

Memory, Nostalgia, Landscape and Ruination

Seana Irvine
December 2023

Table of Contents

Memory, Nostalgia, Landscape and Ruination	3
Deindustrialization's Cultural Consequences	5
Industrial Ruination and Industrial Ruins as Living Landscapes	8
Nostalgia and the Struggle for Memory	12
References	17

Memory, Nostalgia, Landscape and Ruination

Cultural geographers, historians and sociologists alike examine the cultural consequences of deindustrialization through both a temporal and spatial lens. Scholarship focusing on worker experiences of deindustrialization encourages readers to consider its cultural consequences as it is inhabited and interpreted through individual and collective memory, and also as it is experienced through the remnant industrial landscapes such as factories, mills, canals and foundries which litter the post-industrial cities of the global North (Cowie & Heathcott, 2003; Emery, 2019; High & Lewis, 2007; Paton, 2014).

Several scholars point to the inherent contradiction that an industrial culture forged in the hard materiality of iron and steel, literally bolted into physical space, was in reality, built on the illusion of permanence “forged in the furnace of fixed capital investment” (Strangleman et al., 2013). Although industrialism had a profound influence on the organization of working-class lives and spaces, it was ultimately as fleeting and temporary as Marx

envisioned the precarity of capitalism itself, in retrospect, but a moment in the long arc of human experience (Cowie & Heathcott, 2003; Emery, 2019; Strangleman & Rhodes, 2014). As Marx expressed:

All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and men at last are forced to face...the real conditions of their lives and their relations with their fellow men (The Marx-Engels Reader p.475-76 in Berman, 1988, p. 21).

Sociologist Marshall Berman (1988) contextualizes Marx’s vision as essential to the dialectical motion of modernity which he defines as “any attempt by modern men and women to become subjects as well as objects of modernization, to get a grip on the modern world and make themselves at home in it” (Berman, 1988, p. 5).

Berman argues that this broad and inclusive interpretation of modernity is critical to democracy as it seeks to help men and women identify relationships among different disciplines, between cultural and political movements as well as across time and space. Such an understanding of modernity, and the phases of industrialization and post-industrialization contained within, is ultimately intended to be empowering, helping men and women live and work with dignity, gain some control over their future, and make a place - a "home" - for themselves in the modern world (Berman, 1988).

However, the literature exploring the relationship between deindustrialization and gentrification in the modern, post-industrial world does not share Berman's optimism of finding hope by embracing the paradoxes and ambiguities of modernism. This literature contains a deep sense of loss from the inevitable consequences of capitalism's forward march in its constant quest for the new, and of the creative destruction that results from economic principles based on growth, innovation and selective renewal.

Scholarship focusing on deindustrialization's impact on workers made redundant through these same principles are rife with nostalgia, that is, a sense of loss and yearning for a past that cannot be returned to, and a dwelling on the "inevitable" waste left behind (Mah, 2012). Workers displaced by deindustrialization, and those who study their experiences, seek to make sense of the past in order to apply some context and control to the complex present and uncertain future. As Walkerdine and Jimenez (2012) note, in speaking with ex-steelworkers after the closure of the local steelworks, "it is impossible to engage effectively with the present, without understanding how that present was possible" (Walkerdine & Jimenez, 2012, p. 8). By seeking to understand and control the past and present narrative, workers attempt to shape the future in a way that does not relegate their experiences and contributions to the economy and social life merely to the past, but rather ensures they remain as active contributors to the present and future.

Deindustrialization's Cultural Consequences

Literature on deindustrialization and worker experience seeks to understand the long-term effects of deindustrialization by analyzing how communities experience and remember loss. Much scholarly research on deindustrialization is interdisciplinary in nature, combining historical analysis with sociological and geographic methodologies and analysis and much is written from the direct and indirect experience of those with working-class backgrounds (Emery, 2019). Over the past 40 years, a genre of literature known as deindustrialization literature that includes personal and creative representations in the form of photography, fiction, worker stories and popular culture, has emerged as a way of “telling stories not merely about, but also from the perspective of working-class people” (Linkon, 2018). This is what Janet Zandy refers to as writing “from the skin of a worker. From inside someone’s skin, we not only learn about their experiences but also gain access to their

ways of seeing and feeling” (Linkon, 2018, p. xvii). Strangleman et al. (2013) take this notion a step further: storytelling through the lens of the body helps us to feel the physical and emotional toll that industrial labour took on worker’s bodies and minds, and thus, of the ways in which industrial work was embodied and embedded.

Methodologically, this research often uses ethnographic research, including oral history interviews, to center the lived experience and realities of communities that have or are experiencing the effects of displacement. Worker narratives and perspectives, particularly as they relate to their relationship to work itself, to their colleagues, and to their employers, provides a more people-centered account of the impact of deindustrialization, shifting focus from dominant capitalist narratives about growth, progress and value (Hart & K’Meyer, 2003). Such perspective-taking builds understanding of the ways people are affected by

deindustrialization and what they interpret their experience to mean. Deindustrialization history told through the stories and voices of those directly affected provides unique, personal insights of the past, shedding light on what is important, and by omission, what is not.

The memories and stories told by downsized workers are rife with tensions. Deindustrialization storytelling reveals the complex nuances that bind the workers identity with their job, work with family, the public and private, and labour and leisure. As personal stories, they are subjective. It is this messiness, or the “contradict-ladenness of personal memory”, that best evokes the complexity and paradoxes of working-class lives (High, 2022, p. 20).

More than a personal and economic imperative, work forms an essential part of a worker’s identity. Work is a means to self-fulfillment and an essential element in individual psychological health, family stability and social tranquility (May & Morrison, 2003). Industrial work, although physically demanding and repetitive, contributed to character-building, maturity and personal growth, while also creating strong social bonds, particularly as worker’s relied on one another (Strangleman & Rhodes,

2014). Thus when work is removed, beyond the loss of economic security, social stability and a sense of control in one’s own life, people’s identities, health and sense of self are also affected. A sense of trauma, anger, confusion, loss and grieving permeates deindustrialization storytelling. At the same time however, as May & Morrison (2013) note, workers portray themselves not as victims but as agents who demand and deserve respect and fairness. Worker stories carry a hope for retraining and education, if not for the workers themselves, than for their children. A sense of powerlessness and lack of agency is likewise countered with pride for leaving (whenever possible) on their own terms.

English and American Studies scholar Sherry Lee Linkon (2018) reminds us that although loss and the resentment that comes with it have been major themes within deindustrialization literature, this literature also speaks to the ways in which working-class people continue to seek meaning in their labour and in their community connections in order to reinterpret their identity and relationship to place, and to adapt and build resilience in an environment that has become destabilized.

Simply put, if we want to understand the cultural influence of economic restructuring, we must attend to its emotional, intimate, everyday effects... The literature of deindustrialization makes those effects visible... We can, no doubt, identify the exploitations and tensions of global capitalism within even the most personal of stories, but these stories remind us that the political is not only personal but also grounded and enacted in place. (Linkon, 2018).

Industrial Ruination and Industrial Ruins as Living Landscapes

In considering the impact of industrial workplace closures on workers, deindustrialization literature looks to understand the cultural meanings of industrial ruins, and how the relationship between identity, memory, loss and place in the context of deindustrialization informs these meanings. Sociologist Irene Mah (2012) identifies industrial ruination as an active, lived process, using the term as a theoretical framework for understanding the effects of deindustrialization on specific communities. Combining both landscapes and legacies, industrial ruination encompasses the interrelated relationships between people and places, historical and socio-economic processes and their long-term psychological implications, and extends to landscapes of industry, industrial housing and institutions (Emery, 2019; Mah, 2012). Mah's methodology for exploring industrial ruination combined immersive case studies with ethnography to produce storytelling of people and their pasts in the post-industrial landscapes they inhabit (Mah, 2012). This approach moves us to think beyond industrial ruins as static artifacts locked in

the past, and rather as places that continue to influence and exert pressure on the present. In this sense, industrial ruination is analogous to Linkon's concept of the "half-life" of deindustrialization:

Deindustrialization is not an event of the past. It remains an active and significant part of the present. Like toxic waste...deindustrialization has a half-life. Its influence may be waning, slowly, over time, but it remains potent, and it cannot simply be forgotten or ignored....The half-life of deindustrialization generates psychological and social forms of disease, as individuals and communities struggle with questions about their identities and their place in a global economy that has devalued workers and their labour.

(Linkon, 2018, pp. 2–3).

Mah's interpretation of industrial ruination stands in contrast to that of sociologist and cultural geographer Tim Edensor's take on industrial ruins as being alive with meaning, albeit in a far more ephemeral and nebulous manner. Using sensory methodologies more reliant on empathy, intuition and affectation rather than intellectual and empiricist historical research as a way of engaging with abandoned buildings and the presence of workers past, Edensor shares:

"Ruins are sites which have not been exorcized, where the supposedly over-and-done-with remains. Haunted by disruptive ghosts, they seethe with memories, but these wispy forms can rarely be confined. They haunt the visitor with vague intimations of the past, refusing fixity, and they also haunt the desire to pin memory down in place" (Edensor, 2005, p. 829).

With its emphasis on the researchers' senses and how they are personally affected by the ruins, rather than centering those of displaced and dispossessed communities, Edensor's approach has been critiqued by historian Steven High, Mah and others as being representative of the aestheticization, fetishization,

romanticization and commodification of industrial ruins. In a similar vein, High is critical of contemporary urban explorers who, with a universal gaze, objectify and aestheticize rubble into ruin (High, 2013), stripping them of their meaning and context by ignoring the political history and the social relations invested in ruins (High & Lewis, 2007). Scholars have identified the problematic nature of fetishization of ruins as "ruin porn", a form of ruin gazing primarily through photography and exploration, that divorces itself from the reality of the ruin itself, "privileging the ruined object while neglecting the socio-political structure behind its imposing nature" (Pohl, 2022, p. 355). Further, High argues that urban explorers lack self-awareness about their own social location and the politics of their own actions in how they consider their place within, and the ethical implications of, their stories and images of ruins (High, 2013).

Seeking to engage with other interpretations of fetishising industrial ruins, Pohl takes a different stance on ruins as objects of fetishisation. Equating fetishisation as a form of fantasy that is closed off and hidden, per Walter Benjamin and Jacques Lachlan's definitions of fetish, he notes that certain industrial ruins are seen to have

value in their representative function as reminders of what was lost through capitalist urban development. “There is something taking place in these objects, which relates to fantasies of a world prior to the lack that distinguishes their post-crisis realities” (Pohl, 2022, p. 158). In this light, fetishising abandoned industrial ruins is not perceived as an act of aestheticization, but rather as a social, political and economic act that allows these structures to serve as physical reminders of the dreams and promises of a stable middle class before the destabilizing forces of deindustrialization took hold.

In their studies on the importance of place and the significance of landscapes in shaping identity and memory, cultural geographers and social scientists including Dolores Hayden, Doreen Massey and Sherry Zukin, provide another lens in which to examine the cultural meanings of industrial ruins. Landscapes shape our individual experiences and they are vital to constructing our mental maps. They act as “storehouses” for social memories, both personally (where does one come from) and collectively (what are the histories of our social relationships in that place) (Hayden, 1995).

In constructing a sense of identity of the history of a place,

internal perspectives often fail to conceive that specific places are, and have always been, interconnected to the world beyond the place itself, what Massey (1995) refers to as “the history of the global construction of the local” (Massey, 1995, p. 182).

Places are more than locations on maps. Place mediates the relationship between the individual and political and are significantly produced by the systemic forces of state and capital (McQuarrie, 2017). As Hayden notes, places are articulations of social relations that are constantly shifting, powerful in their ability to nurture and shape citizens’ public memory over shared time (Hayden, 1995). Yet the power of place is often untapped in working-class neighbourhoods, not only because these neighbourhoods have often experienced first hand the devastation of industry closure, urban renewal, environmental racism and lack of infrastructure investment, but also conceptually, as the disciplines of history, geography, architecture and social history have failed to look holistically at the importance of these landscapes as having historic cultural value (Hayden, 1995).

Landscapes are the major cultural product of the institutions, structures and systems of our time and they reflect the spatial consequences of combined social and economic power and class and social reproduction (Mah, 2012; Zukin, 1991). Landscapes of deindustrialization serve as a canvas that etches the structural and spatially uneven violence of capitalism's creative destruction in both the management and treatment of ruins and the neighbourhoods that are left behind (High, 2022; Mah, 2012; Zukin, 1991). As noted, Zukin (1991) defines the former as landscapes of consumption and the latter, landscapes of devastation with those who inhabit the latter considered the losers, lacking both income and prestige (Zukin, 1991). The cultural values of traditional industry communities were inscribed in the physical landscape of cities, landscapes which themselves were changed by industrialization and deindustrialization. Thus economic transformation reorganizes our sense of place as it transforms the character of specific places, materially and symbolically (Rhodes, 2013).

Yet Mah reminds us that these complex landscapes are distinct and the stories they contain layered.

"The legacies of industrial ruination cannot be accounted

for by the binaries of success and failure, creation and destruction, or consumption and devastation. There are many tensions, contradictions, and contingencies within the lived experiences of people who occupy these "wasted places" (Mah, 2012, p. 8). For Mah, studying the waste left behind, of what is discarded, is sociologically important. Historian Ann Laura Stoler identifies ruination as a political project that "lays waste to certain peoples and places, relations and things" (Stoler in High et al., 2017, p. 8).

The physical remains of industrial landscapes, "either abandoned or redeveloped, serve as reminders that workers who once stood at the centre of local life are now relegated to the periphery" (High & Lewis, 2007, p. 8). Similarly, Edensor's characterization that, in harbouring the unexorcised ghosts of memory, the industrial ruins that remain within these landscapes of devastation act as a reminder that those who have been disposed of and deemed irrelevant cannot be so easily dispensed of (Edensor, 2005).

Nostalgia and the Struggle for Memory

The role of nostalgia in understanding the cultural impacts of deindustrialization and the ways in which worker narratives are ascribed to industrial ruins and their redevelopment is the focus of significant scholarship (Edensor, 2005; Frisch, 2022; Hart & K'Meyer, 2003; High & Lewis, 2007; Mah, 2012; Stanton, 2006; Strangeman & Rhodes, 2014). Much of this scholarship is informed by the struggle for memory as working-class histories and identities have been ignored, erased and forgotten by those more powerful in society (Linkon, 2018). Further, “if memory places bind people and communities together, and are symbolic in nature, then abandoned mills and factories have become symbolic sites of identity for those workers who have come to identify with their displacement, uniting displaced workers in a memory community of “anger and sorrow” (High & Lewis, 2007, p. 9).

This feeling of powerlessness and dispossession contributes to deep feelings of nostalgia, what historian Peter Fritzsche defines as a melancholy feeling of

dispossession (High & Lewis, 2007), sociologists Tim Strangeman and James Rhodes refer to as a complex emotion of attachment (Strangeman & Rhodes, 2014) and urban geographer Margaret Kohn identifies as a longing for an illusory or imagined past (Kohn, 2010). Cowie and Heathcott remind us that deindustrialization scholarship must maintain a critical focus, balancing the need to understand the experience and perspectives of those affected by deindustrialization, while not falling prey to “smokestack nostalgia” with its risk of romanticizing and sentimentalizing the past (Cowie & Heathcott, 2003a.). Mah (2012) brings a critical understanding of the paradox of nostalgia to her study of industrial ruination. She identifies the “ambivalent nostalgia” that is held by communities wherein their memories of happier, more stable times with relatively well paying jobs simultaneously stand in contrast to their recognition that the work was physically demanding and extractive, taking a toll on the workers bodies and the natural environment, while also being embedded in class and power relations (Mah, 2012; McIvor, 2017).

As High and Lewis (2017) note, industrial ruins are memory places, for they make us pause, reflect and remember. But remember what, and to what end? Historian Michael Frisch echoes this, asking “What is the role of memory and public memorializing in digesting changes as profound and traumatic as deindustrialization? Further, whose history should be remembered and memorialized, by whom, and to what ends?” (Frisch, 2022, p. 241). Attempting to answer these questions requires appreciating the duality that how people think about the past influences their understanding of themselves and the political, economic and social landscapes of the present. It also entails understanding that memory is not static, that traditions do not exist only in the past but can be created in the present, and that places are hybrid constructions of the local and global (Frisch, 2022; Jedlowski, 2001; Massey, 1995; Strangleman et al., 2013).

What we call ‘memory’ is a complex network of activities, the study of which indicates that the past never remains ‘one and the same’, but is constantly selected, filtered and restructured in terms set by the questions and necessities of the present, at both the individual and the social levels. Philosophically speaking, what we call ‘memory’ can be described as the field of a complex temporal dialectic: while on the one hand the flow of life over time entails effects that condition the future, on the other it is the present that shapes the past, ordering, reconstructing and interpreting its legacy, with expectations and hopes also helping to select what best serves the future (Jedlowski, 2001, p. 30).

Memory is political because memories are selected and interpreted on the basis of culturally-located knowledge that is developed within a network of social relationships. These, in turn, build the cohesion among a social group that helps to guarantee its identity (High & Lewis, 2007; Jedlowski, 2001). Memory of places and place identity also connect through the histories that are told of those places. Because memories are ultimately subjective, the past becomes a human construction, one that is constantly selected and filtered by the dominant

narratives of the present (Jedlowski, 2001; Massey, 1995)
How memory as it is embedded - or not - through the redevelopment of historic districts into cultural hubs that include high end galleries, retail and housing, is ultimately a political project. In such settings, “it is not simply the meanings and memory that have been contested. It is, quite literally, policy and politics for the present and future.” (Frisch, 2022, p. 241).
Spatialisation of memory, or the creation of “memory-scapes” which Edensor (2005) defines as “performative and disciplined rituals for imprinting a singular sense of the past on space”, is embedded in strategies to determine where and how things, activities, and people should be placed.

Typically, facades are retained, although divested of the patina which testified to previous usage, but age value is reencoded via ‘antique’ street furniture. These makeovers select only a few ‘heritage’ features, removing all clutter so space may be themed coherently. These normative processes disguise a politics wherein developers and experts remember space for middle-class inhabitants, businesses, shoppers, and tourists, raising wider questions about which fragments and spaces of memory are incinerated, dumped, or buried and which pass into social and institutional memory.
(Edensor, 2005, p. 831).

In a similar vein, heritage redevelopment projects have received criticism as obliterating history by “Disneyfying” the past, a form of engineered reimagining and monotone cultural sanitation designed to “evoke nostalgia for the past and pleasure in the present while diminishing the critical capacities that facilitate meaningful urban citizenship” (Kohn, 2010, p. 360). These approaches serve to depoliticize nostalgia by creating an environment of a past that did not really exist, a context in which nostalgia is characterized as a “placebo that allows one to accept the status quo uncritically and inhibits deeper social criticism” (Kohn, 2010, p. 365).

In the context of industrial heritage culture-based revitalization projects, culture is memorialized through publicly sanctioned narratives, narratives that can serve to sever the link between past and present. In her study of the Lowell National History Project, a former textile mill in Lowell, Massachusetts, anthropologist Cathy Stanton examines how the industrial history of capitalism is interpreted as part of the site's contemporary redevelopment. Stanton finds that the ways in which worker stories have been discarded from the reading of past mirrors the dislocation of worker experience in the present.

Like all industrial history museums, [Lowell] came to praise and to bury - to extol the workers whose labour

created these places and frame that labour as something essentially finished. These places, in fact, are instrumental in creating the past. Often this sense of "pastness" is created at the expense of people still living in the present...people who have not been able to prosper in the changing US economy, or those associated with older patterns of living and working: miners, factory workers, farmers, people from groups associated in some way with "tradition" (Stanton, 2006, p. 6).

Historian Michael Frisch writes that industrial heritage redevelopment projects must view industrial heritage as a "generative domain rather than as just contested terrain...a domain that provides a publicly useful space within which we may work to confront our collective implication in a complex past and an as yet undetermined future" (Frisch, 1998, p. 249). Through this lens, it is possible to understand former sites of industrial production as providing a public benefit that goes beyond the binary of one the one had, museums where worker memories are preserved as relics of the past, and on the other, as sites for redevelopment that result in facadism and the erasure of that same memory.

Thinking of work cultures and their traditions only as existing in the past speaks to nostalgia and of things that cannot be recovered. Yet Massey (1995) reminds us that “the identity of a place is not to be seen as inevitably destroyed by new importations ... identity is always and always has been, in the process of formation: it is in a sense forever unachieved” (Massey, 1995, p. 186). In other words, new traditions can be built in the present and these traditions can create new identities that are both grounded in place and that recognize their interconnectivity beyond, temporally and spatially. Just as memory and cultural practices of industrialization and deindustrialization have contributed to disembodied memories of work cultures, so too can memory and cultural practices contribute to re-embodied and re-embedded work cultures and the places they inhabit (Rhodes, 2013; Strangleman & Rhodes, 2014).

References

- Berman, M. (1988). *All that Is solid melts Into air: The experience of modernity* (2nd ed.). Penguin Books.
- Cowie, J., & Heathcott, J. (Eds.). (2003). *Beyond the ruins: The meanings of deindustrialization*. Cornell University Press.
- Edensor, T. (2005). The ghosts of industrial ruins: Ordering and disordering memory in excessive space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 23(6), 829–849. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d58j>
- Emery, J. (2019). Geographies of deindustrialization and the working-class: Industrial ruination, legacies, and affect. *Geography Compass*, 13(2), e12417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12417>
- Frisch, M. (1998). De-, re-, and post-industrialization: Industrial heritage as contested memorial terrain. *Journal of Folklore Research*, 35(3), 241–249.
- Frisch, M. (2022). De-, Re-, and Post-Industrialization: Industrial Heritage as Contested Memorial Terrain. 10.
- Hart, J. L., & K'Meyer, T. E. (2003). Worker memory and narrative: Personal stories of deindustrialization in Louisville, Kentucky. In J. Cowie & J. Heathcott (Eds.), *Beyond the ruins: The meanings of deindustrialization* (pp. 284–304). Cornell University Press.
- Hayden, D. (1995). *The power of place: Urban landscape as public history*. The MIT Press.
- High, S. (2013). Beyond aesthetics: Visibility and invisibility in the aftermath of deindustrialization. *International Labor and Working-Class History*, 84, 140–153. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0147547913000276>
- High, S. (2022). *Deindustrializing Montreal: Entangled histories of race, residence and class*. McGill-Queen's University Press.
- High, S., & Lewis, D. W. (2007). *Corporate wasteland: The landscape and memory of deindustrialization*. Between the Lines.
- High, S., MacKinnon, L., & Perchard, A. (Eds.). (2017). Introduction. In *The deindustrialized world: Confronting ruination in postindustrial places* (pp. 3–22). UBC Press.

- Jedlowski, P. (2001). Memory and sociology: Themes and issues. *Time & Society*, 10(1), 29–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961463X01010001002>
- Kohn, M. (2010). Toronto's Distillery District: Consumption and nostalgia in a post-industrial landscape. *Globalizations*, 7(3), 359–369. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731003669735>
- Linkon, S. (2018). *The half-life of deindustrialization: Working-class writing about economic restructuring*. University of Michigan Press. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.8432351>
- Mah, A. (2012). *Industrial ruination, community, and place: Landscapes and legacies of urban decline*. University of Toronto Press.
- Massey, D. (1995). Places and their pasts. *History Workshop Journal*, 39(1), 182–192. <https://doi.org/10.1093/hwj/39.1.182>
- May, S., & Morrison, L. (2003). Making sense of restructuring: Narratives of accommodation among downsized workers. In J. Cowie & J. Heathcott (Eds.), *Beyond the ruins: The meanings of deindustrialization* (pp. 259–283). Cornell University Press.
- McIvor, A. (2017). Deindustrialization embodied: Work, health, and disability in the United Kingdom since the mid-twentieth century. In S. High, L. MacKinnon, & A. Perchard (Eds.), *The deindustrialized world: Confronting ruination in post-industrial places* (pp. 27–45). UBC Press.
- McQuarrie, M. (2017). The revolt of the Rust Belt: Place and politics in the age of anger. *British Journal of Sociology*, 33.
- Paton, K. (2014). *Gentrification: A working-class perspective*. Routledge.
- Pohl, L. (2022). Aura of decay: Fetishising ruins with Benjamin and Lacan. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 47(1), 153–166. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12481>
- Rhodes, J. (2013). Youngstown's 'ghost'? Memory, identity, and deindustrialization. *International Labor and Working-Class History*, 84, 55–77. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0147547913000343>
- Stanton, C. (2006). *The Lowell experiment: Public history in a post-industrial city*. University of Massachusetts Press.
- Strangleman, T., & Rhodes, J. (2014). The 'new' sociology of deindustrialisation? Understanding industrial change. *Sociology Compass*, 8(4), 411–421. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12143>

Strangleman, T., Rhodes, J., & Linkon, S. (2013). Introduction to crumbling cultures: Deindustrialization, class, and memory. *International Labor and Working-Class History*, 84, 7–22. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0147547913000227>

Walkerdine, V., & Jimenez, L. (2012). *Gender, work and community after de-industrialisation: A psychosocial approach to affect*. Palgrave.

Zukin, S. (1991). *Landscapes of power: From Detroit to Disney World*. University of California Press.