



# Kept-Behind and Leapt-Ahead Places

*Addressing the impacts of unequal and uneven outcomes and responses to deindustrialization on space and community through industrial strategy and universal basic infrastructure*

**Jacob Miller**

**Jacob Miller**

**Candidate Number: CJPY9**

**Kept-Behind and Leapt-Ahead Places**

*Addressing the impacts of unequal and uneven outcomes and responses to deindustrialization on space and community through industrial strategy and universal basic infrastructure*

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the MSc Building and Urban Design in Development

10,227 words

MSc Building and Urban Design in Development

Supervisor: Dr. Naji P. Makarem

Development Planning Unit, University College London

17 August 2019

Cover Photo: Seattle, WA taken by Jacob Miller

Jacob Miller

**Kept-Behind and Leapt-Ahead Places**

*Addressing the impacts of unequal and uneven outcomes and responses to deindustrialization on space and community through industrial strategy and universal basic infrastructure*

# Acknowledgements

---

**This work represents years of work, inquiry and thought. I want to first thank New Bedford, Massachusetts for unlocking my passion to positively change communities, as well as my family, friends and mentors in New Bedford and beyond for giving me the energy and passion to continue this work. Next, I'd like to thank my supervisor Dr. Naji Makarem, the whole Building and Urban Design in Development team, the amazing BUDDies I made, and the Development Planning Unit generally for providing me the platform and giving me guidance to rigorously and critically pursue my passion project. This paper is greatly influenced by Dr. Diane Coyle, whose clear and articulate vision of the future has inspired me, and the research from others like Dr. Mike Kenny coming out of the Bennett Institute for Public Policy at the University of Cambridge. I'd like to thank Francesca Froy, who taught me spatial syntax on the ground in Manchester and allowed me to assist in her PhD research on industrial structures. Finally, I'd like to thank Dr. Alan Jagolinzer for pushing me to take the risk and backpack around the U.S., State Senator Mark Montigny, some of the best educational institutions Greater New Bedford Regional Vocational Technical High School, the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth, the University of Cambridge and University College London for giving me the tools to be an engaged world citizen, and the Marshall Aid Commemoration Commission and the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation for providing me access to numerous channels of talent and treasure.**

**Hundreds of people and influences are represented in these pages, as this has become a life project. It is ultimately dedicated to my late Nana, Trudi Miller, who taught me empathy, openness, laughter and some of life's golden rules, like "if you don't ask-- the answer is always no."**

# Kept-Behind and Leapt-Ahead Places

JACOB MILLER

## Contents

INTRODUCTION	8
ECONOMIC DEINDUSTRIALIZATION	10
CAUSES OF DEINDUSTRIALIZATION	12
THE SHARP EDGE BETWEEN LABOR AND MANAGEMENT	
ECONOMIC DIVERGENCE: FROM POST-INDUSTRIAL TO KEPT-BEHIND	16
BRAIN DRAIN	
DIVERSIFICATION: ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CAPITAL	
SCARS: PHYSICAL MANIFESTATIONS OF LOW VALUE CHAIN WORK	
CURRENT STATE OF KEPT-BEHIND PLACES	18
URBAN TRAUMA, STORYTELLING AND MEMORY	
RISE OF THE ENTREPRENEURIAL CITY	
THE COMPANY TOWN STRIKES BACK	
CASE STUDY: SEATTLE, WASHINGTON; DETROIT, MICHIGAN; CINCINNATI, OHIO; NEW BEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS	
MOVING BEYOND KEPT-BEHIND	22
POLITICS OF CANDOR AND CARE: POST-TRAUMATIC PLANNING	
INDUSTRIAL STRATEGY BUILT ON A FOUNDATION OF UNIVERSAL BASIC INFRASTRUCTURE	
CONCLUSION: A NEW VISION FOR 'KEPT-BEHIND' PLACES	26
BIBLIOGRAPHY	28



# Abstract

Spatial inequity is marked by a polarity: some places are kept-behind, some places have leapt-ahead and few places sit in-between. The implications of this reality touches on nearly every present human institution and experience. This paper seeks to explore this polarity through the lens of unequal and uneven outcomes and responses to deindustrialization weaving together case studies from the United States of America (U.S.) and United Kingdom (U.K). Using this as a starting point, this paper will explore the elements of a kept-behind place and the current state of these places through an ethnographic exploration of the Amazon second headquarters (HQ2) selection process. The Amazon HQ2 site selection competition serves as a foil to the ultimate aim of this paper, which is to conclude with a proposal for a bottom-up led and top-down supported industrial strategy with universal basic infrastructure as its foundation. This paper will also engage with topics including the future of work, memory and trauma, economic narrative and therapeutic planning practices. Each topic and analysis is aimed towards an urban vision that provides access to a healthy environment, fulfilling work and generalized well-being marked by access to relevant resources and social connectedness.

# Introduction

*All the world's a stage,*

*And all the men and women merely players;*

*They have their exits and their entrances;*

*And one man in his time plays many parts*

*--Shakespeare, As You Like It, Act II, Scene VII [All the world's a stage]*

A factory closes. Shops, schools and other institutions close. Generations that relied on the factory floor as their career and livelihood scatter to find other opportunities. Many leave the community and those that stay are forced to reconcile with an unknown future, while being haunted by the shadows of their once prosperous past and a widening skills gap between those who stay and leave creating a 'brain drain' that can become difficult to reverse (Glaeser and Hausman 2019, pg. 15). The stories of these post-industrial places often focus on people leaving, along with a fascination of the ruination and attempted reinvention process. This moment of 'peripeteia,' which is described by Aristotle to be a dramatic turning point -- a point in the narrative fate is dramatically altered (Storr 2019, pg. 19), is where this paper begins and eventually seeks to propose potential solutions. The ultimate goal of the paper is to build a vision of cities that enable people to access a healthy environment, fulfilling work and generalized well-being marked by access to relevant resources and social connectedness. It is critical to note that deindustrialization is not a homogeneous experience. Many places deindustrialize and are not considered 'kept-behind. This dynamic will be explored further in the sections below.

The quick changes that accompany the crumbling industrial base take years, and sometimes decades, to recover from. The effects of the deindustrialized economy manifest on the urban stage and can transform it into the 'kept-behind' place. In Shakespeare's *As You Like It*, it is proclaimed that, "All the world's a stage... and one man in his time plays many parts." The city is both a stage and a player; it acts and is acted upon. As the "post-industrial" economy shapes the city, as both the actor and the stage, it is critical to examine the many parts it plays and the future of its urban character. It is critical to note that this paper does not propose simply reopening or reshoring factories or that deindustrialization is wholly negative, rather it critically assesses its unequal and uneven outcomes and responses on spaces and communities.

This paper seeks to move the academic and political discussion away from naming these places 'post-industrial' and 'left-behind,' as these terms are implicitly passive. Both build a narrative of reality that the state of these places is due to some outside uncontrollable forces. This paper will push beyond these distinctions and argue that these places are 'kept-behind.' Policies, ideologies and intentional forces are at play to create divergences. It is argued that, "The urban forms of the future, like those of the past, will continue to be the product of deliberate decisions, and not the random outcomes of impersonal forces" (Mumford 2018). Lefebvre, also argues, "space reveals its true nature as a political space, the site and object of various strategies" (2003, pg. 44). This paper acknowledges and seeks to unpack these deliberate forces with caution and respect, as these issues are multifaceted and multi-



scalar. Lefebvre's use of the term 'space' is useful, yet this paper departs from an understanding of space as area to be moved through and place as an area to dwell (Sennett 2018). 'Kept-behind' places are not a stop on the road to somewhere better, but share the complexity of dwelling associated with any human place. Acknowledging the deliberate decisions that make a kept-behind place will open opportunities to provide dwelling with well-being, thus challenging Carnegie's (1889, pg. 3) assertion that, "We accept and welcome, therefore, as conditions to which we must accommodate ourselves, great inequality of environment, the concentration of business, industrial and commercial, in the hands of a few, and the law of competition between these, as being not only beneficial, but essential for the future progress of the race." This way of thinking leads to a winner-take-all mentality, where progress for some is at the detriment of others.

This paper explores three main questions: What are the causes of deindustrialization and how does it lead to becoming a 'kept-behind' place? What is the current state of 'kept-behind' places? What can policymakers and those working on urban challenges do to change the trajectory of 'kept-behind' places? The ultimate aim of this paper is to provide a proposal for a bottom-up led and top-down supported industrial strategy with universal basic infrastructure (Coyle 2017) as its foundation. This strategy should build toward a vision of cities that enable people to access a healthy environment, fulfilling work and generalized well-being marked by access to relevant resources and social connectedness.

Case studies and interviews from the United Kingdom (UK) and the United States of America (USA) are woven throughout. Both the UK and the USA have acutely felt the effects of the post-industrial economy, yet have taken divergent paths in addressing its implications. The UK and the USA have been chosen due to their economic ideological similarities. Both the UK and the USA, are "liberal market economies... that coordinate their activities mainly through the institutions of the markets and hierarchies, and they tend to invest in "switchable assets" (allowing rapid entry and exit)" (Wade 2014, pg. 384). The market, in most cases, takes precedence over the government. This paper does not seek to further examine the differences, rather it interweaves similarities and potential lessons.

# Economic Deindustrialization

*What are the causes of deindustrialization and how does it lead to becoming a 'kept-behind' place?*

An industrialized economy, for this paper, is based on a reliance on the manufacturing sector for national employment and productive output. The trend of deindustrialization is marked by the movement of “mass production in large factories,” from “high value locations in inner cities to lower value land on the edge of cities, in other parts of the country, or in emerging economies; in short where both land and labour are cheaper” (Ferm and Jones 2017, pg. 3383). Essentially, cities offer proximity at high cost, which does not bode well for messy, land-intensive industrial activity (Glaeser and Hausman 2019, pg. 17). This movement occurs for a variety of reasons that will be explored further in later sections. Critical for this section is this shift from a predominantly manufacturing based economy to a service economy.

It is important to note that services and industrial economies are not mutually exclusive, nor is the rise of one meant to imply the fall of the other. Even with this in mind, it is argued that one of the best measures of deindustrialization is the change in manufacturing employment (Kollmeyer 2009, pg. 1646). Data shows that in the United States, jobs in the manufacturing sector peaked at 28% of the workforce in 1965 and fell to just over 12% in 2005 (pg. 1645). This process of deindustrialization is considered to be “one of the most far-reaching socioeconomic transformations of the late 20th century” (pg. 1645).

Many have argued that, “cities that experience “deindustrialization” often experience overall decline, distress, and increased poverty” (Bluestone 2014, pg. 1). I argue that the experience of deindustrialization varies greatly. Not every city that goes through a deindustrialization process is considered to be “post-industrial” or have an experience that absolutely mirrors the one outlined above. For example, London’s employment base was over 33% manufacturing in 1951 compared to today’s 3% (Hall 1962, pg 23; Rhodes 2018, pg. 10). These statistics may hide other dynamics, like how manufacturing is categorized and defined, thus should exclusively be viewed as an indicator of change.

This quick drop in manufacturing employment was filled in by a strong service sector buoying the city’s overall economic prosperity and placing it among the world’s top cities for productivity and value (Ferm and Jones 2017, pg. 3381). London’s rise in jobs in the financial and business services and creative industries has cushioned its fall into the post-industrial economy, but it is argued that “the notion of the post-industrial is misleading, suggesting a split from the past that does not adequately acknowledge the role of global cities such as London or New York in the global production, the interconnectedness of economies or the dependence of the financial business services sector on various industrial activities to thrive and function” (Ferm and Jones 2017, pg. 3381). Interconnectedness will be further explored. Urban value chains are difficult to track and treat in isolation. A value chain view of the urban economy is often analyzed through the lens of the resource based theory, that implies that every organization is a bundle of resources, “that are valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable and imperfectly substitutable” (Bowman and Ambrosini 2000, pg. 1). Departing from this point of view urban economies and their complexity can be assessed based on where their activities sit on value chains. For example, industrial Manchester in 1943 mostly specialized on lower-level value chain work. The majority of mills were specialized on cotton spinning or dying with very few producing finished products (Froy 2020).

The case of London’s experience of deindustrialization sheds light on the complexity of change in the transition from an industrial to a post-industrial economy. I begin with London to illustrate the distinction, that may appear

purely rhetorical at first glance, between a post-industrial city and a kept-behind place. London is a global city, which Sassen describes as a global city where, “a multiplicity of globalization processes assume concrete, localized forms” (2005, pg. 40). It has maintained economic preeminence despite economic changes mostly due to where its activities lie on the value chain. “It is notable that manufacturing industries which represent earlier links in the productive process are less important in London than those representing later links. Thus London is deficient in textiles, not in clothing; in woodworking, not in furniture; in paper production, not in stationery or printing. This pattern is characteristic of a major market centre” (Hall 1962, pg. 27). Unlike places that have been ‘kept-behind’, London has not relied on the lowest level of value creation allowing it to build an environment of innovation, though it is critical to note that like every place London does have elements of the ‘kept-behind’ and is not the Emerald City.

London has found success based on Jane Jacobs’ (1969, pg. 55) assertion that, “The point is that new goods or services, whether criminal or benign, do not come out of thin air. New work arises out of existing work; it requires parent work?” Cities, like New Bedford and Fall River USA and Rochdale UK, have not fared as well. They have had trouble creating new work. I argue the challenge is due to these locations focusing on low level value chain activities. Other potential causes of this could be the lack of a diversified economy at the outset or the lack of human capital to fill the needs of a high knowledge economy. All of these dynamics will be explored further. Discourse in these communities tend to focus on past success, or as Foucault describes, “There is in this hatred of the present or the immediate past a dangerous tendency to invoke a completely mythical past” (1991, pg. 248). The causes of deindustrialization will be explored in the next section before exploring the economic divergence between global cities and kept-behind places.

# Causes of Deindustrialization

Deindustrialization has numerous interlocking causes. It cannot be explained simply. I argue that there are three main drivers of economic deindustrialization in the U.S. and U.K. economies: ideology, firm decision making and labor-saving technological changes. These factors are not exhaustive, yet acts as an entry point into this complex phenomena. The case of deindustrialization, domestic downsizing and offshoring is clearly outlined by Peter Lazonick (2014, pg. 5), in “Profits Without Prosperity,” where he argues:

*Since the beginning of the 1980s there have been three broad reasons for downsizing, which I summarize as “rationalization”, “marketization”, and “globalization.” From the early 1980s, rationalization, characterized by permanent plant closings, eliminated the jobs of unionized blue-collar workers. From the early 1990s, marketization, characterized by the end of a career with one company as an employment norm that had prevailed at major U.S. corporations through the 1980s, placed the job security of middle-aged and older white-collar workers in jeopardy. From the early 2000s, globalization, characterized by the massive movement of employment offshore, left all members of the U.S. labor force, even those with advanced educational credentials and substantial work experience, vulnerable to displacement.*

These periods have issues. Many of these movements began before the 1980s. Though, these periods do capture the crystallization of the neo-liberal institutional project, “Institutions provide the incentive structure of an economy; as that structure evolves, it shapes the direction of economic change towards growth, stagnation, or decline” (North 1991, pg. 97). It is important to note that there is a discourse within the deindustrialization literature that the phenomenon is a myth. Robert Lawrence, a scholar affiliated with the Brookings Institute in the 1980s, concludes that “deindustrialization is simply a myth” (quoted in Bluestone 1984, pg. 41). The below section will explore the ideological and decisions that underpin the deindustrialization process.

## *The Sharp Edge between Labor and Management: Ideology, Firm Decision Making and Technology*

It is no secret that conservatives have nearly won the war of ideas over the past three decades and have completely reshaped institutions. This section will move from the effects of this paradigm on the individuals, ideologies, firms and their business models, technologies and spaces. Advanced economies have experienced years of absolute growth with rising GDP, yet this statistic does not provide a holistic picture of economic health or prosperity (Coyle 2015). North (1991, pg. 98) argues, “Economic history is overwhelmingly a story of economies that failed to produce a set of economic rules of the game (with enforcement) that induce sustained economic growth.” The current rules of the game have set places on paths that either keep them behind or leap them ahead.

Right leaning think tanks, academic institutions and private businesses have infiltrated governments and perpetuate a message of market over government. This message has stuck. According to Farrant and McPhail (2010; cited in Wade 2014, pg. 382), “In 2010 Friedrich von Hayek’s polemic, *The Road to Serfdom*, was ranked at number 241 on the Amazon Best Sellers list-- remarkable for a book published as long ago as 1944.” Early thinkers and proponents of market over government thinking include scholars like Adam Smith, who argued in *The Wealth of Nations*, “It is the maxim of every prudent master of a family, never to attempt to make at home what it will cost him more to make than to buy...What is prudence in the conduct of every private family, can scarce be folly in that of a great kingdom” (1776, pg. 22). Market think, in its current form, is powerful. This strong message permeates throughout all aspects of life, including to the individual, there is a strong sense that if people “boot-strap” or work

harder they can change their outcome. The myth of upward mobility has been deeply explored by numerous scholars and journalists. In the article “The 9.9 Percent Is the New American Aristocracy” (2018), Stewart argues that the myth our system is based on is false:

*everyone has an opportunity to make the leap: Mobility justifies inequality. As a matter of principle, this isn't true. In the United States, it also turns out not to be true as a factual matter. Contrary to popular myth, economic mobility in the land of opportunity is not high, and it's going down.*

This is by no mistake. Myths are critical to building effective societies and successful myths are “made for imagination to breath life into them” (Camus 1975, pg. 87). The movement between a myth and an ideology is not far. Lefebvre (1970, pg. 103) articulates the blurred line between myth and ideology. He argues that myth is a “non-institutional discourse (not subject to the constraints of laws and institutions), whose elements are taken from the context. Ideology would consist in an institutional discourse justifying and legitimizing (or criticizing, refusing, and refuting) existing institutions but unfolding through them” (1970, pg. 105). Economists like Milton Friedman saw public opinion and ideology as a way to dramatically change social and urban fabrics. He argues that shareholder value is, “fundamentally subversive doctrine in a free society. There is one and only one social responsibility of business—to use its resources and engage in activities designed to increase its profits so long as it stays within the rules of the game, which is to say, engages in open and free competition without deception or fraud” (Friedman 1970).

This ideological perspective was quickly adopted by business leaders. For example, Jack Welch the CEO of General Electric said, “Ideally, you'd have every plant you own on a barge to move with currencies and changes in the economy” (The Economist, 2013). Welch, after retiring as General Electric's CEO, redacted his statements explaining, “On the face of it, shareholder value is the dumbest idea in the world. Shareholder value is a result not a strategy... your main constituents are your employees, your customers, and your products” (Sherman 2017, pg. 55). The ideological perspective built a business model and labor process with Taylorist foundations which “sought to break tasks down into smaller deskilled pieces and to reorganize them in the most efficient way; and workers were gathered together in large numbers in single factories” (Srnicek 2017, pg. 9). The emergence of other producers like Germany, Japan and eventually China in the Post-World War II period led to a competitive price squeeze. This squeeze precipitated the fall of U.S. manufacturing, the offshoring process, and the institutional abandonment of unions and organized labor (Srnicek 2017).

This ideological framework and corresponding business model opens up the crack for change. Firms, now emboldened to take advantage of low cost land and labor, begin to offshore their operations and escape public scrutiny through a communication strategy, while residents of these former factory towns are forced to, “maneuver around the crumbling, rusty relics of industrialism much like the way today's Greeks and Italians maneuver around the roped-off ruins of Ancient Athens and Rome. They simultaneously taunt inhabitants with memories of better days, and render false hope that they are one big break from returning to glory” (Gest 2011, pg. 11). It is unfair and irresponsible to rest the responsibility directly on firms they “owe their existence to the opportunities provided by the institutional framework” (North 1991, pg. 109). There is a complex political economy at work producing what some have called a fourth industrial revolution (Srnicek 2017; Ojanpera, O'Clery and Graham 2018).

In the flux of this dynamic change, firms became proficient at finding ways to reduce costs and boost profitability, as “it rapidly became apparent that the stock of indigenously-funded, locally managed older industries were not able to compete in the changing global patterns of production” (Lever 1991, pg. 990). Richard Baldwin and Javier Lopez- Gonzalez argue that, “the revolution started when supply chain trade gained importance between

high-tech and low wage nations between 1985 and 1995” (2013, pg. 2). Although, it should be noted that this view is contested. Rowthorn and Ramaswamy articulate that, “Trade between low-skill and cost locations and high-skill and cost locations has relatively little effect on the pace of deindustrialization” (1999, pg. 34). These firm decisions, supported and promoted by government actors and thinkers broadly, directly affect the urban stage. Offshoring initiated the creation of our current model of globalization.

Firms are able to seamlessly search and locate in places with the lowest cost and employ technology that allows for further cost savings. There has always been a sharp edge between labor, capital and management. In 19th century industrializing Britain, the Luddites emerged as a powerful social movement inspired by the labor actions of Edward Ludd, who took his hammer to a new machine on the factory floor. Ludd is considered to be an unremarkable person, yet acted as a symbol for working class people throughout Britain. The Luddite movement took on many forms, but it mainly “sought to put an end to the manufacturers’ use of certain types of machinery. More precisely, the Luddites “opposed the use of machines whose purpose was to reduce production costs, whether the cost reductions were achieved by decreasing wages or the number of hours worked” (Binfield 2015, pg. 3). Seeking out technology is a staple of capitalism. It allows firms to “cut costs, beat out competitors, control workers, reduce turnover time, and gain market share” all of which create the incentive to “continually transform the labor process” (Srnicek 2017, pg. 8). While there is not a burgeoning modern Luddite movement, many people fear the rise of automation and new forms of labor saving technology.

The fear of automation and other new forms of labor saving technology is underpinned by a labor market that is greatly changing along with considerable variation in forecasts for the future of work. One thing is certain, human capital is highly important, illustrated in the increasing percentage of jobs that require non-routine cognitive and socio-emotional skills increasing from 33 to 41% in advanced economies from 2005 to 2015. This increase accompanies a dramatic fall of share of employment requiring routine skills from 42 to 32% in advanced economies (Ojanpera, O’Clery and Graham 2018, pg. 4). While there has been considerable focus on automations effect on potential joblessness, its future development will more likely create and exacerbate international and intranational spatial inequalities (Ojanpera, O’Clery and Graham 2018, pg. 6).

Joblessness and technological advances exist in dramatically different spaces. Following Jane Jacobs logic of new work requiring parent work (1969, pg. 55), current technology hubs will only grow and places with persistent joblessness and low human capital will only be kept-further behind. In 2017, 3.6% of Americans moved between counties or state lines (Bughin, Manyika and Woetzel 2019, pg. 5). The trailblazing, high economic value cities are locking people in and locking people out with cities becoming and staying younger. This transforms the previous dynamic of cities being places for early careers to transition out of towards suburban family life. As the population of young people and those that choose to age there grows and stabilizes, so does the amenities and costs associated with the place (Ely 2019). Many scholars agree that automation will boost job creation and forecast positive job growth for the U.S. as a whole through 2030, yet agree that the pace of job growth in places that are currently behind will only decline (Bughin, Manyika and Woetzel 2019, pg. 1).

This dynamic plays out through policies which shape inevitably shape space. ‘Cluster’ policies are based on the notion of agglomeration economies, the idea that firms will be more successful if close to each other, with benefits including reduced transport costs (Glaser 2010, pg. 1) but also the ability to exchange know-how, an important aspect in an increasingly knowledge-based and technology-intensive economy. This is exemplified in the ever-growing costs, yet desire to based firms in Silicon Valley California. In the early days of Silicon Valley, “the tech start-ups were small and... the aspiring geniuses spent a lot of time with people in other firms, looking at what the competi-

tion was doing, occasionally cooperating and conspiring. Start-up failures spurred the need to look around and outside. Then, as now, the rates of failure were high; only about 7 percent of start-ups last for more than two years in America” (Best 2018, pg. 149). Firms can, essentially, be owned and operated out of a garage, but the people that make up those firms prefer and innovate in tight nit environments. Enrico Moretti argues, “technology and innovation today are not locationally neutral, but are drawn to hubs that offer an entire supportive ecosystem” (cited in Mallach 2016, pg. 21). Each of the above three dynamics and symptoms are entry points into a sprawling discussion around deindustrialization. They do not represent a conclusive study of deindustrialization and its causes and do not necessarily reflect some of the positive aspects of deindustrialization, which include environmental restoration. The next section will explore the reasons for economic divergence that turns a place from post-industrial to kept-behind.

# Economic Divergence

Cities in the United States and the United Kingdom are on dramatically different paths. As mentioned in an earlier section, London, as an extreme case, has been able to transition from a post-industrial economy into the knowledge economy relatively seamlessly. Cities like Liverpool U.K., while experiencing recent regeneration credited to arts and culture, have had more transitional obstacles from its industrial past (Mallach 2016). During the 1980s, urban unrest in Liverpool led policymakers in London to consider abandoning the city all together. Internal documents from the Thatcher cabinet posed the question against government investing, “Isn’t this pumping water uphill? Should we go rather for ‘managed decline’?” (Travis 2011). While the policy of managed decline was not fully implemented its ideological implications are illuminative. The economy of today is responding to the opportunities of yesterday and the trailing and kept-behind cities will only fall further behind if there is no swift intervention. This section seeks to answer the question: what constitutes a kept-behind place? I argue the answer lies in brain drain, economic and social capital diversification and physical scars.

## *Brain Drain: Labor Force*

The shadows of deindustrialization are hard to shake. As illustrated, some places are able to shed them more quickly than others. Bluestone (1984, pg. 51) argues, “The significance of deindustrialization can therefore be evaluated only in terms of how rapidly and how successfully workers dislocated from so-called sunset industries are reemployed in growing, sunrise industries.” Billy Joel’s (1982) song “Allentown” tells the story of the effect of factory closures and a constant refrain throughout is “it’s getting very hard to stay.” It’s often easier to move a brain than to train one. This transition is a difficult one to make for labor forces that rely on routine manufacturing tasks causing those that are able to leave to go and reinforcing labor force challenges.

There have been pockets of effort responding to this challenge. Amazon, which is the focus of later case studies, in July of 2019, announced a company wide effort to retrain 100,000 workers by 2025. Upskilling warehouse and technology employees is seen as a strategic move by the company to begin addressing a tightening labor market. It is considered to be an experimental approach in an environment where government programs to turn coal miners into coders have been nominally successful (Casselman and Satariano 2019). Even with interest in labor market transformation growing, “the central point is that innovation occurs in places that are far from American’s most troubled local economies” (Glaeser and Hausman 2019, pg. 6). Rebecca Tunstall remarked, at a 2019 Place-Based Industrial Strategy Workshop hosted at the University of Cambridge, “Existing places don’t change in the short and medium term-- change is extremely modest in places with highest unemployment and are those least likely to change.” The place-based resistance to economic change could be caused by numerous path-dependent factors, which is supported by “a wealth of literature documents that entrepreneurs are disproportionately educated, are more likely to start firms in more educated places, and are more successful the more educated they and their local areas are” (Glaeser and Hausman 2019, pg. 9). The next section analyzes the divergences caused by differences in economic and social capital.

## *Diversification: Economic and Social Capital*

A major cause of divergence is the local economic diversification. For example, in the comparative case of Allentown and Youngstown USA, two once prosperous steel cities, Allentown has seen economic resurgence due to early action towards diversification. Policymakers in the city saw the importance of expanding the city’s industrial



base. One of the investors in a new Allentown industrial park, Frank Marcon made a causal link between diversification and success, stating that it was “imperative that we go out for the greater diversification of our industry” (Stainbrook and Beste 2002; cited in Safford 2004, pg. 17). The opposite approach was taken in Youngstown. This dynamic was played out numerous times at key historical moments. Most emblematic was the final steel factory closures in 1977, where the responses differed greatly, “In Youngstown, it was characterized by extreme fragmentation, infighting, and ultimately inaction. In Allentown, a relatively unified coalition emerged and was able to take a number of key actions” (Safford 2004, pg. 17). Becoming a company town and relying on a single industry creates tremendous amounts of economic precarity. Economic history is rife with examples from Detroit, Michigan to Grimsby, United Kingdom there are places that relied heavily on one industry to only see them close and completely transform their landscape.

Civic society, thus social capital, is critical in understanding and used as a lever to reverse divergences. It is important to note the case of divergence in post-industrial outcomes of Allentown and Youngstown is not quantity of social capital it’s the way it’s deployed. Safford argues (2004, pg. 28) that a successful civic society is based on “particular organizations must connect actors who are not otherwise well connected in order to serve as a focus of civic engagement.” The importance of productive civic discourses has been credited for other urban revitalizations. Redevelopment in Buffalo, New York USA is credited to “an alignment of civic discourses, official planning, major policies and programs, a fine-grain of do-it-yourself civic and business action... Civic discourse led the way, setting the agenda for planning, policy, program and action” (Mallach et. al 2016, pg. 36). Diversity breeds life. The next section analyzes the physical manifestations of deindustrialization and low value chain work.

#### *Scars: Physical Manifestations of Low Value Chain Work*

Kept-behind places are physically scarred by their past. New Bedford, Massachusetts, a former whaling and textiles city, is designated a superfund site by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency due to dangerous chemicals in the harbor and surrounding drinking water sources. This pollution is a remnant of the past industrial activity and the corporations who polluted, now mostly out-of-business, are not participating in the decades long and disruptive clean-up (Nelson and Bergen 2012). This pollution along with the closed and decaying built-for-purpose factory buildings have been marked the city’s economic future. Rational profit-seeking companies searching for new locations for business are less likely to move to a place with environmental and real estate challenges. Leading New Bedford to begin exploring the expansion of a ‘sludge’ recycling facility as an economic development opportunity (Dunlop 2019). This dynamic is at play in communities across the U.S. and the U.K., in “Mapping Environmental Injustice,” Zwickl, Ash and Boyce (2015, pg. 7), illustrate the class and race based physical manifestations of low value chain work and production:

*East St. Louis, Illinois, just across the Mississippi River from St. Louis, Mo., is not your typical American town. It has a hazardous waste incinerator, numerous chemical plants, and multiple “national priority” toxic waste sites. It’s also home to 26,000 residents, 98% of them African-American. The median household income is about \$21,000— meaning that half the households in the city have annual incomes even lower. The rate of childhood asthma is among the highest in the nation.*

The past unfolds endlessly into the future and is often manifested physically. The next section will explore the current state of ‘kept-behind’ places through an exploration of trauma, storytelling, memory and a relational ethnographic exploration of the Amazon HQ2 competition process through the lens of Harvey’s (1989, pg. 5) entrepreneurial city model.

# Current State of Kept-Behind Places

The experiences and outcomes of deindustrialization are varied and complex. There is no one-size-fits-all experience. It is argued that there are about twenty-five megacities and high growth hubs in the U.S. that are trailed by approximately 54 trailing cities all with a mix-match of attributes, competitive and comparative advantages (Bughin, Manyika and Woetzel 2019, pg. 1). It is important to note that even within the twenty-five megacities there are places that could be considered kept-behind. This section explores the current state of 'kept-behind' places through trauma, storytelling and memory, as well as, a relational ethnography of the Amazon HQ2 application process.

## *Urban Trauma, Storytelling and Memory*

Trauma is change. Change is fundamental in how we shape our stories of the present, our memories of the past and collective visions for the future. 'Kept-behind' places are marked by the destruction of their status-quo. The factories close and send through earth-quake like reverberations through all aspects of life creating a new normal, "the fact that all creation can only occur at the price of a destructive counterpart" (Malabou 2012, pg. 4). Destroying the reality and the physical trauma left-behind, as described above, dramatically alters visions of self and others' visions of place. Schiller (2017) explores the importance of storytelling in economic history arguing that not enough attention has been paid to the importance of stories in economic and political decision making. Humans are storytelling creatures; stories cause war, split us into factions and determine outcomes of entire populations (Sachs 2012). The stories we tell shape our collective memory and only by understanding this memory can 'kept-behind' places move forward. Understanding and working through these memories of a prosperous past and the traumas associated with it is critical and doable. It is argued:

*Memory and history, far from being synonymous, appear now to be in fundamental opposition. Memory is life, borne by living societies founded in its name. It remains in permanent evolution, open to the dialectic of remembering and forgetting, unconscious of its successive deformations, vulnerable to manipulation and appropriation, susceptible to being long dormant and periodically reviewed. History, on the other hand, is the reconstruction, always problematic and incomplete, of what is no longer. Memory is a perpetually actual phenomenon, a bond tying us to the eternal present; history is a representation of the past (Olick et al. 2011, pg. 236).*

'Kept-Behind' places are marked by trauma and the stories and memories associated with them. These places can only move forward by understanding and addressing these critical quantitative aspects of urban development. The next section attempts to bring together all the previous aspects of this paper applied to a relational ethnography.

## *Rise of the Entrepreneurial City*

The current U.S. and U.K. development model is based on the premise that cities are in control of their own destinies. Building on the ideological discussion above, this section looks at the specific case of the Amazon HQ2 competition through the lens of Harvey's entrepreneurial city model (1989, pg. 5), who in "From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism" argues that starting in the early 1970s:

*deindustrialization, widespread and seemingly 'structural' unemployment, fiscal austerity at both the national and local levels, all couples with a rising tide of neo-conservatism and much stronger appeal to market rationality and privatization provide a backdrop to understanding why so many urban governments, often of quite different*

*political persuasions and armed with very different legal and political powers, have all taken a broadly similar direction. The greater emphasis on local action to combat these ills also seems to have something to do with the declining powers of the nation state to control multinational money flows, so that investment increasingly takes the form of a negotiation between international finance capital and local powers doing the best they can to maximize the attractiveness of the local site as a lure for capitalist development.*

Hundreds of cities across North America attempted to lure Amazon into their communities offering trillions of dollars in collective incentives. This race-to-the bottom, smokestack chasing model shone a spotlight on the current state of development in the U.S. and provides an entry point in understanding current challenges and opportunities and acts as a foil to what I argue a more just development model based on universal basic infrastructure could look like (Miller 2018).

### *The Company Town Strikes Back*

“Those who have the gold, make the rules,” Vincent, a stranger turned friend, said during an hour-long chat in Seattle’s Pioneer Square. Vincent approached me as I was sitting in the square on late summer day drinking coffee preparing for the start of a cross country journey. With a hiking backpack and a few prepared questions, I met with dozens of people across the United States exploring urban growth through the lens of the Amazon HQ2 application process and the whole time kept coming back to Vincent’s wise words.

I spent months watching from afar and became increasingly curious about the cities like New Bedford that applied, but were not selected for Amazon’s HQ2. Cities that were once boom and company towns, felt the bust of the company leaving, and yet begged for the dynamic to come back. So, I took the little savings I had and set out on a cross country journey from Seattle to Detroit to Cincinnati back home to New Bedford to understand the dynamics of urban growth and see what cities like my hometown can do without Amazon and the current form of urban and economic development. Methodologically, this process follows Desmond’s (2014) relational ethnography model that seeks to break beyond studying specific groups in places, by assessing “processes involving configurations of relations among different actors or institutions” (pg. 547).

### *Seattle, Washington- Housing and the Head Tax*

I landed in Seattle with my big backpack and took the Link light rail from the airport to the University of Washington – the light rail system’s last stop. As I walked from the train stop to my Airbnb, I passed the university, a seemingly middle-class neighborhood, then crossed a bridge where two party boats cruised by underneath my feet. On the other side of the Montlake bridge is Washington State Route 520, where I saw my first glimpse of Seattle’s informality, a tent encampment was set up on the grass between the highway and the water. These were my first few steps on American soil and I quickly realized that I was in for a journey full of tensions.

I put the key code in at the Airbnb I booked and opened the door to four people sitting in the living room. The space is listed as a shared bedroom in a person’s house. I figured that I would be sharing a room with a few people, but turns out dozens of people live in the house for months long stints and have never met the owner. Most are employed full-time and have to move from Airbnb to Airbnb. Seattle’s housing market is impossible to navigate for the delivery drivers, customer service representatives and service employees living in that house. One of my housemates remarked, “I deliver packages for Amazon, but could never get one delivered to me—I don’t have an address.”

Seattle feels like an old company town with Amazon dominating. The company owns large amounts of real-estate and has their own grocery stores to rental housing units. A company town dynamic is playing out in their local governance power structure, too. Amazon is wielding a large amount of power. While I was there, the talk of the town was the head tax to address homelessness. A tax that was passed by the city council then reversed weeks later due to pressure from the business community.

Housing and homelessness mushrooms into a complicated array of questions, issues and opportunities that span all aspects of an individual's life. Seattle's head tax sought to address homelessness by levying an additional \$275 per-employee annually on businesses making more than \$20 million a year. The tax passed the city council and was reversed after mounting pressure from businesses in the city (Semuels 2018). "We've been very opposed to the head tax," Markham McIntyre, the Chief of Staff of Seattle's Chamber of Commerce told me. He called the original passage, "rhetorical victory for the council."

McIntyre explained many of the progressive and people focused efforts the Seattle business community is taking ranging from workforce development to technology in school. He, and others I spoke to in the business community are weary of government spending on homelessness, "If our ambition is to try to house people we have to figure out what is effective rather than throw money at what is currently not working and hoping that it all of a sudden it starts working." I was pointed to watch the Seattle Ballard Town Council's meeting on the head tax, where an attendee stood up to address city council and said, "We don't trust you anymore... your policies of letting them camp and trash our city are attracting more homeless." Glaeser and Ward (2009) argue, "Educated people are more engaged politically, and education is correlated with enacting more stringent land use controls." This is fundamentally playing out in this debate. People do not want homelessness, yet are unwilling to build affordable housing in their neighborhoods.

McIntyre put me in touch with Nicholas Merriam, the CEO of Sea.Citi, who met me the next day over coffee. He described Sea.Citi, as a way to "repair rifts between sectors." The hope is to be a matching platform between tech employees and community needs. With a goal of creating a tech employee engagement playbook that can be sent through internal communications, the group will encourage employees to engage in South Seattle schools through donations and volunteerism.

Even with efforts being made to mend the gaps between the industry and the community people are still, at best, skeptical. Sarah Studer, the Co-Director of Seattle's ImpactHub, described to me the feeling that the head tax repeal was, "back to square one, but feeling even further back." Homelessness is at the ImpactHub's front door in Pioneer Square, the area where modern Seattle was founded and that welcomed over 70,000 people during the gold rush who sought gold in Canada's Klondike River. I left Seattle with a distinct feeling that welcoming Amazon's gold into your city comes with strings attached. Not only does a large corporation have an impact on the social issues of the city, but it can severely limit the menu of public options to address them.

### *Detroit, Michigan- The City of Legacy Makers*

I was riding the elevator up to a meeting at the Detroit Chamber of Commerce when the news broke that all drinking water for the Detroit Public Schools had to be turned off due to high levels of contamination. The office was buzzing with activity, the Chamber was hosting a contingent from Israel to create linkages for tech startups.

“We already have an Amazon,” Justin Robinson, the Vice President of Business Attraction at the Detroit Chamber of Commerce, said to me. He was describing Quicken Loans and its leader Dan Gilbert. The city’s Amazon HQ2 application, “Move Here, Move the World,” was mainly led by Gilbert, with a team of outside consultants, and Robinson feels that the process proved the regional business community can mobilize in the same direction. Their application called for the creation of a downtown campus, modeled after Seattle, and highlighted all the region’s benefits within a five-hour drive.

Detroit’s application did not make the finalist list. City officials received a call from Amazon, which outlined their main deficits included talent and transportation. They are working to address both through programs like the Detroit’s Promise Program, a full tuition scholarship for graduates of Detroit’s public schools to continue their education and transport developments like the QLine StreetCar. The Chamber and others that I spoke to see Detroit’s growth as positive and a model for other cities. The Mayor’s office has a neighborhood focus and there are new restaurants and other amenities opening across the downtown.

Detroit is a difficult city to get around without a car. I met with Kevin Deegan-Krause, associate Professor of Political Science at Wayne State University, who is teaching a first-year honors class about Detroit. He drove me around to different neighborhoods in the city. We stopped at the Detroit Segregation Wall, went into wealthy suburbs, and drove down the long cavernous boulevards built for the hundreds of thousands of lost automobile manufacturing employees.

Detroit was the company town of the 20th century. A single industry town is not resilient to change. Jane Jacobs describes the crisis posed to company towns, “Everything—all other development work, all other processes of city growth, the fertile and creative inefficiency of the growth industry’s suppliers, the opportunities of able workers to break away, the inefficient but creative use of capital—can be sacrificed by the exigencies of the growth industry, which thus turns the city into a company town. This is what happened in Detroit with the automobile industry” (1969, pg. 124). When the company leaves, the town is forever changed and it’s difficult to recreate a local ecosystem.

The automobile industry’s decline left a striking wake. Turn a corner and you find a mansion, walk a dozen feet and there’s an abandoned home. We talked about the reverse commute that people have to take. Working-class residents live closer to the city center, but have to commute to the suburbs to take jobs in the service sector. Without a strong regional public transportation system and Michigan’s higher than average car insurance costs, this journey can be impossible for some to make. The tension of private power that I saw in Seattle played out in Detroit’s approach to public transportation.

As I was driven around the city, we encountered the QLine, a curbside running street car. Cars were getting stuck behind it and it got stuck behind cars, I saw someone on the newly delivered shareable Lime electric scooters fall trying to cross the tracks, and I later rode it on its’ slow procession down Woodward Avenue towards the river. I learned that Gilbert and other businesses had direct say into how that line was built. Large groups of the general community wanted it to run down the center of Woodward Avenue. The business community wanted to boost property values, so it runs curbside. The QLine serves the luxury condos and business community running up and down Woodward. It doesn’t make its way into the neighborhoods.

After I left my meeting in the Chamber of Commerce, the summer heat was intensifying and I rented one of the Lime electric scooters to make my way to the Fisher Building, where community members gathered to protest the school water shut down. Activist after activist from the Moratorium Now Coalition spoke. The protest was about

more than water. Members of the crowd jeered about Gilbert and the “downtown people’s legacy projects” who take money and don’t invest in the community.

Detroit is a city of legacy makers. Dan Gilbert could be considered the Henry Ford of today. He is overseeing the city built in his vision. This is the same dynamic I saw at play in Seattle and again Vincent’s words rang true in another city. I repeated to myself, almost like a mantra, as I was on a Greyhound bus to Cincinnati, “Those who have the gold, make the rules.”

### *Cincinnati, Ohio – Regionalism and the Call for Balance*

Over the Rhine is Cincinnati’s premier example of neighborhood revitalization. Originally, the neighborhood welcomed German immigrants to the city, but went through a period of sharp decline and now has reinvented itself with arts and culture, a buzzing restaurant scene and a new street car system.

I walked the neighborhood with Dean David Mengel from Xavier University. He described to me the efforts by 3CDC, a non-profit focusing on revitalizing the neighborhood, to invest in the space and we stopped at a local church turned brewery for lunch. The space was made for young people and I could see how investments were being channeled to address the city’s biggest challenges in bringing companies like Amazon in—talent attraction and transportation. Cincinnati’s Amazon application proposed new public transportation and more investment in the tech ecosystem including talent development.

Cincinnati is distinct because it sits at the intersection of three states and takes regionalism seriously. Many of the economic development conversations I had while traveling were painted as win-win, when in reality someone had to lose. Ed Loyd, the Vice President of Marketing and Communications describes REDI Cincinnati’s approach to development as, “a win for the region is a win for all of us.” REDI is a regional economic development initiative, which focuses on the “interlinked” and “interdependent” fifteen counties that span southwestern Ohio, northern Kentucky, and southeastern Indiana. This cross-state language is not used in many places in our country. Interstate competition is often used to create competition for increased incentives as seen in the HQ2 application process. Loyd views “incentives as a hot button topic, but from our experience, it’s the last thing companies look at. It’s having a site and workforce. Incentives are a useful tool, but not the thing we lead with.” Loyd’s view directly aligns with scholars who argue, “Regional economies can be seen as intricate, overlapping systems of inter-organizational relationships” (Lauman, Galaskiewicz and Marsden 1978; Markusen 1994, 1996; cited in Safford 2004, pg. 5). By taking a whole picture approach to a region’s economy, practitioners, like Loyd, are able to partially escape the current winner-take-all model of development.

Liz Blume, the Executive Director of the Community Building Institute in the city, is skeptical of incentives and feels that being part of the race for companies like Amazon is important, but balance is paramount. She believes that not participating can send a message that the city is not open for business. The extent of participation is a larger political and social discussion that does not have a correct answer. Some, like urban activist and scholar Richard Florida, called for a total ban on the Amazon HQ2. Florida’s ‘Non-Aggression Pact for Amazon HQ2’ collected over 16,000 online signatures and was undersigned by leading academic and political leaders throughout North America. To participate or not to participate in the current growth model appears like a binary choice. Yet, Blume’s question and call of balance framed my whole experience perfectly. Growth can be good and change communities for the better, but it needs to be tempered so to not exclude and push people out.

## *New Bedford, Massachusetts- Home*

I arrived back home tired and full of information. I grew up in a boom and bust town. Twice the richest city per capita, once from whaling the other from textiles, New Bedford's economic history fits into the American story of growth (Medeiros 2017). Entrepreneurial minded individuals, most backed by historic wealth, got together and set-up shop in New Bedford. First it was whaling for oil, then maximizing productivity with thousands of employees in cotton mills and now is a fishing city, which continues to reinvent itself through arts and culture.

After the trip and reflecting on New Bedford, and many of the hundreds of others submitted Amazon HQ2 applications, I saw places nearly begging for parallel growth and inequality to move into to their zip codes. Matthew Desmond (2019) has called the current form of U.S. capitalism the "low-road version," where historically "given the choice between modernity and barbarism, prosperity and poverty, lawfulness and cruelty, democracy and totalitarianism, America chose all of the above." This is all of the above approach was seen as each city put their best faces and incentives forward in attempts to get tens of thousands of high paying jobs and all the other benefits and challenges of becoming the host of the world's most valuable company. This view into the plumbing of the current U.S. style of development led me to explore other options. The next section will propose and explore an alternative style of economic and urban development focused on a proposal for a bottom-up led and top-down supported industrial strategy with universal basic infrastructure as its foundation.

# Moving Beyond Kept-Behind

*What can policymakers and those working on urban challenges do to change the trajectory of 'kept-behind' places?*

*Things only come into visible focus as things when they become inoperable – they break or stutter and they then become the object of attention. The background is thereby foregrounded. -- Graham and Thrift (2007, pg. 2).*

## *Politics of Candor and Care: Post-Traumatic Planning*

Candor and care are critical for change in 'kept-behind' places. There is a reoccurring theme in economic development and local politics, where leaders declare that their city is going to be the next Silicon Valley of 'fill-in-the-blank' industry. The improbability of this is high and the message it sends is damaging. Mission-oriented visions (Mazzucato 2019) are powerful to rally a group of people towards change, but a politics of candor that soberly assesses the activities and capabilities of a place is nearly one of the only ways to change economic destiny. I argue that cities and economic development initiatives would be more effective if they worked towards economic goals within reach and fit local capacities and capabilities (Mealy 2019). This push moves beyond proposing new activities and values care and maintenance with "what starts out as repair may soon become improvement, innovation and even growth" (Graham and Thrift 2007, pg. 6).

Care and maintenance begins with working through trauma. A tool of this healing is therapeutic planning which, "is not a manipulative make-them-feel-better tactic, nor is it a formal cure- them-all approach. Therapeutic planning is emotionally engaged planning, which intends to support a process of healing and reconstruction of meaning" (Erfan 2017, pg. 37). Key to this notion of therapeutic planning is the idea of changing the central story or reconstructing a narrative to bring out the belief that a group, "within itself, has the knowledge, creativity, sensitivity, and power it needs to solve its own problems" (pg. 38). By looking inward and working on capacity building within the community, planners and policy makers can begin to address the underlying challenges of being a 'kept-behind' place.

## *Industrial Strategy Built on a Foundation of Universal Basic Infrastructure*

A new focus on place-based, granular and iterative policy and spacemaking is critical to change the trajectory of our 'kept-behind' places. Glaeser and Hausman (2019, pg. 12) argue, "A further reason for revisiting spatial policies is that market forces do not seem to be eliminating these joblessness gaps on their own... joblessness has become a permanent part of many areas." One of the main vehicles for this is industrial policy, but there is an adversity in the U.S. and the U.K. to industrial policy and strategy. Since the structural adjustments in the 1980s marked by an increased reliance on market-based thinking, the idea of government intervention in industrial dynamics is often labeled as government "picking winners" and recent arguments against U.K. industrial strategy have posited that it will continue to entrench deindustrialization (Silverwood and Woodward 2018, pg. 631). It is important to note that this adversity to industrial strategy has not always been the view and even recently industrial policy briefly mentioned in U.S. politics and is now undergoing a resurgence in U.K. policy. In a 1980 editorial (quoted in Bluestone 1984, pg. 41) of Business Week, the board argues:

*The U.S. economy must undergo a fundamental change if it is to retain a measure of economic viability, let alone leadership in the remaining 20 years of this century. The goal must be nothing less than reindustrialization of America. A conscious effort to rebuild American's productive capacity is the only alternative to the precipitous*



*loss of competitiveness of the last 15 years, of which the year's wave of plant closings across the continent is only the most vivid manifestation.*

A speech by Gene Sperling (2013), director of the White House's National Economic Council under President Barack Obama, calls for a renewal of the manufacturing industry in the U.S., while this could be seen as a call for a renewal of interest in industrial policy he quickly argues for a shift away from the "industrial policy" model to an "innovation spillover model." This speech and its policy implications are considered to have disappeared (Wade 2014, pg. 14). Bluestone and Harrison (1982; cited in Safford 2004, pg. 14) argue that a "multi-pronged industrial policy was necessary to counter the dehumanizing effects of deindustrialization." This industrial policy never manifested and the transition for communities was not smoothed. Both the U.S. and the U.K. engage in industrial strategy, but refuse to call it what it is. The Amazon HQ2 selection process is an example of the current form of government led industrial strategy. Each municipal and state government 'picked' Amazon as the ultimate winner of tax and other incentives. An intentional bottom-up created and top-down supported industrial strategy is critical to change the dynamics in 'kept-behind' places.

A bottom-up created and top-down supported industrial strategy based on the idea of universal basic infrastructure (Coyle 2017) is one clear path to completely alter the trajectory of our 'kept-behind' places. This strategy should be written with participatory practices and establish the contextual infrastructural floor provided by institutions. This floor should focus on service provisions that lead to well-being. Building a baseline of transportation, education, health, environmental sustainability will allow for places to reach contextual conceptions of the good life and escape this hedonic treadmill of growth, where places are seeking growth for the few and not the many, while building towards a eudaimonia vision of community health and well-being: striving for excellence in development (Waterman 2007). This would represent a horizontal approach to urban development focusing on the conditions that affect industry (Nathan 2013, pg. 2).

Each of these plans should be contextual and driven by local needs. Numerous political, social and economic questions remain and should be further studied. This proposal is not meant to be a panacea either, but to act as an alternative entry point into thinking and creating urban change. It is clear that the current urban development system is working for the few and not the many. Our world is clearly is adhering to the vision outlined by Carnegie, mentioned above, where people and places are controlling vast majorities of labor and capital. This is meant to be a new vision.

# Conclusion

This paper has made the case for an industrial strategy with a foundation of universal basic infrastructure to address the challenges associated with ‘kept-behind’ places and the uneven effects and responses to deindustrialization that created them. The current form of urban development, best captured by Harvey’s Entrepreneurial City model (1989, pg. 5), has created a system where cities engage in a race to the bottom sales and growth focused approach to development. As seen throughout the Amazon HQ2 selected case studies, cities are constantly vying for development and growth, and ultimately the jobs each bring. Other key questions need to be explored, with further research. For example: Is growth good? What are the spatial, political and social limits to growth? Should development be focused on places with perceived path-dependent factors like clusters and agglomeration? There are an infinite number of questions that could not be addressed and require vision and conversation.

The fundamental finding of this paper is that our urban economies and spaces are in constant change based on a reality that has been determined by ideology, we currently engage in business dominated and place desensitized industrial strategy and for it to change there needs to be a fundamental shift in the way we think about developing and changing our communities. “When economies do evolve... nothing about that process assures economic growth” (North 1991, pg. 109). The economy of today is responding to the opportunities of yesterday. A sober, evidenced based approach to delivering government services and infrastructure will begin to shift communities, ideologies and attitudes. The ‘kept-behind’ places of today need not become the next global cities, but can begin to change by striving towards an achievable, while an extremely difficult to attain and maintain goal, of becoming a place that provides access to a healthy environment, fulfilling work and generalized well-being marked by access to relevant resources and social connectedness. ‘Kept-behind’ places are the laboratories for sustainable and equitable urban change. Leadership at all levels is required to turn this or an alternative vision of change into reality.



# Bibliography

Baldwin, R. and Lopez-Gonzalez, J. (2013) 'Supply- Chain Trade: A Portrait of Global Patterns and Several Testable Hypotheses', National Bureau of Economic Research, (Working Paper 18957), pp. 1–62.

Best, M. (2018) *How Growth Really Happens: The Making of Economic Miracles through Production, Governance, and Skills*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Binfield, K. (2004) *Writings of the Luddites*. JHU Press.

Bluestone, B. (1984) 'Is Deindustrialization a Myth? Capital Mobility versus Absorptive Capacity in the U. S. Economy', *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 475, pp. 39–51.

Bluestone, B. (2014) *What Makes Working Cities Work? Key Factors in Urban Economic Growth*, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. Available at: <https://www.bostonfed.org/publications/community-development-issue-briefs/2014/what-makes-working-cities-work-key-factors-in-urban-economic-growth.aspx> (Accessed: 22 April 2019).

Boston, F. R. B. of (2014) *What Makes Working Cities Work? Key Factors in Urban Economic Growth*, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. Available at: <https://www.bostonfed.org/publications/community-development-issue-briefs/2014/what-makes-working-cities-work-key-factors-in-urban-economic-growth.aspx> (Accessed: 19 April 2019).

Bowman, C. and Ambrosini, V. (2000) *Value Creation Versus Value Capture: Towards a Coherent Definition of Value in Strategy - Bowman - 2000 - British Journal of Management - Wiley Online Library*. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1467-8551.00147> (Accessed: 17 August 2019).

Bughin, J., Manyika, J. and Woetzel, J. (2019) *Future of work in America | McKinsey*. Available at: <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/future-of-work/the-future-of-work-in-america-people-and-places-today-and-tomorrow> (Accessed: 17 August 2019).

Camus, A. (2013) *The Myth of Sisyphus*. Penguin UK.

Casselmann, B. and Satariano, A. (2019) 'Amazon's Latest Experiment: Retraining Its Work Force', *The New York Times*, 11 July. Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/07/11/technology/amazon-workers-retraining-automation.html> (Accessed: 17 August 2019).

Coyle, D. (2016) *GDP: A Brief but Affectionate History - Revised and expanded Edition*. Available at: <https://press.princeton.edu/titles/10598.html> (Accessed: 17 August 2019).

Coyle, D. (2017) *Universal basic services are more important than income*, *Financial Times*. Available at: <https://www.ft.com/content/734e8fe6-1880-11e7-9c35-0dd2cb31823a> (Accessed: 22 April 2019).

Doussard, M., Peck, J. and Theodore, N. (2009) 'After Deindustrialization: Uneven Growth and Economic Inequality in "Postindustrial" Chicago', *Economic Geography*, 85(2), pp. 183–207.

Dunlop, K. (2019) Angry New Bedford city councilors speak out against proposed Parallel Products recycling plant, southcoasttoday.com. Available at: <https://www.southcoasttoday.com/news/20190510/angry-new-bedford-city-councilors-speak-out-against-proposed-parallel-products-recycling-plant> (Accessed: 17 August 2019).

Ely, R. (2019) Work of the Past, Work of the Future. Available at: <https://events7.mediasite.com/Mediasite/Play/0c28325473ab4b72b75b0a63a829be9d1d> (Accessed: 17 August 2019).

Erfan, A. (2017) 'Confronting collective traumas: an exploration of therapeutic planning', *Planning Theory & Practice*, 18(1), pp. 34–50. doi: 10.1080/14649357.2016.1249909.

ERIKSON, K. (1991) 'Notes on Trauma and Community', *American Imago*, 48(4), pp. 455–472.

Ferm, J. and Jones, E. (2017) 'Beyond the post-industrial city: Valuing and planning for industry in London', *Urban Studies*, 54(14), pp. 3380–3398. doi: 10.1177/0042098016668778.

Florida, R. (2018) Petition · Elected Officials and Community Leaders of Amazon HQ2 Finalist Cities: Support a Non-Aggression Pact for Amazon's HQ2 · Change.org. Available at: <https://www.change.org/p/elected-officials-and-community-leaders-of-amazon-hq2-finalist-cities-support-a-non-aggression-pact-for-amazon-s-hq2> (Accessed: 17 August 2019).

Foucault, M. (1991) 'Chapter 19: "Space, Knowledge and Power"', in *The Foucault Reader*. London: Penguin, pp. 239–256.

Friedman, M. (1970) 'The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits', *New York Times Magazine*, 13 September. Available at: <http://umich.edu/~thecore/doc/Friedman.pdf>.

Froy, F. (2020) Using Network Science to Better Understand Agglomeration Economics: The Case of Manchester, PHD Thesis. University College London.

Gest, J. (2016) *The New Minority: White Working Class Politics in an Age of Immigration and Inequality*. 1st edn. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Glaeser, E. L. and Hausman, N. (2019) The Spatial Mismatch Between Innovation and Joblessness. Working Paper 25913. National Bureau of Economic Research. doi: 10.3386/w25913.

Glaser, E. (2010) *Agglomeration Economics*. The University of Chicago Press.

Gottman, Jean (1964) *Megalopolis: the urbanised northeastern seaboard of the United States* / Jean Gottmann. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Graham, S. and Thrift, N. (2007) 'Out of Order: Understanding Repair and Maintenance', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 24(3), pp. 1–25. doi: 10.1177/0263276407075954.

Hall, P. (1962) *The Industries of London since 1861*. London: Hutchinson U Library.

Harvey, D. (1989) 'From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism: The Transformation in Urban Governance in Late Capitalism', *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography*, 71(1), pp. 3–17. doi: 10.2307/490503.

Hendrickson, C., Muro, M. and Galston, W. A. (2018) 'STRATEGIES FOR LEFT-BEHIND PLACES', p. 44.

Jacobs, J. (1969) *The Economy of Cities*. New York, USA: Random House.

Joel, B. (1982) Billy Joel - Allentown (Official Video) - YouTube. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BHnJp0oyOxs> (Accessed: 17 August 2019).

Lazonick, W. (2014) 'Profits Without Prosperity: How Stock Buybacks Manipulate the Market, and Leave Most Americans Worse Off', Annual Conference of the Institute for New Economic Thinking, p. 18.

Lefebvre, H. (2003) *The Urban Revolution*. University of Minnesota.

Lever, W. F. (1991) 'Deindustrialisation and the Reality of the Post-Industrial City', *Urban Studies*, 28(6), pp. 983–999.

Malabou, C. (2012) *The Ontology of the Accident*. Polity Press.

Mallach, A., Shibley, R. and Hovey, B. (2016) *Remaking Post-Industrial Cities: Lessons from North America and Europe*. Available at: <https://www.crcpress.com/Remaking-Post-Industrial-Cities-Lessons-from-North-America-and-Europe/Carter/p/book/9781138899292> (Accessed: 17 August 2019).

Mazzucato, M. (2019) 'Mission oriented Innovation Policy'. Available at: <https://marianamazucato.com/research/mission-oriented-innovation-policy/> (Accessed: 17 August 2019).

Medeiros, P. (2017) The business of whaling made New Bedford wealthy, successful, [southcoasttoday.com](http://www.southcoasttoday.com). Available at: <http://www.southcoasttoday.com/news/20170827/peggi-medeiros-business-of-whaling-made-new-bedford-wealthy-successful> (Accessed: 1 December 2018).

Miller, J. (2018) The road past Amazon HQ2. Available at: <https://www.bennettinstitute.cam.ac.uk/blog/road-past-amazon-hq2/> (Accessed: 17 August 2019).

Mumford, E. (2018) *Designing the Modern City: Urbanism Since 1850*. Yale University Press.

Nathan, M. and Overman, H. (2013) 'Agglomeration, clusters, and industrial policy', *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 29(2), pp. 383–404. doi: 10.1093/oxrep/grt019.

Nelson, W. G. and Bergen, B. J. (2012) 'The New Bedford Harbor Superfund site long-term monitoring program (1993-2009)', *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 184(12), pp. 7531–7550. doi: 10.1007/s10661-012-2517-0.

North, D. C. (1991) 'Institutions', *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 5(1), pp. 97–112.

Ojanpera, S., O'Clery, N. and Grahm, M. (2019) Data science, artificial intelligence and the futures of work, The Alan Turing Institute. Available at: <https://www.turing.ac.uk/research/publications/data-science-artificial-intelligence-and-futures-work> (Accessed: 17 August 2019).

Olick, J. K., Vinitzky-Seroussi, V. and Levy, D. (2011) *The Collective Memory Reader*. Oxford University Press.

Porter, M. (1985) *Competitive Advantage*. New York, USA: The Free Press.

Ramaswamy, R. et al. (1999) 'Growth, Trade, and Deindustrialization', *IMF Working Papers*, 98(60), p. 1. doi: 10.5089/9781451848021.001.

Rhodes, C. (2018) 'Manufacturing: statistics and policy'. Available at: <https://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/SN01942> (Accessed: 17 August 2019).

Richardson, G. B. (1972) 'The Organisation of Industry', *The Economic Journal*, 82(327), pp. 883–896. doi: 10.2307/2230256.

Sachs, J. (2012) *Winning the Story Wars: Why Those Who Tell and Live the Best Stories Will Rule the Future*. Boston, Mass: Harvard Business Review Press.

Safford, S. (2009) *Why the Garden Club Couldn't Save Youngstown: The Transformation of the Rust Belt*. Harvard University Press.

Sandercock, L. (1998) *Making the Invisible Visible*. University of California Press. Available at: <https://www.ucpress.edu/book/9780520207356/making-the-invisible-visible> (Accessed: 3 December 2018).

Sassen, S. (2005) 'The Global City: Introducing a Concept', *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 11(2), pp. 27–42.

Sennett, R. (2018) *Building and Dwelling*. Penguin.

Shakespeare, W. (1603) *As You Like It: Entire Play*. Available at: <http://shakespeare.mit.edu/asyoulikeit/full.html> (Accessed: 17 August 2019).

Sherman, L. (2017) *If You're in a Dogfight, Become a Cat!: Strategies for Long-Term Growth*. New York, USA: Columbia Business School Publishing.

Shiller, R. J. (2017) *Narrative Economics*. Working Paper 23075. National Bureau of Economic Research. doi: 10.3386/w23075.

Smith, A. (1776) *The Wealth of Nations*. London: W. Strahan and T. Cadell.

Sperling, G. (2013) 'The Case for a Manufacturing Renaissance'. The Brookings Institution, 25 July.

Stewart, M. (2018) *The Birth of the New American Aristocracy - The Atlantic*. Available at: <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2018/06/the-birth-of-a-new-american-aristocracy/559130/> (Accessed: 17 August 2019).

Storr, W. (2018) *The Science of Storytelling: Why Stories Make Us Human, and How to Tell Them Better*. Available at: <https://www.harpercollins.co.uk/9780008276935/the-science-of-storytelling-why-stories-make-us-human-and-how-to-tell-them-better> (Accessed: 17 August 2019).

The Economist (2013) 'Welcome home', 19 January. Available at: <https://www.economist.com/leaders/2013/01/19/welcome-home> (Accessed: 12 December 2018).

Travis, A. (2011) 'Thatcher government toyed with evacuating Liverpool after 1981 riots', *The Guardian*, 30 December. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2011/dec/30/thatcher-government-liverpool-riots-1981> (Accessed: 17 August 2019).

Tunstall, R. and Mealy, P. (2019) 'Place-Based Industrial Strategy Workshop'. University of Cambridge, 8 July.

Wade, R. H. (2014) *Transforming Economies: Making industrial policy work for growth, jobs and development - Chapter 14*. Available at: [http://www.ilo.org/global/publications/books/WCMS\\_315679/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/global/publications/books/WCMS_315679/lang--en/index.htm) (Accessed: 17 August 2019).

Waterman, A. S. (2007) 'On the importance of distinguishing hedonia and eudaimonia when contemplating the hedonic treadmill', *American Psychologist*, 62(6), pp. 612–613. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X62.6.612.

Zwickl, K., Ash, M. and Boyce, J. (2015) 'Mapping Environmental Injustice » TripleCrisis'. Available at: <http://triplecrisis.com/mapping-environmental-injustice/> (Accessed: 17 August 2019).





