscapes of the Black Country³ (Palmer 2018). Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, significant upheavals within Britain’s manufacturing and coal mining industries saw the abandonment of a significant number of sites, buildings and precincts (as was the case in other parts of the world, as the chapters in this volume aptly convey), and, in response, the burgeoning of a scholarly interest, led largely by engineers and other working professionals (Cranstone 2005). In response, the heritage industry – as part of a wider conservation impulse – started to incorporate industrial places into its remit, drawing such pasts into documentation projects, museum exhibitions and specifically designated tourism sites (Storm 2014; Berger and High 2019). However, with a focus squarely on the ‘objects’ and ‘places’ of heritage themselves, these earlier attempts to understand and represent industrial pasts were done in isolation from their social contexts, with people viewed as receivers (visitors or consumers) of this newly emerging segment of the sector (Waterton and Watson 2013, 2015). As the pace of social and economic change escalated, so too did an appetite for industrial heritage, geographically and conceptually, eventually consolidating into a popular and definable ‘area of interest’ in the 1990s via the tethering of debates to new thinking in social theory (Casella 2005). Spearheaded by the work of Raphael Samuel (1994) and his encyclopaedic exploration of popular heritage, scholarly interest in heritage moved away from iconic and high-status objects and places towards their social and cultural context and significance. The rapid industrial changes and attendant structural crises in Britain, Europe and North America during the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s had prompted a critical interrogation of the representational role of heritage – and the cultural work it does – as well as an acknowledgement that the idea of heritage that had come to dominate tended to privilege elite and middle-class cultural experiences, while actively marginalizing alternative perspectives (Storm 2014). While the role of heritage as an economic resource in regeneration projects and related tourism enterprises remained a clear focus of concern, milestone publications by Graham et al. (2000), Harvey (2001) and Smith (2006) revealed heritage to be a selective process, fuelled by expressions of power, identity and control. The rich seam

of research emerging at this time thus helped to locate heritage as a social and cultural process – something more than a collection of things or, indeed, resources – and prompted a concomitant interest in ‘ordinary’, ‘living’ ‘subaltern’ and ‘working-class’ pasts. This was a heritage far removed from the stately homes, castles and designed landscapes that had already found their way into the sector and were instead ‘often of a mundane character, consisting of complicated, large-scale, polluted, or otherwise devastated landscapes ... too dilapidated, or too commodified, or too complicated to be easily recognized within a heritage perspective’ (Storm 2014: 11).

Monographs, edited collections and themed special issues have continued to converge on the topic, casting out from those initially interested in the history of particular industries to those working in heritage, tourism, sociology, anthropology, geography and memory studies. Each successive wave of publication has sought to redress shortcomings perceived in previous iterations, getting us closer to understanding how both industrial pasts and deindustrialization affect social and political life. But there is still more work to be done. In order to advance this area of research, the editors of this volume have successfully brought together a collection of chapters that are united in their interest in the processes and realities of deindustrialization and concomitant industrial heritage initiatives. Focusing on the provision of transregional comparisons, the editors have curated a series of case studies (a panorama, as they aptly describe it) from across the United Kingdom and Europe – Germany, Italy, the West Balkans and Sweden – in order to reinvigorate our examinations of the disappearance of industry and its (re-)embedding in heritage landscapes. The volume thus brings into view a range of very different case studies, in many ways providing a thorough response to Berger and High’s compelling question of whether or not it makes a difference ‘if we are studying or interpreting (de-)industrial history in single-heritage industrial towns, in regions of heavy industry, or in multi-heritage towns, where industrial heritage has never been the only “show” in town’ (2019: 5). A variety of voices are heard throughout, including from heritage tourists, retired miners and factory workers, heritage professionals, artists, political figures and representatives, as well as members of nearby and online communities.

A decision that distinguishes this from other volumes focused on (de)industrial heritage is that by the editors to ask their authors to hinge their carefully conducted empirical work around a common framework, one I have elsewhere termed ‘more-than-representational landscapes’ (Waterton 2019). At a base level, the turn to more-than-representational thinking was fuelled by a frustration with the way in which people and their lived experiences, or everyday life, had been reduced to semiotics, discourse and representation (Walkerdine 2020). This is an observation that certainly rings true for heritage

studies. Adopting a more-than-representational approach in order to think about landscape, then, has allowed each contributor to flesh out their understandings of deindustrialization and the complexities of its associated heritage in ways that do not completely dispense with that which has gone before, but that instead add to the framework: they have brought into the mix a focus on our encounters with industrial pasts and their landscapes in ways that exceed textual and visual registers, and include the sensual, haptic, corporeal and kinaesthetic in theoretically and politically useful ways (Cromby 2007). Given the prevalence of Britain in deindustrialization studies, it is unsurprising to find in this volume a series of case studies that focus on British experiences. However, it is the work of Davis (Chapter 1) that first introduces the reader to that country's varied encounters with deindustrialization via a set of autoethnographic reflections trained on a more localized and unexpected site: the military-academic-industrial complex of Orford Ness. An example of what Berger and High (2019) might term 'multiheritage', Orford Ness is a landscape now managed by the National Trust and afforded a number of heritage designations such as a National Nature Reserve, a Site of Special Scientific Interest, a Special Area of Conservation and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. As Davis argues, the beauty of the site is dramatically disrupted by a careful strategy of controlled ruination, one that has attracted considerable attention from visitors, artists and heritage scholars alike, and that provides a powerful and increasingly persuasive alternative to more dominant approaches to conservation. As a military-academic-industrial complex, the lived experiences of displaced workers are themselves not especially prominent; indeed, Davis' autoethnographic accounts work to expose an absence of a different kind – a sense of isolation and loneliness, to quote Davis, that emerges out of 'a rumination on memory, the past and, above all, destruction'.

Orange (Chapter 2), by contrast, homes in on the internationally recognized former mining landscapes of Cornwall, an area intensely focused on tin and copper mining in eighteenth-century Britain and a focus of the 2006 World Heritage serial inscription titled 'Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape'. Here, the dual narratives of industrial pasts and deindustrialization are more obvious and familiar (see Berger and High 2019). A transnational space, the Cornish landscape was not only mined for its geological treasures, but also produced a diaspora of tens of thousands of Cornish miners who, following the crash of tin and copper prices in the late nineteenth century, left the region in search of work in Australia, South Africa and North America. However, as Orange points out, the area and its industrial past(s) were never entirely abandoned and instead remain deeply and bodily connected to a range of local people. At first glance, quite a different story is told by Hunt (Chapter 8), who provides an illustration of

extensive regenerative processes in the city of Lincoln. There are similarities here to the controlled ruinations recounted by Davis, with the reshaping of the Brayford Pool – via the wholesale transformation of an industrial landscape into a newly orchestrated leisure and entertainment zone – highlighting the constantly evolving nature of our world. Hunt's work echoes my own observations at the outset of this chapter, and points to the existence of multiple narratives in multiple times. Here, her focus on a framework of 'sense of place' disrupts more linear understandings of the city and allows for a simultaneous investment in past(s), present(s) and future(s).

My own attempts to fill out the spaces in heritage theory in more-than-representational ways also began in Britain, at the centre of one of the country's industrial heartlands, while I was conducting interviews with visitors to three museums in Stoke-on-Trent: the Etruria Industrial Museum, the Gladstone Pottery Museum, and the Potteries Museum and Art Gallery. All three are located within the Potteries in the West Midlands, the area with which I opened this chapter. Though referred to as a city, Stoke-on-Trent is actually the linear configuration of six confederated towns – Tunstall, Burslem, Hanley, Stoke, Fenton and Longton. During its peak, the area's pottery industry was fuelled by a large and skilled workforce necessary not only for the production of ceramics as finished products, but also for the supply and distribution of raw materials via mills, mines and canals. The manufacturing process itself called upon a range of different skillsets: the preparation of clay; shaping and assembly; and firing and decorating. Collectively, these skills and associated manufacturing processes led to the formation of a peculiar urban landscape, dotted with the distinct shapes of pot-banks, cobbled yards and smoking bottle ovens, and, in more recent years, a suite of heritage sites that seek to convey an impression (nostalgic or otherwise) of the industry in its heyday. The area's lexicon is similarly littered with a strangely iconic language that is still used in the area today, including expressions such as 'saggers', 'muffle kilns', 'bottom knockers', 'mould runners', 'slag heaps' and 'handle-makers'. When I initially commenced my fieldwork in 2009, I thought I was interested in the intersection between heritage, identity and belonging in an area that had historically been overlooked and under-explored. But instead, I was immediately drawn towards the more-than-representational, or the affective and emotional dimensions of remembering and encountering heritage – feelings that sometimes lingered beyond the inexpressible and that hinted at both the sociality of memory and its highly individual nature, as the following interviewee so eloquently describes:

Here you can feel the history, you can almost hear them walking about and what, what they were ... You can almost feel them here, and you take that away and you've got nothing ... It feels almost a part, a part of us, it's like if this was, if this was ever knocked down or people were trying to destroy it I would

have very strong views about it because we feel it belongs to us. You know, our ancestors made this place what it is so, you know, it belongs to us really, we've all got a share in it, if you like... (Interview, Gladstone Pottery Museum)

As I tried to convey in my opening remarks, emotions triggered by the industrial past are never confined solely to those spaces of heritage that have been deliberately prepared to remember them, though they undoubtedly evoke many powerful responses. Places of industrial heritage are, after all, places of violence, witnesses not only to physical injury, but also to the very act of 'closure' and the concomitant feelings of 'moral and political rage felt by those left behind' (Berger and High 2019: 3). In this, I initially saw the potential for some similarities between my own work in Britain and the former coal mining regions of Leipzig in Eastern Germany, which is the focus of Chapter 3 (Pérez-Sindín), and the mining and steel industries of the Ruhr Valley, also in Germany, which is the focus of Chapter 4 (Huszka) and which, as Berger (2019) has argued, has become an industrial heritage 'superpower'. Like Stoke, the Ruhr Valley faced deep structural crises in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, with widespread pit and steel factory closures. For Leipzig, the industrial closures and subsequent attempts at reinvention came later, with the region's industries – chemical factories and coal mining – largely demolished or declining during the 1990s. In both, the sustained unemployment and outward migration of youth that swiftly followed in Stoke played out quite differently, with state interventions working just enough to avoid similar social deprivation in the Ruhr and the transition to new economies in Leipzig (coupled with investments in public infrastructure) eventually giving way to better prospects (Power and Herden 2016). In Stoke, such disenfranchisement eventually led to the rejection of the Labour Party, with a surge towards UKIP in the mid-2000s later giving way to support for the Conservative Party in 2019. While the wider region of Saxony in Eastern Germany similarly embraced the populist Right, gifting the anti-migrant party, the Alternative für Deutschland, the largest share of the vote in the 2019 state elections, the same cannot be said of the city of Leipzig or the Ruhr Valley, where right-wing politics have gained little support. And so, it was with great interest that I read about the impact of green space on community health and wellbeing in Leipzig, triggered by a suite of educational and ecological initiatives put forward by new actors in the area. Likewise, the environmental transformations of the Ruhr Valley, supported by proud narratives of 'healing', have prompted the emergence of a new regional imaginary and economic future for the region.

These ruminations on how industrial landscapes might 'become otherwise' take us back to ideas of the more-than-representational and the import of such a style of thinking for transregional analyses of deindustrialization. 'Becoming-otherwise' is a phrase that references generative force and excess,

and the accompanying idea that we are all equipped with differing capacities (based on class, gender, economics, age, collective experience and personal histories) to be drawn into other possible worlds. My own brief attempt to consider the experiences of Stoke alongside those of Leipzig and the Ruhr Valley underscores the limits of such possibilities brought about by different contexts and their ability to produce different political subjectivities. As the editors suggest in the Introduction to this volume, understanding these constraints requires moving forward with an interest in questions of representation that are coupled with or enhanced by a concern for performance, embodiment and encounter. In a brief epilogue at the end of this volume, I cannot do justice to the full history and literature on more-than-representational thinking. Suffice to say that it is an area of philosophical debate with a long history, though it only really took hold in the humanities and social sciences in the mid-2000s (there are of course important pioneers whose work precedes that date) and arrived shortly thereafter into the field of heritage studies.

One of my earlier explorations of this style of thinking came with the co-authored monograph *The Semiotics of Heritage Tourism*, which I wrote with Steve Watson and was published in 2014. In that volume, we introduced the idea of a ‘semiotic landscape’, which we used to broaden the parameters of semiotic analysis so as to include the more-than-representational. While remaining interested in language, discourse, visibility, representation and signification – or all those things generally assumed to sit within the remit of ‘semiosis’ – we were also inclined towards immediacy, performance, engagement and affect. Indeed, we see the representational and nonrepresentational as inseparable pragmatically. Thus, by adopting the term ‘semiotic landscape’, we have attempted to weave together cognition, habits, discourses and affect, and offer a means of analysing *both* within the field of heritage. While initially adopting the term ‘nonrepresentational’, which we borrowed from Nigel Thrift, we quickly turned to the more broadly defined ‘more-than-representational’ in an attempt to halt, as Wetherell et al. (2015: 59) have put it, affect becoming some ‘kind of “other” to semiosis’. As the editors pointed out at the start of this volume, a more-than-representational approach advocates for the inclusion of everyday, relational and affective encounters, while simultaneously acknowledging the discursive and the cognitive. In addition, my work with Steve has also pointed to the need to recognize that human actors and their affective capacities are also influenced by personal history, as well as a range of social, cultural and institutional processes of meaning making (Wetherell et al. 2020). In short, we are never ‘fully autonomous nor entirely free of social forces’ (Wetherell et al. 2020: 18).

To understand this attentiveness to the more-than-representational, Steve and I adopted the notion of ‘encounter’, which seems to resonate with

many of the chapters in this volume. Our use of the term is an advocacy for an approach that homes in on the representational qualities that accrete around heritage *as well as* the felt, embodied and emotional experiences it engenders in moments of engagement (Waterton and Watson 2014). Bull and Leyshon (2010: 126) point out that ‘individuals are always encountering their own lives, in places and in moments’. Going further, DeSilvey (2012: 47) sees heritage encounters as a ‘momentary alignment between person and place’ or, as Stewart (2007: 56) has argued, ‘traces of a past still resonant in things’; traces that surprise and only become legible through moments of recognition or that sense that ‘something’ has happened (see DeSilvey 2012). I find these intimations of ‘encounter’ to be particularly useful for thinking about the contours of intensity that define places of industrial heritage and their meanings. This is because acknowledging the idea of an ‘encounter’ opens up the possibility of questioning what a heritage place means and what feelings it evokes, or which emotions stick to it over time as people interact with it. In other words, as Wetherell et al. (2020: 18) advocate, it allows ‘the making of meaning and the embodied cascade of emotion [to remain] inextricably linked’.

Each chapter in this volume alludes to the way in which emotions and affects ‘stick’ to particular places over time, prompting feelings of promise (Huszka), pride (Pérez-Sindín), isolation and loneliness (Davis), a sense of the ‘not quite’ (Lawnicki), mourning (Sjöholm), frustration and annoyance (Orange). These sit alongside intimations of a haunting (Davis), transformation (Šentevska) and reinvention (Gavinelli et al.), along with new understandings of nostalgia (Hunt) and futurity (Hein et al.). Importantly, as the prelude to this chapter hopefully illustrates, a more-than-representational approach also enables us to think about heritage as places or things that attract other sorts of feelings or intensities, feelings that are not touristic in nature, but are sponsored by some other sort of interest, bodily memory and history of contact (see Laliberté and Schurr 2016). Šentevska’s (Chapter 6) assessment of a sugar mill in Belgrade provides a particularly clear example of this in its attempts to explore the synergies, conflicts and long struggles that exist between agents of cultural production, war-induced social and political transitions, and deindustrialized landscapes. Indeed, the picture Šentevska paints of the interactions between ‘artists involved in KPGT projects, their staff and audiences, office and industrial workers, security staff and gatherers of used metal’ is a compelling one, pointing to the complex interrelations between industrial pasts and their future(s).

As will have become clear by this point, the notion of ‘encounter’ developed by Steve and I that I introduced earlier is philosophically linked to notions of affect and the concomitant idea that bodily experiences are key to understanding a person’s power to act when interacting with other bodies, events and places. The basic nature of ‘affect’, as Leys argues in her recent

book, *The Ascent of Affect: Genealogy and Critique* (2017), is notoriously difficult to define. There now exists a number of pathways for understanding it, each with their own conceptual and empirical difficulties. While Steve and I have tended towards Spinozian understandings of affect, reinvigorated relatively recently via the work of Brian Massumi (1987: xvi), we have also found Sara Ahmed's (2004) reflections on emotional work instructive for this discussion. Summing up her position in the opening pages of her 2004 article 'Affective Economies', Ahmed writes:

How do emotions work to align some subjects with some others and against other others? How do emotions move between bodies? ... I argue that emotions play a crucial role in the 'surfacing' of individual and collective bodies through the way in which emotions circulate between bodies and signs. Such an argument clearly challenges any assumption that emotions are a private matter, that they simply belong to individuals, or even that they come from within and *then* move outwards towards others. It suggests that emotions are not simply 'within' or 'without' but that they create the very effect of the surfaces or boundaries of bodies and worlds. (2004: 117, emphasis in original).

I agree that no exploration of heritage and affect can close off the social, the shared and the political that make heritage a significant cultural form. Ahmed's work in particular enables us, as heritage researchers, to see affect not as something that specifically and only resides in individuals, but as something that circulates among and between people and/or objects, human and nonhuman, sticking to one or other, slipping sideways or backward in time, and leaving traces in the present (Šentevska, Chapter 6 in this volume). But Ahmed's insistence that a cultural politics is also at play is a reminder that affect does not travel mindlessly, but can be challenged, thereby helping to explain acts of resistance, subversion, dissent and dissonance.

There is, of course, an empirical problem with affect, which is to say that it is very difficult to capture methodologically. Each contributor to this volume must surely have grappled with this as they attempted to explore what is so often referred to as the inexpressible. Both editors and authors have been successful in bringing together a variety of methods and modes of analysis, drawing in visual and linguistic data alongside a concern for bodies, both individual and as part of wider assemblages. In the chapter by Lawnicki (Chapter 7), for example, which explores the absence and presence of abandoned buildings in Tulza, Bosnia and Herzegovina – or the invisibility of the visible, as she describes it – we see explorations of what bodies *do*, how they *move*, how they *live*, become and interact, and with what idiosyncrasies. In other words – and to borrow from Willis and Cromby (2020: 2) – we see attempts to locate 'concrete instances of affective phenomena' through observations of lived experience, both autoethnographic and otherwise, alongside the expressions made by randomly selected residents in three different Tuzla

neighbourhoods. Introducing the evocative concept of the ‘not-quite’, or landscapes that are ‘no longer industrial’, but ‘somehow *not quite* postindustrial either’, Lawnicki carefully describes the braiding together of a number of conflicting narratives about pride, continuity, conflict and abandonment that collectively support the affect of the ‘not-quite’ and a concomitant ‘reluctance to engage’. Not at all surprisingly, like so many of us who appeal to an understanding of neurosciences in their theorizations of affect, Lawnicki excludes direct consideration of the body in biological terms, though she underscores that affect is rooted there nonetheless.

In grappling with the more-than-representational, some contributors to this volume have gravitated towards the adoption of quite novel approaches to data collection. Orange and Pérez-Sindín, for instance, adopt the ‘go-along’ or similar, whereas Davis has worked with narrations of walking. Hein et al. steer towards examinations of visual representations, created by students in their analyses of the post-oil landscapes of Dunkirk on the French North Sea coast, whereas Gavinelli et al. provide early observations of the RiMaflow project in Milan, Italy, exploring the persistent and creative responses of ex-factory workers as they reimagine both place, and their own roles within it, in a postindustrial landscape. Both case studies provide extraordinary insight into myriad of processes of reinvention at both the individual and collective levels. In an interesting turn towards textual analysis, Sjöholm considers the affective-discursive entanglements forged during processes of heritagization and the attendant urban transformations in two mining towns in northern Sweden – Malmberget and Kiruna. Drawing on a corpus of publicly available documents (such as development plans, conservation plans, media reports and so forth) alongside on-the-ground observations, Sjöholm teases out the voices of a range of stakeholders, ranging from the two local councils, the mining company LKAB, private homeowners, consultants, the National Heritage Board and the National Board of Housing, Building and Planning. Added to these are those voices appearing online to mourn the loss of the towns and to agitate for the right to feel sad in the face of loss.

The volume as a whole has in large part stayed with the trend of using interviews as a primary method in heritage studies. This is despite the tricky relationship between discourse and affect, made trickier still by the latter’s ineffability. What this signals to me is that the more typical and established forms of data collection – interviews, focus groups and ethnographic observation – continue to remain useful to the field, though there is certainly scope, and an appetite, to expand our methodological toolkits. I see their continued inclusion as a good thing because, as I outlined earlier, it enables the field to continue to contemplate affect in conjunction with an empirical treatment of discourse and meaning. We see this entwining in every chapter of the volume: moments of encounter, of embodied intensities signalled

by the choice of words such as ‘frustration’, ‘pride’ and ‘anxiety’, that are more comprehensively understood only through their connection with an area’s history and the cartography of meanings most heritage places produce, in guidebooks or tourist maps that point to intensities signified as tourist attractions.

In reading over the chapters in this volume, I was also struck by a recurring desire to attend to the temporal and spatial dimensions of affect, which is usefully at odds with those almost stereotypical accounts that see deindustrialization as a process that creates spaces for nostalgia, and where postindustrial decline is seen to ‘fix’ and transfix a place and its people. By contrast, each chapter, and the volume itself, is predicated on a sense of change or transformation, whilst also taking account of those times when moving forward can feel too hard. Of course, the notions of change and transformation are entirely contingent on context. Both have always been inherent to the notion of deindustrialization – the cessation of entire industries (and the aftermath) is nothing short of transformational, after all – but there are new tensions evident in the case studies provided, where change is no longer connected to an ‘end point’, but is seen as a continuous process of ‘coming into being’ or ‘becoming’, a process that is shared and distributed, but sensed differently. In the context of this book, change and transformation are connected to any one of a number of acts of reinvention common to deindustrializing areas, whether it be intentional decay, regeneration, neglect, gentrification and adaptive reuse. But in all such examples, there is a refusal to cleave apart stasis and movement, a refusal that sits alongside the potential for dreamed of futures. As Wetherell et al. (2020: 29) point out, this sense of continuity and its generative force require that our analyses look not only at the ‘affecting moment’, but also at the ‘intertwining of past practices, identities, positions, material social locations, forms of privilege and disadvantage, and so on which embed that affect and make it consequential’. This harks back to one of the more serious risks involved with more-than-representational thinking and the concomitant talk of ‘becoming’, which was first raised by Tolia-Kelly (2006) over a decade ago: everything seems possible to anyone. Walkerdine’s more recent attempts to temper this are therefore of interest, with her insistence that such *becoming* needs ‘a clear path’ and a feeling of safety, of ‘being able to move beyond a personal world of constraints, limits and coordinates’ (2016: 759), where such constraints, in deindustrialized communities, are so often connected to the hugely significant issues of class, gender and the raft of structural disadvantages that have yet to be explored and reworked to satisfaction.

In closing, it is probably fair to say that reflecting on the way in which this volume has pulled together affect, place and becoming has caused me to take stock. I started this epilogue with flashbacks to two ‘scenes’ from

my past because I was struggling to find a coherent way to explain my understanding of the relationship between deindustrialization and heritage. In adopting this approach, I was borrowing from Kathleen C. Stewart, who argues that using such scenes can provide ‘a tangent that performs the sensation that something is happening – something that needs attending to’ (2007: 5). I therefore started the chapter by talking about two encounters or events that point to an engagement with landscapes, heritage and theories of affect, applied to an area recovering from processes of deindustrialization, a place that feels abandoned and betrayed, because I wanted to focus attention not only on what heritage places *are* and *mean*, but also what they can *do*. Although I have always been cautious about cleaving apart the past and the present, reading back over my earlier work on the Potteries (Waterton 2011), I was struck by the absence of a clearer impression of the past (or pasts) and futurity in my interpretations (but see Hunt, and Hein et al., Chapters 8 and 10 in this volume respectively). I was so concerned with the politics of the present that my accounts were somewhat clumsier when it came to interlinking individual bodies with past/future timespaces. I provided brief but accurate snapshots of the Potteries’ pasts, but remained more mindful of how those pasts were being used in the present by visitors and residents. That is not to say that I didn’t see how each encounter was ‘pre-reflexively constituted by history, cultural and social relations’ (Willis and Cromby 2020: 1); rather, my approach was underpinned by a belief that any place of heritage, along with its intangible meanings and the intensities of feeling it fosters, is significant because of the role it plays in contemporary society. This was an argument I had mustered in direct opposition to earlier propositions that ‘value’ and ‘meaning’ were innate or inherent, which, I argued, worked to exclude contemporary populations from positions of power and control in the management process. By contrast, my point was that the evocative power of places of heritage lies in their ability to help people make sense of the physical spaces in which they stand and what is known to have happened there. The way in which such sites are officially framed and represented undoubtedly plays a significant role too, hinting at the cultural, economic and political agendas that sit behind them, but, I argued, there were important affective forces at work, forces that were not always immediately expressible, but were deeply felt and constituted in moments of performance.

Writing the epilogue to this volume presented me with an opportunity to revisit my previous work on a deindustrialized area in England. The 2019 General Election was fresh in my mind and I realized that my accounts of heritage in the Potteries weren’t quite ‘finished’ without accounting in some way for the future. Nor could I fully understand the election of three Conservative MPs without thinking more deeply about the area’s complex history and its influence on voters’ concerns in the present. Walkerdine’s

(2016: 700) concept of ‘affective history’ suddenly seems extremely useful, along with her suggestion that it is ‘the legacies of the past in the present and how that past lives on in the embodied present of community’ that is of concern (see also Walkerdine 2013, 2015) – a concept for the next edited collection, perhaps?

Emma Waterton is Professor in the Geographies of Heritage at Western Sydney University. Her research has developed across four areas: (1) unpacking the set of relations that constitute the discourse of heritage and its erasures; (2) understanding heritage encounters via the application of affect theory; (3) exploring the intersections between heritage and practices of social governance; and (4) experimental approaches for data capture. She is author or editor of twenty-three books, including *The Semiotics of Heritage Tourism* (with Steve Watson, 2014) and *Geographies of Commemoration in a Digital World – Anzac @ 100* (with Danielle Drozdowski and Shanti Sumartojo, 2021). She is the Editor-in-Chief of *Landscape Research*.

Notes

1. *Which Side Are You On?* is an English film documenting the miners’ strike of 1984–85, directed and produced by Ken Loach. It was released in 1984 and features a number of songs, poems and reflections on the strike action.

2. Commonly referred to as the EU referendum, with the country’s subsequent withdrawal from the EU referred to as ‘Brexit’.

3. The Black Country was one of Britain’s most industrialized areas, located in the West Midlands, and has a history of extensive factories, brickworks and rich coal seams. The coal itself, along with the thick black smog associated with the area’s furnaces, gave rise to the name ‘Black Country’.

References

Published Sources

- Ahmed, S. 2004. ‘Affective Economies’, *Social Text* 22(2): 116–39.
- Anderson, B., and H.F. Wilson. 2018. ‘Everyday Brexits’, *Area* 50(2): 291–95.
- Berger, S. 2019. ‘Industrial Heritage and the Ambiguities of Nostalgia for an Industrial Past in the Ruhr Valley, Germany’, *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History* 16(1): 37–64.
- Berger, S., and S. High. 2019. ‘(De-)Industrial Heritage: An Introduction’, *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History* 16(1): 1–27.
- Bright, G. 2016. ‘Working in Ghost Labs: Developing a Collaborative Process/Event Space of Politicised Intergenerational Community Re-imagination’. Retrieved 13 April 2021 from <https://www.dur.ac.uk/dialogue/signposts/staff/?itemno=27994>.
- Buchli, V., and G. Lucas. 2001. ‘The Absent Presence’, in V. Buchli and G. Lucas (eds), *Archaeologies of the Contemporary Past*. London: Routledge, pp. 3–18.

- Bull, J., and M. Leyshon. 2010. 'Writing the Moment: Landscape and Memory-Image', *Spatial Practices* 10: 124–48.
- Casella, E.C. 2005. "'Social Workers": New Directions in Industrial Archaeology', in *Industrial Archaeology: Future Directions*. New York: Springer, pp. 3–32.
- Cranstone, D. 2005. 'After Industrial Archaeology?', in E.C. Casella and J. Symonds (eds), *Industrial Archaeology: Future Directions*. Boston, MA: Springer, pp. 77–92.
- Cromby, J. 2007. 'Towards a Psychology of Feeling', *International Journal of Critical Psychology* 21: 94–118.
- Derrida, J. 1993. *Spectres of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning and the New International*. London: Routledge.
- DeSilvey, C. 2012. 'Copper Places: Affective Circuitries', in O. Jones and J. Garde-Hansen (eds), *Geography and Memory: Explorations in Identity, Place and Becoming*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 45–57.
- Dittmer, J., and E. Waterton. 2021. 'Naval-Gazing: The Popular Geopolitics of Affect and Maritime Heritage', in M. Mostafanezhad, M. Córdoba Azcárate and R. Norum (eds), *Tourism Geopolitics: Assemblages of Infrastructure, Affect and Imagination*, Tucson: University of Arizona Press, pp. 145–65.
- Drozdewski, D., S. Sumartojo and E. Waterton. 2021. *Geographies of Commemoration in a Digital World – Anzac @ 100*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Emery, J. 2018. 'Belonging, Memory and History in the North Nottinghamshire Coalfield', *Journal of Historical Geography* 59: 77–89.
- Evans, G. 2017. 'Brexit Britain: Why We Are All Postindustrial Now', *American Ethnologist* 44(2): 215–19.
- Gordon, A. 2008. *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Graham, B., G. Ashworth and J. Tunbridge. 2000. *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy*. London: Arnold.
- Harvey, D. 2001. 'Heritage Pasts and Heritage Presents: Temporality, Meaning and the Scope of Heritage Studies', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 7(4): 319–38.
- Hetherington, K. 2004. 'Secondhandedness: Consumption, Disposal, and Absent Presence', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 22(1): 157–73.
- Hill, L.J. 2015. 'Human Geography and Archaeology: Strange Bedfellows?', *Progress in Human Geography* 39(4): 412–31.
- Jones, O. 2015. "'Not Promising a Landfall...": An Autotopographical Account of Loss, Memory and Landscape', *Environmental Humanities* 6(1): 1–27.
- Laliberté, N., and C. Schurr. 2016. 'The Stickiness of Emotions in the Field: Complicating Feminist Methodologies', *Gender, Place and Culture* 23(1): 72–78.
- Leys, R. 2017. *The Ascent of Affect: Genealogy and Critique*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Maddrell, A. 2013. 'Living with the Deceased: Absence, Presence and Absence-Presence', *Cultural Geographies* 20(4): 501–22.
- Massumi, B. 1987. 'Translator's Foreword: Pleasures of Philosophy', in G. Deleuze and F. Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London: Continuum, pp. ix–xvi.
- Palmer, M. 2018. 'Forty Years of *Industrial Archaeology Review*: A Personal View', *Industrial Archaeology Review* 40(2): 58–64.
- Power, A., and E. Herden. 2016. *Leipzig City Story: CASEreport 107 (May 2016)*. Retrieved 13 April 2021 from <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/67845/1/casereport107.pdf>.
- Samuel, R. 1994. *Theatres of Memory*. London: Verso.
- Smith, L. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge.
- Stewart, K. 2007. *Ordinary Affects*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Storm, A. 2014. *Post-industrial Landscape Scars*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Thrift, N. 2009. 'Understanding the Affective Spaces of Political Performance', in M. Smith et al. (eds), *Emotion, Place, Culture*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 79–95.
- Tolia-Kelly, D. 2006. 'Affect: An Ethnographic Encounter? Exploring the "Universalist" Imperative of Emotional/Affectual Geographies', *Area* 38(2): 213–17.
- Walkerdine, V. 2013. 'Using the Work of Felix Guattari to Understand Space, Place Social Justice and Education', *Qualitative Inquiry* 19(10): 756–64.
- . 2015. 'Transmitting Class across Generations', *Theory and Psychology* 25(2): 167–83.
- . 2016. 'Affective History, Working-Class Communities and Self-Determination', *Sociological Review* 64(4): 699–714.
- . 2020. "'No-one Listens to Us": Post-Truth, Affect and Brexit', *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 17(1): 143–58.
- Waterton, E. 2005. 'Whose Sense of Place? Reconciling Archaeological Perspectives with Community Values: Cultural Landscapes in England', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 11(4): 309–25.
- . 2011. 'In the Spirit of Self-Mockery? Labour Heritage and Identity in the Potteries', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 17(4): 344–63.
- . 2014. 'A More-Than-Representational Understanding of Heritage? The "Past" and the Politics of Affect', *Geography Compass* 8(11): 823–33.
- . 2019. 'More-Than-Representational Landscapes', in P. Howard et al. (eds), *The Routledge Companion to Landscape Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 91–101.
- Waterton, E., and H. Saul. 2021. 'Ghosts of the Anthropocene: Spectral Accretions at the Port Arthur Historic Site', *Landscape Research* 46(3): 362–76.
- Waterton, E., and S. Watson. 2013. 'Framing Theory: Towards a Critical Imagination in Heritage Studies', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 19(6): 546–61.
- . 2014. *The Semiotics of Heritage Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- . 2015. 'The Ontological Politics of Heritage: or How Research Can Spoil a Good Story', in E. Waterton and S. Watson (eds), *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 21–36.
- Wetherell, M., T. McCreanor, A. McConville, H. Moewaka Barnes and J. le Grice. 2015. 'Settling Space and Covering the Nation: Some Conceptual Considerations in Analysing Affect and Discourse', *Emotion, Space and Society* 16: 56–64.
- Wetherell, M., A. McConville and T. McCreanor. 2020. 'Defrosting the Freezer and Other Acts of Quiet Resistance: Affective Practice Theory, Everyday Activism and Affective Dilemmas', *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 17(1): 13–35.
- Willis, M., and J. Cromby. 2020. 'Bodies, Representations, Situations, Practices: Qualitative Research on Affect, Emotion and Feeling', *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 17(1): 1–12.

Interviews

Gladstone Pottery Museum, Interviewee 009, female, 18–29, local resident.