CHAPTER 1

Theorizing Heritage in the Post-Industrial City

Maris Boyd Gillette

Introduction

Heritage regularly plays a role in post-industrial urban 'regeneration', as numerous studies of former industrial cities have shown (e.g. Chen et al. 2016; Gillette 2017; Storm 2014; Xie 2015). This empirical evidence has led the editors of this volume to pose the question of how we might productively theorize the relationship between heritage and urban restructuring (see Introduction). Heritage, they propose, is a technology of the neoliberal city that legitimates particular trajectories of development through a practice of 'bordering', closure and exclusion.

In this chapter I investigate to what extent the scholarly models used to theorize heritage in post-industrial cities have directed our attention to the processes of bordering, closure and exclusion that legitimate urban redevelopment. I argue that the scholarship and empirical evidence of heritage in post-industrial cities suggests that we can, in fact, sharpen our analytic frame by pinpointing an essential feature of the bordering that characterizes post-industrial heritage. The redevelopment trajectories legitimated by heritage in the post-industrial city are fundamentally about class, though they may also involve other forms of exclusion and closure (see relevant chapters in this volume).

If we accept that heritage in post-industrial settings always has class implications, as my review of the existing scholarship indicates, we can foreground this characteristic by theorizing post-industrial heritage as a material and ideological process of gentrification that encloses new class constellations in the neoliberal city. More specifically, heritage in

post-industrial urban redevelopment projects displaces the working class, physically and figuratively, in order to create spaces and narratives for middle- and upper-middle-class denizens. Material structures that once housed the working class or the processes of industrial labour are transformed for the use of the middle and upper-middle class. Industrial production is replaced by neoliberal consumption. Narratives concerning industrial workers are eviscerated, stylized and adapted to suit the tastes of middle- and upper-middle-class patrons. Even 'nature' is worked on to create 'urban green spaces' that appeal to middle-class sensibilities and leisure patterns, a process that has been called 'ecological gentrification' (Sandberg 2014; see also Berger et al. 2017). In short, heritage in the post-industrial city promotes and legitimates urban restructuring that benefits middle- and upper-middle-class 'gentry' by enclosing and displacing the working class physically, ideologically and environmentally.

Key Analytic Concepts in the Study of Post-Industrial Heritage

Anthropologists, archaeologists, architects, geographers, historians, sociologists, tourism scholars and others have researched heritage in post-industrial contexts. Analytically and empirically, the cases of heritage in the post-industrial city lead inexorably to the conclusion that post-industrial heritage creates class borders. Dominating this scholarship are four distinct analytic models: museumification, performance, ruination and scar. Each of these frames indicates some process of 'bordering' at work, but none, in my view, adequately captures the class elements of post-industrial heritage. I explore each of these concepts in turn, looking at examples of how scholars have used them to study post-industrial urban restructuring, and highlighting the process of bordering to which each model points.

Museumification

One of the first models used to conceptualize post-industrial heritage has been called 'museumification' (Debary 2004; see also Cameron 2000). Scholars who employ the museumification frame argue that specific industrial heritage sites 'display' some histories while omitting and foreclosing others (e.g. Wallace 1987; Debary 2004; Goodall 1993; Shackel and Palus 2006). Museumification as an analytic strategy focuses on practices of representation and insists that post-industrial representations of industry are as much about forgetting and excluding – bordering, in other words – as

about remembering and preserving. Numerous studies detail how industrial heritage sites limit, exclude and repackage working-class pasts to create appealing representations – what historian Mike Wallace has called 'history light' – for consumption by middle-class tourists and homeowners (Wallace 1987; see also Cameron 2000; Högberg 2011; Oakley 2015; Pashkevich 2017; Shackel and Paulus 2006). Anthropologists, archaeologists, historians and others have applied the museumification concept to urban heritage projects in many contexts; here I discuss examples from post-industrial cities in the US, France and Sweden.

Anthropologist Catherine Cameron analysed the museumification of industry in the city of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania after steel-making ceased (2000). She investigated the process through which Bethlehem's former steel plant was redeveloped, focusing on who was involved and how the industry was interpreted and represented. Federal and state funders, a private non-profit redevelopment agency, and the company Bethlehem Steel, whose former plant was being turned into a heritage site, drove the process, which was explicitly linked to the goal of urban renewal. These actors agreed that the plant-turned-museum would showcase the 'drama, danger, and scale' of steel-making (67). 'Museumifying' steel-making to 'display' this narrative meant focusing on technology and innovation, and ignoring other aspects of the industry's history, such as the lives of its former workers, or discussion of relations between labour and management. How it came to pass that Bethlehem Steel closed its eponymous Bethlehem plant was also excluded. At the time that the company closed the Bethlehem plant, it continued to operate steel mills in Indiana and Maryland, and had plans to purchase plants in other parts of Pennsylvania. Museumifying steel in Bethlehem kept this part of the story out of the heritage representation. Cameron points out that locals were not invited to participate in crafting Bethlehem Steel's post-industrial heritage. This act of exclusion, she notes, was not necessarily unwelcome, as Bethlehem residents preferred the city's colonial Moravian history to its industrial past.

Anthropologist Octave Debary studied museumification in Le Creusot, France, a small city once dominated by a family-owned ironworks and steelworks (2004). Like Cameron, in his research Debary traces the process by which the city turned parts of the owner's property, including the family's residence (a castle), into an 'ecomuseum' and then a more conventional museum (127–30). Forgetting, excluding and foreclosing were central to the process of museumification in Le Creusot. Debary argues that the absence of any narratives about the tense relations between owners and labourers was 'wilful amnesia' about Le Creusot's 'class warfare'. As in Cameron's case, redeveloping an industrial site into a museum in Le

Creusot also entailed narrating a usable past. In this case, the past focused on a paternalistic entrepreneur and family capitalism, and consigned labour struggles and the working class to what Debary called the 'warehouse, a garbage dump for dead objects and stories' (131).

Archaeologist Anders Högberg's study of heritage-making and redevelopment of the former Scandinavisk Eternit industrial area of Lomma, southern Sweden, is another example of scholarship on post-industrial heritage that uses the 'museumification' model (2011). Högberg used the term 'transformation' rather than museumification to talk about the process through which this former industrial site became an 'attractive' residential area, but like Cameron and Debary he argues that creating industrial heritage is 'more a process of forgetting than of remembering' (38). In the case of Scandinavisk Eternit, heritage forgetting not only meant ignoring the loss of jobs and other economic consequences of the company's closure, but also forgetting and excluding the history of a company which knew that its product – a building material made out of concrete and asbestos – was killing its workers and nevertheless chose to hide this fact and continue producing. Turning Scandinavisk Eternit into heritage for Lomma entailed preserving a single office building, removing the production sites of the toxic product, and constructing a 'bland' memorial park, 'a pleasant environment with green areas and a sculpture' (38, 40). Histories of labour, illness and mortality, and of a company cover-up, were excluded. The end result was a heritage space populated exclusively by wealthy, elderly purchasers of the new residences. In Högberg's words, 'A two-edged, traumatic history of many working lives' was 'reduced to a tame narrative' to facilitate construction of a 'prosperous future' (40).

According to material culture scholar Peter Oakley, who has studied how former mining sites are turned into heritage to promote regeneration, industrial heritage locations are 'temples to valorized ancestors' that are carefully managed to foreground particular representations of industry at the expense of others (2015: 64). As his comments and these three cases suggest, the museumification framework for analysing post-industrial heritage draws attention to what we can call narrative bordering, the construction of specific representations that include and exclude particular pasts at industrial heritage sites. Common to these cases of narrative bordering is that stories about labour and the working class are simplified, reduced or omitted in favour of stories about technology, innovation, entrepreneurship and scale. In other words, the museumification of former industries gentrifies the past by bordering and excluding the working class and labour in favour of representations that facilitate a class-based form of urban restructuring also known as gentrification.

Performance

In some studies of former industries in regenerating cities, industrial heritage is analysed in terms of performance. The anthropologists, historians and sociolinguists who think about industrial heritage as a performance are also interested in narrative and representation. Yet whereas the museumification model focuses on the contents of representations at post-industrial sites, the specific stories that are included and excluded, scholars who analyse industrial heritage as performance focus on the processes of representing the past. Performance as an analytic frame directs attention to a dialogic and interactive process of making meaning between heritage professionals and heritage site visitors (see, e.g., Coupland and Coupland 2014; Kesküla 2013; Stanton 2006). Here I present two examples of scholars who use performance to study post-industrial heritage.

Anthropologist Cathy Stanton's monograph on the Lowell National Historical Park in the former industrial city of Lowell, Massachusetts, remains to date the most extensive discussion and application of the performance concept to industrial heritage (2006). Stanton draws on Goffman's dramaturgical model of social interaction, and Turner's theorization of ritual as a marked domain for engaging with cultural symbols, to develop performance as an analytic tool for the study of industrial heritage (2006: 21–23). She scrutinizes the shared meanings that are dramatically enacted at Lowell's industrial heritage venues by heritage professionals (including tour guides and curators) and visitors. Importantly, as she observes, staff and visitors at the Lowell National Historical Park are homogenous in terms of their social class: they all belong to the middle and upper-middle class. Unsurprisingly, then, the tours that heritage professionals give to tourists at Lowell's former mills and textile factories perform industrial work as past, 'post', history. These tours provide middle-class tourists with 'rituals of reconnection' to their parents' and ancestors' working-class identities (135–84), together with messages concerning ethnicity and Americanness. These performances of industrial heritage displace the working class into 'then', 'who we were', effectively obscuring or bordering the possibility of workers and industrial labour in Lowell's here and now. In ways similar to museumification, the performance of industrial heritage also gentrifies the past, excluding labour from the present day and legitimating the presence of middle-class tourists at the mills.

Like Stanton, the historian Bethan Coupland and sociolinguist Nikolas Coupland study industrial heritage tourism, in this case at former mines in Wales and Cornwall (2014). They also argue that the performance of heritage at the mines creates 'salient meanings, identities and values' by 'staging' a valued cultural past and making it available for scrutiny and

reassessment by heritage professionals and tourists alike (514). Coupland and Coupland are particularly interested in how performances at these sites construct authenticity, including by hiring former miners to work as tour guides. The former miners carefully craft narratives that will appeal to the tourists, 'editing' the past to remove the unwanted bits, which include workers' racism and misogyny, while creating pleasure for heritage consumers by producing a sense of reality and direct connection (507). In these performances in Cornwall and Wales we again see narrative gentrification at work, as historical stories about workers and mining are 'edited' into narratives that please tourists, but here these performances entail a form of self-gentrification by miners turned into tour guides. Similar performances of self-gentrification can be found in other locations (see Kesküla 2013; Walker 2012).

Scholars who study industrial heritage as performance focus on how heritage professionals and audiences collaborate to give meaning to former industries. These performances are processes of narrative bordering that exclude and repackage working-class experiences and histories for middle- and upper-middle-class visitors. Working-class labour is 'worked on' to create an 'authentic' experience of labour that is sanitized and restructured as a tourist commodity. Former members of the working class can be complicit in these performances that gentrify history and place.

Ruination

Ruination is another analytic frame deployed by archaeologists, urban studies scholars, sociologists and other researchers who seek to understand post-industrial cities. The concept of ruination is closely linked to the work of geographer Tim Edensor, who has been especially interested in the aesthetic and sensory qualities of ruins, and the way in which they offer putatively 'unregulated' spaces inside neoliberal capitalist regimes (e.g. Edensor 2005; see also DeSilvey and Edensor 2012). Edensor's theorization has been critiqued for its class politics, or lack thereof; in particular, Stevan High has argued that the aesthetics of industrial ruins are themselves a class phenomenon, appealing overwhelmingly to white middle-class 'urban explorers' who seek sites of adventure and nostalgia in deindustrializing cities (High and Lewis 2007: chapter two). Other scholars, however, have adopted other strands of Edensor's work. Among these is sociologist Alice Mah, whose recent book-length investigation of heritage and urban redevelopment in three post-industrial cities in North America and Europe has received significant scholarly attention (2012).

Alice Mah uses the concept of ruination to analyse post-industrial physical environments, human bodies and collective memory in Niagara Falls (US and Canada), Newcastle upon Tyne (England), and Ivanovo (Russia). Following Edensor and Schumpeter, she characterizes ruination as a process of creative destruction. The idea of landscape as an 'assemblage' of human and material components, recently popularized within actor-network theory, also informs her approach (2012: 11–13). Mah highlights the uneven geography of ruination, which produces spaces of tourism and revival adjacent to spaces of deprivation and exclusion (e.g. 37–68). Those who suffer most from ruination are economically disadvantaged communities comprised of former workers.

In Mah's analysis, ruination is often a lengthy and uneven process. For example, while Newcastle upon Tyne's ruination was readily seen in its abandoned shipyards, gated industrial sites that blocked access to the riverfront, and decaying worker houses, deindustrialization, and thus the ruination of industry, proceeded in incremental stages over a long period (chapter 3). This long slow process induced a sense of inevitability and naturalness among Newcastle's residents, captured in a phrase she heard frequently: a fatalistic wish to 'get on with it'. Mah's work suggests that we understand post-industrial urban renewal itself as a process of ruination. The spaces of tourism and revival produced by regeneration are the continuation of a long process of deindustrialization, through which industrial sites are ruined for the workers who had once lived and worked there. Archaeologists, landscape architects and others who have applied the concept of ruination to redeveloping urban and urbanizing locations make similar arguments (e.g. Petursdottir 2012; Qviström 2018).

As an analytic frame, ruination draws attention to coterminous physical, emotional and ideological processes through which industries are destroyed and new urban formations created. Yet, as Stevan High insists, class is fundamental to the ruining of industry. The aesthetics of the industrial ruin appeal to middle-class sensibilities. The redevelopment of ruins disenfranchises and displaces the working class. In other words, when industry is 'ruined' to become heritage in the post-industrial city, it is more ruined and ruinous for the working class. For the middle class, industrial ruination is less about destruction than creation.

Scar

The concept of scar is the final major analytic tool found in the scholarly literature on post-industrial heritage. Historian Anna Storm is the scholar who has developed this concept most extensively, applying the concept

to the study of several post-industrial settings in her book *Post-industrial Landscape Scars*, which includes but is not limited to urban contexts (2014). Other studies of former industrial areas apply related notions, such as 'healing' (e.g. Berger et al. 2017), or use Storm's work to propose related concepts, such as 'waste-scapes' (Weber 2019).

Storm proposes that we analyse post-industrial settings as scars in part because of her dissatisfaction with the idea, often seen in the heritage literature, that heritage and the past are palimpsests or layers of 'text' (2014: 3–4). The notions of palimpsest and layers suggest an undisturbed access to the past which Storm finds problematic. By contrast, the concept of a scar indicates development and growth. Deindustrialization wounds, but the wounds are not static. A scar grows over the wound, and that growth changes the past fundamentally. Storm categorizes post-industrial landscape scars as reused, ruined and undefined in her book, applying these categories to former nuclear power plants, mining industries and steel manufacture. Given the visceral nature of the metaphors of wound and scar, it is somewhat puzzling that Storm did not develop the potential of these terms for her categories. Scars fester, heal, bleed, reopen and fade. Might we say the same about post-industrial landscapes? Nevertheless, prominent advantages of the scar concept include its insistence on change and process, as well as its evocative link to damage and healing. For example, in the forming mining region of Ruhr, German officials have used nature to conceal unwanted industrial pasts and promote 'healing' by making a dirty, undesirable place into an attractive tourist destination (2014: 101–26; see also Berger et al. 2017).

As with the other scholarship I have presented, Storm's post-industrial landscape scars are growths with class implications. Her studies of Ruhr and Avesta detail processes of gentrification through which former industries are turned into sites of consumption for non-workers. In addition to physical gentrification through re-naturalization and art, the industrial heritage cases she explores are also processes of figurative gentrification, in which working-class histories are repackaged, bordered and hidden for redevelopment purposes. The concept of scar, like the concept of ruination, draws our attention to the long-term physical, sensorial and aesthetic processes through which industry becomes post-industry and industrial cities are redeveloped. Yet the organic metaphors of decay and growth, however productive they may be, fail to draw attention to the class implications of post-industrial heritage. To keep class at the centre of our analysis, I argue, we need to analyse industrial heritage as bordering class, or more specifically, gentrification.

Conceptualizing Heritage in the Post-Industrial City

All of the theoretical frameworks that I have described briefly here illuminate important aspects of what happens when heritage becomes part of urban redevelopment. 'Museumification' calls attention to processes of forgetting and remembering, the bordering of the past to disseminate desired histories, for example about technological innovation and human resilience, and 'warehouse' those that are unwanted, such as why industry left, what relations between workers and entrepreneurs were like, and what the consequences of industrial closure were for various participants. The concept of 'performance' foregrounds the imaginative and interactive processes through which heritage professionals and visitors co-create meaning at heritage sites as actors and audiences, particularly as these performances promote a sense of connection between the middle-class tourist and an imagined, yet decisively bordered and delimited, working class. 'Ruination' as a process of 'creative destruction' calls attention to the material, social and psychic processes of degradation, which include heritage-making itself as both a form of loss and deprivation for workers and an opportunity for consumption for new middle-class residents and visitors. The scar metaphor focuses attention on growth, forcing us to recognize that bordering industry, turning a site of production into a site of the 'post', always fundamentally changes it, typically through making labour less accessible.

All of these analytical models suggest that industrial heritage creates borders in the post-industrial city, but none adequately spotlights what post-industrial heritage in the city does from the perspective of class. Scholars can, and do, use these terms to explore the class dimensions of industrial heritage, describing how heritage sites present working-class history to middle-class consumers (e.g. Stanton 2006), or exacerbate the sufferings of laid-off workers (e.g. Mah 2012), but the concepts of museumification, performance, ruination and scar do not suggest that industrial heritage inherently deals with class, despite the fact that all case studies of industrial heritage have class components. Some of these concepts, particularly those that are grounded in organic processes, distract attention from the very human set of decisions that give rise to, and then steer, urban restructuring, intimating a naturalness to a process that is neither natural nor class neutral. The concepts that do point directly at the human dimensions of deindustrialization highlight imaginative processes and connect to pleasurable educational experiences like visiting a museum or watching a play. Such framing distracts attention from the very marginalization of the working class that is the precondition for this middle-class creativity.

Heritage as Gentrification in the Post-Industrial City

I argue that 'gentrification' best captures the class 'bordering', displacement and exclusion seen when industrial heritage is produced during the restructuring and redevelopment of post-industrial cities. As the empirical cases I have discussed indicate, this gentrification has physical-material and ideological-narrative components. The physical practice of designating material sites, typically former industrial buildings, as heritage, and transforming them into residences, offices for the 'creative class', and shopping areas – sites of consumption – is integral to the neoliberal goals of redevelopment in cities. Members of the working class must be removed from the sites of their disenfranchisement (former industrial areas) in favour of attracting residents, tourists and consumers with higher incomes to re-valued post-industrial zones. This is gentrification as we have understood the process since sociologist Ruth Glass first coined the term (1964). At industrial heritage sites, these material processes are accompanied by ideological and narrative 'restructuring', the processes of museumification, the performance of new place-based identities, and the 'editing' or ruining of working-class history to make 'history light', which can be conceptualized as figurative or mental gentrification. By excluding and recasting working-class histories and memories to please middle- and upper-middle-class consumers and tourists, ideological and narrative gentrification not only recapitulate but also legitimate the material processes of gentrification. Finally, industrial heritage gentrification typically includes ecological phenomena, wherein nature is 'gentrified' to appeal to middle- and upper-middle-class sensitivities (see Sandberg 2014; Wolch et al. 2014).

Sociologist Ruth Glass coined the term 'gentrification' to describe a class-based process of change occurring in central London neighbourhoods, where middle-class 'gentry' moved into working-class areas, opened businesses and demanded improved infrastructure (1964). Central to the process was displacing the urban poor. Since Glass coined the concept, scholars have studied gentrification in urban and other settings, analysing its causes, characteristics and consequences, and exploring the motives of participants (e.g. Atkinson and Bridge 2010; Brown-Saracino 2009; Smith 2002; van Weesep 1994). This research shows that gentrification may be gentry-led or government-initiated, but always entails displacing working-class residents from where they live and work, improving the built environment (which raises rents), and creating new amenities for the middle class (e.g. Hee et al. 2008; Storm 2014: 101–52; Yung et al. 2014).

In post-industrial cities, turning former industries into heritage is a prominent component of urban gentrification. Numerous studies from Europe and North America describe how that industrial heritage is a strategy to

renew deindustrialized urban areas through tourism, middle-class consumption and the arrival of new entrepreneurs (e.g. Dicks 2000; Mah 2012; Stanton 2006; Storm 2014; Xie 2015). Similar processes are found in other, more recently deindustrialized parts of the world. For example, studies of the adaptive reuse of former factories in Beijing and Shanghai depict how municipal officials and developers use industrial heritage to bring the 'creative class' and tourists to former industrial areas (e.g. Chen et al. 2016; Hee et al. 2008; Pendlebury et al. 2018; Yung et al. 2014).

In recent years, environmental studies scholars have examined the role that urban green spaces play in gentrification (e.g. Sandberg 2014; Wolch et al. 2014). For example, domesticating and cultivating the post-industrial environment in the former limestone quarry today celebrated as Malmö's 'Grand Canyon' has contributed to the gentrification of Limhamn (Sandberg 2014). The quarry has become what Sandberg describes as a 'gated ecology', 'an open and orderly vegetation pattern' that serves as an amenity for and spectacle to attract wealthy residents. The working-class history of the site has been almost totally removed and its industrial history is ignored, as the moniker 'Malmö's Grand Canyon' suggests. No members of the working class live there, as housing costs in today's Limhamn are too expensive for working-class incomes. Sandberg uses the concept of 'environmental gentrification' to draw attention to this process, and the types of flora and fauna that attract the middle class. He and others have argued that ecologists should work against gentrification by creating spaces that are 'just green enough' to improve neighbourhoods for existing residents without attracting gentrifiers (ibid.; see also Wolch et al. 2014).

Industrial heritage is a part of physical processes of gentrification in the neoliberalizing post-industrial city. Materially, industrial heritage gentrification is about privatizing and selling post-industrial spaces and redesigning the built environment and nature to transform former sites of production into venues for consumption. Together with these material and physical processes come ideological 'redevelopment', the bordering and restructuring of history to create representations and interpretations of industry that attract middle- and upper-middle-class visitors, tourists and residents. Many scholars have critiqued industrial heritage sites as 'sanitizing history' (Berger et al. 2017: 42–43) and engaging in 'wilful amnesia' about class (de Bary 2004; see also High and Lewis 2007; Högberg 2011; Stanton 2006). What their analyses have not adequately demonstrated is how such figurative processes, through which key aspects of working-class history, environmental contamination and state policies are displaced from heritage narratives and experiences, are necessary bolsters to physical and material gentrification. The physical and material gentrification of former industrial areas are legitimated and supported by narrative bordering, ideologically

restructuring the past to displace workers and appeal to 'gentry' such as tourists and new middle-class residents.

Concluding Remarks

From the perspective of most urban officials and residents, the detritus of defunct former industries must be managed. Many regard turning former industrial sites into tourist attractions or heritage-enhanced nodes of new entrepreneurship as positive processes. Redevelopers clean up, re-outfit and repurpose former factory buildings for new uses, including commercial sales, artistic practices, business and tourism. Heritage professionals clean up, rearticulate and represent the histories of former industries, hoping to appeal to visitors and potential buyers or renters. Industry becomes clean, chic, amusing, a novelty to these new gentry, if it is redeveloped. Absent redevelopment, post-industrial settings are an eyesore, a waste, a symbol of decline and failure to grow.

Heritage gentrification as a concept has the advantage of fore-grounding the class dimensions of this process, the uneven and unequal consequences of urban restructuring for the working class and the middle and upper classes. It shows the relationship between material and ideological processes that undergird the production of industrial heritage. Yet like the other concepts discussed in this chapter, it has its limita-tions. Among the potential problems of industrial heritage gentrification as an analytic tool is whether middle-class people recognize or associate themselves with the category 'gentry' (see also Brown-Saracino 2009). Another is the sentiment associated with gentrification; to some audiences, even including audiences of former workers, gentrification sounds like a positive development, an improvement of 'blight' and promise of a more hopeful future rather than a way to border, exclude and disenfranchise the working class.

Heritage, the editors of this volume have suggested, is a technology of redevelopment in the neoliberal city. Bordering is key to urban re-structuring, and heritage plays a role in this bordering. Heritage may be a technology of neoliberal bordering along many vectors, including race, ethnicity and gender. When it comes to industrial heritage in the post-industrial city, however, class is always part of the material and ideological bordering that transforms dead industry into living heritage. While it may have flaws, gentrification as an analytic frame for understanding industrial heritage in the neoliberal city forces us to recognize these class dynamics at work.

Maris Boyd Gillette is a socio-cultural anthropologist and cultural historian who researches economic practices, social identities and material culture, primarily in modern China, but also the US, UK and Sweden. She participates regularly in collaborative action research with community institutions, including museums, media centres and municipal offices. Her current research includes a project on mining tourism in China and a project on coastal fisheries in Sweden. She is Professor of Social Anthropology, School of Global Studies, the University of Gothenburg, Sweden.

References

Atkinson, R. and G. Bridge. 2010 [2004]. 'Globalisation and the New Urban Colonialism', in J. Brown-Saracino (ed.), *The Gentrification Debates*. New York: Routledge, pp. 51–61.

Berger, S., C. Wicke and J. Golombek. 2017. 'Burdens of Eternity? Heritage, Identity and the "Great Transition" in the Ruhr', *The Public Historian* 39(4): 21–43. doi: 10.1525/tph.2017.39.4.21.

Brown-Saracino, J. 2009. *A Neighborhood That Never Changes: Gentrification, Social Preservation, and the Search for Authenticity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cameron, C. 2000. 'Emergent Industrial Heritage: The Politics of Selection', *Museum Anthropology* 23(3): 58–73. doi: 10.1525/mua.2000.23.3.58.

Chen J., B. Judd and S. Hawken. 2016. 'Adaptive Reuse of Industrial Heritage for Cultural Purposes in Beijing, Shanghai and Chongqing', *Structural Survey* 3 (4/5): 331–50. doi: 10.1108/SS-11-2015-0052.

Coupland, B. and N. Coupland. 2014. 'The Authenticating Discourses of Mining Heritage Tourism in Cornwall and Wales', *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 18(4): 495–517. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12081.

de Bary, O. 2004 'Deindustrialization and Museumification: from Exhibited Memory to Forgotten History', *Annals of the American Academy* 595 (September 2004): 122–33. doi: 10.1177/0002716204266630.

DeSilvey, C. and T. Edensor. 2012. 'Reckoning with Ruins', *Progress in Human Geography* 37(4): 465–85. doi:10.1177/0309132512462271.

Dicks, B. 2000. *Heritage, Place and Community*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Edensor, T. 2005. *Industrial Ruins: Aesthetics, Materiality and Memory*. Oxford: Berg.

Gillette, M.B. 2017. 'Deindustrialisation and Heritage in Three Crockery Capitals', in Anne Helen Mydland and Neil Brownsword (eds), *Topographies of the Obsolete: Ashmolean Papers*. Crewe: The Printing House Ltd, pp 20–49.

Glass, R. 1964. *London: Aspects of Change*. London: Centre for Urban Studies.

Goffman, E. 1956. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Social Sciences Research Centre.

Goodall, B. 1993. 'Industrial Heritage and Tourism', *Built Environment* 19(2): 92–104.

Hee L., T. Schroepfer, N. Su and Z. Li. 2008. 'From Post-Industrial Landscape to Creative Precincts: Emergent Spaces in Chinese Cities', *International Development Planning Review* 30(3): 249–66. doi:10.3828/idpr.30.3.4.

High, S. and D. Lewis. 2007. *Corporate Wastelands: The Landscape and Memory of Deindustrialization.* Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

Högberg, A. 2011. 'The Process of Transformation of Industrial Heritage: Strengths and Weaknesses', *Museum International* 63(1–2): 34–42. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0033.2012.01761.x.

Kesküla, E. 2013. 'Reproducing Labor in the Estonian Industrial Heritage Museum', *Journal of Baltic Studies* 44(2): 229–48. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/01629778.2013.775852.

Mah, A. 2012. *Industrial Ruination, Community, and Place: Landscapes and Legacies of Urban Decline.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Oakley, P. 2015. 'A Permanent State of Decay: Contrived Dereliction at Heritage Mining Sites', in H. Orange (ed.), *Reanimating Industrial Spaces: Conducting Memory Work in Post-Industrial Societies*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, pp. 49–71.

Pashkevich A. 2017. 'Processes of Reinterpretation of Mining Heritage: The Case of Bergslagen, Sweden', *Almatourism* 7 (2017): 107–23. doi: 10.6092/issn.2036-5195/6758.

Pendlebury, J., Y.-W. Wang and A. Law. 2018. 'Re-Using "Uncomfortable Heritage": The Case of the 1933 Building, Shanghai', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 24(3): 211–29. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2017.1362580.

Petursdottir, P. 2012. 'Concrete Matters: Ruins of Modernity and the Things Called Heritage', *Journal of Social Archaeology* 13(1): 31–53. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1469605312456342.

Qviström, M. 2018. 'Farming Ruins: A Landscape Study of Incremental Urbanization', *Landscape Research* 43(5): 575–86. doi: 10.1080/01426397.2017.1353959.

Sandberg, L. 2014. 'Environmental Gentrification in a Post-Industrial Landscape: The Case of the Limhamn Quarry, Malmö, Sweden', *Local Environment* 19(10): 1068–85. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2013.843510.

Shackel, P. and M. Palus. 2006. 'Remembering an Industrial Landscape', *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 10(1): 49–71. doi:10.1007/S10761-006-0004-4.

Smith, N. 2002. 'New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy', *Antipode* 34(3): 427–50. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8330.00249.

Stanton, C. 2006. *The Lowell Experiment: Public History in a Post-Industrial City*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Storm, A. 2014. *Post-industrial Landscape Scars.* Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Turner, V. 1982. *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play*. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.

Van Weesep, J. 1994. 'Gentrification as a Research Frontier', *Progress in Human Geography* 18(1): 74–83. doi: 10.1177/030913259401800107.

Walker, D. 2012. 'Towards a Beneficial World Heritage: Community Involvement in the Blaenavon Industrial Landscape', *Museum International* 63(1–2): 25–33. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0033.2012.01760.x.

Wallace, M. 1987. 'Industrial Museums and the History of Deindustrialization', *The Public Historia*n 9(1): 9–19. doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/3377102.

Weber, Heike. 2019. 'Twentieth-Century Wastescapes: Cities, Consumers, and Their Dumping Grounds', in T. Soens et al. (eds), *Urbanizing Nature: Actors and Agency (Dis)Connecting Cities and Nature since 1500*. London: Routledge, Chapter 12.

Wolch, J., J. Byrne and J. Newell. 2014. 'Urban Green Space, Public Health, and Environmental Justice: The Challenge of Making Cities "Just Green Enough"', *Landscape and Urban Planning* 125 (2014): 234–44. doi: 10.1016/j.landurbplan. 2014.01.017.

Xie, P. 2015. *Industrial Heritage Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Yung, E., E. Chan and Y. Xu. 2014. 'Sustainable Development and the Rehabilitation of a Historic Urban District: Social Sustainability in the Case of Tianzifang in Shanghai', *Sustainable Development* 22: 95–112. doi: 10.1002/sd.534.