



This is a repository copy of *Deindustrialization in cities of the global south*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/160159/>

Version: Published Version

---

**Article:**

Schindler, S., Gillespie, T., Banks, N. et al. (4 more authors) (2020) Deindustrialization in cities of the global south. *Area Development and Policy*, 5 (3). pp. 283-304. ISSN 2379-2949

<https://doi.org/10.1080/23792949.2020.1725393>

---

**Reuse**

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:  
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>



## Deindustrialization in cities of the Global South

Seth Schindler, Tom Gillespie, Nicola Banks, Mustafa Kemal Bayırbağ,  
Himanshu Burte, J. Miguel Kanai & Neha Sami

To cite this article: Seth Schindler, Tom Gillespie, Nicola Banks, Mustafa Kemal Bayırbağ, Himanshu Burte, J. Miguel Kanai & Neha Sami (2020): Deindustrialization in cities of the Global South, *Area Development and Policy*, DOI: [10.1080/23792949.2020.1725393](https://doi.org/10.1080/23792949.2020.1725393)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23792949.2020.1725393>



© 2020 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



Published online: 08 Apr 2020.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 807



View related articles [↗](#)










View Crossmark data [↗](#)

RESEARCH ARTICLE



# Deindustrialization in cities of the Global South

Seth Schindler <sup>a,b</sup>, Tom Gillespie <sup>a</sup>, Nicola Banks <sup>a</sup>,  
Mustafa Kemal Bayırbağ <sup>c</sup>, Himanshu Burte <sup>d</sup>, J. Miguel Kanai <sup>e</sup>  
and Neha Sami <sup>f</sup>

## ABSTRACT

Recent research by economists has shown that deindustrialization is more severe in Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America than it ever was in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Nevertheless, most research on deindustrialization is focused on the former centres of Fordist manufacturing in the industrial heartlands of the North Atlantic. In short, there is a mismatch between where deindustrialization is researched and where it is occurring, and the objective of this paper is to shift the geographical focus of research on deindustrialization to the Global South. Case studies from Argentina, India, Tanzania and Turkey demonstrate the variegated nature of deindustrialization beyond the North Atlantic. In the process, it is demonstrated that cities in the Global South can inform wider theoretical discussions on the impacts of deindustrialization at the urban scale.

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 15 September 2019; Accepted 31 January 2020

## KEYWORDS

deindustrialization, urban decline, postcolonial urbanism, gentrification, comparative urban research

## 摘要

发展中国家城市的去工业化现象. *Area Development and Policy*. 经济学家近期的研究表明, 撒哈拉以南非洲和拉丁美洲的去工业化现象比高收入国家更为严重. 尽管如此, 大多数有关去工业化的研究都集中在北大西洋工业中心地带的前福特制造业中心. 简言之, 研究去工业化的地区和发生去工业化的地区不匹配, 本文的目的是将去工业化研究的地理重点转移到发展中国家. 本文阐述了来自阿根廷, 印度, 坦桑尼亚和土耳其的案例研究, 这些案例证明了在北大西洋以外地区去工业化的多样性. 本文还表明, 发展中国家的城市可以就有关去工业化对城市规模的影响提供更广泛的理论讨论.

## 关键词

去工业化, 城市衰落, 后殖民城市主义, 贵族化, 城市比较研究

## CONTACT

(Corresponding author)  [seth.schindler@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:seth.schindler@manchester.ac.uk)

<sup>a</sup>Global Development Institute, The University of Manchester, Manchester, UK.

<sup>b</sup>Manchester Urban Institute, The University of Manchester, Manchester, UK.

<sup>c</sup>Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

<sup>d</sup>Centre for Urban Science and Engineering (CUSE), Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Mumbai, India.

<sup>e</sup>Geography Department, The University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK.

<sup>f</sup>Indian Institute for Human Settlements, Bangalore, India.

**RESUMEN**

Desindustrialización en las ciudades del hemisferio sur. *Area Development and Policy*. En recientes estudios realizados por economistas se ha mostrado que la desindustrialización es más grave en el África subsahariana y Latinoamérica de lo que nunca fue en la OCDE. Sin embargo, en la mayoría de estudios sobre la desindustrialización se presta atención a los antiguos centros de manufactura fordista en la concentración industrial del Atlántico Norte. En suma, existe un desajuste entre dónde se estudia la desindustrialización y el lugar donde ocurre. El objetivo de este artículo es cambiar el enfoque geográfico de los estudios sobre la desindustrialización hacia el hemisferio sur. En este artículo se presentan casos prácticos de Argentina, India, Tanzania y Turquía en los que se demuestra la naturaleza variada de la desindustrialización más allá del Atlántico Norte. En este proceso, se demuestra que las ciudades del hemisferio sur pueden ilustrar debates teóricos más amplios sobre los efectos de la desindustrialización a escala urbana.

**PALABRAS CLAVE**

desindustrialización, declive urbano, urbanismo poscolonial, gentrificación, estudio urbano comparativo

**АННОТАЦИЯ**

Деиндустриализация в городах глобального Юга. *Area Development and Policy*. Недавние исследования экономистов показали, что деиндустриализация в странах Африки к югу от Сахары и в Латинской Америке является более серьезной, чем где-либо в ОЭСР. Тем не менее большинство исследований по деиндустриализации сосредоточено на бывших центрах фордистского производства в промышленном центре Северной Атлантики. Короче говоря, существует несоответствие между тем, где исследуется деиндустриализация и где она происходит, и целью данной статьи является смещение географического фокуса исследований деиндустриализации на глобальный Юг. В данной статье представлены примеры из Аргентины, Индии, Танзании и Турции, которые демонстрируют пеструю природу деиндустриализации за пределами Северной Атлантики. Исследование демонстрирует, что города глобального Юга могут стать источником информации для более широких теоретических дискуссий о последствиях деиндустриализации на уровне города.

**КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА**

Деиндустриализация, упадок городов, постколониальный урбанизм, джентрификация, сравнительные урбанистические исследования.

**INTRODUCTION**

Scholarship on deindustrialization has come of age in the past four decades and has evolved into a rich interdisciplinary field. It has expanded thematically from an initial focus on political economy to include less tangible impacts of deindustrialization on people and communities ‘beyond the ruins’ (Cowie & Heathcott, 2003). Although deindustrialization scholarship has become thematically rich and theoretically sophisticated, its geographical imagination has remained strikingly limited. A recently edited publication, *The Deindustrialized World: Confronting Ruination in Postindustrial Places* (High, MacKinnon, & Perchard, 2017, p. 6), notes that ‘the centrality of the US experience ... has effectively anchored the international field of research’ since the early 1980s. One ostensible objective of the book is to introduce ‘into the conversation different national contexts’ and ‘reveal the comparative threads drawing together the particularities of industrial decline in different geographies’ (p. 8). Although the book’s 15 chapters manage to avoid some of the most studied examples of deindustrialization,

such as Detroit and Pittsburgh, they regrettably focus exclusively on cities in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

The Global South looms large in the background of deindustrialization scholarship, but it remains a non-descript destination for runaway factories. The implicit assumption embedded in much of this scholarship is that the South has industrialized at the expense of cities and communities in the North Atlantic and elsewhere in the OECD. This assumption could not be farther from the truth. While there has undoubtedly been a reorganization of industrial production on a global scale – what Fröbel, Heinrichs, and Kreye (1980) termed the ‘new international division of labour’ – recent research demonstrates that industrial offshoring was a highly uneven process. Baldwin (2016, p. 2) shows that ‘only six developing nations ... saw their share of world manufacturing rise by more than three-tenths of one percentage point since 1990’. Over roughly the same period, many countries in Latin America and Africa experienced deindustrialization that, at least in terms of percentage of gross domestic product (GDP), exceeds the level experienced by countries in the North Atlantic that are typically the focus of deindustrialization scholarship (Rodrik, 2016). Indeed, Dani Rodrik shows that ‘the brunt of globalization and the rise of Asian exporters has been borne by other developing countries, rather than the advanced economies’ (Rodrik, 2016, p. 16). In summary, there is a mismatch between where deindustrialization is researched and where it is occurring (however, see Hassink, Hu, Shin, Yamamura, & Gong, 2018).

This paper broadens the focus of deindustrialization scholarship. The findings from Rodrik, Baldwin and other economists provide a useful starting point because they demonstrate the need to shift our focus and explore the emergent geography of deindustrialization in the Global South. However, their use of country-level data has limitations: most notably, it problematizes deindustrialization as a national/developmental issue that can be addressed with industrial and trade policy. It does not inform our understanding of how deindustrialization unfolds in cities and communities, yet this is precisely the scale at which deindustrialization is most intensively and viscerally experienced. Indeed, deindustrialization in the North Atlantic is typically framed as a city/regional problem, and most research is situated at subnational scales which confirms that it is not only an economic phenomenon. This paper takes its cue from this rich body of research and focuses on how deindustrialization unfolds in cities in the South. It presents a broad range of cases from India, Tanzania, Turkey and Argentina. The objective is two-fold. The first is to recover the experience of people beyond the North Atlantic whose histories have been erased in scholarship on deindustrialization. The second is to highlight the variegated modes of deindustrialization in cities in the South, and implicitly compare these processes with assumptions informed by the experience from the North Atlantic.

The paper is structured as follows. The next section situates this paper in research on deindustrialization and postcolonial urbanism. It demonstrates that the former failed to account for events beyond the North Atlantic, while deindustrialization has remained a blind spot in the latter. The third section introduces the case studies. The final section concludes by drawing out comparative insights and identifying avenues of future research at the intersection of scholarship on deindustrialization and urban studies.

## SITUATING DEINDUSTRIALIZATION BEYOND THE NORTH ATLANTIC

At the end of the Second World War, industrial activity was highly concentrated. The United States had 7% of the global population, yet it controlled more wealth than the rest of the world and its manufacturing capacity dwarfed foreign rivals (Adas, 2006, p. 223). In the following decades, the United States launched a programme of reconstruction whose objective was to restore the industrial capability of Western Europe and Japan to pre-war levels (Ekbladh,

2009). In response to the perceived threat from the Soviet Union, the United States embraced a Fordist–Keynesian model whereby the state sought to impose a wage bargain and contain conflict between capital and labour.<sup>1</sup> The result was a golden era in the North Atlantic, and according to Esping-Andersen (1996, p. 1), ‘prosperity, equality and full employment seemed in perfect harmony’. While Esping-Andersen overlooks the fact that discrimination in many forms was hard-wired into the post-war regime, his glowing appraisal does highlight the remarkable longevity and stability of this growth episode (Piketty, 2014). This regime entered a period of crisis in the late 1960s from which it never recovered. It remains unclear whether the erosion and ultimate breakdown of the post-war economic order was caused by in-built contradictions or exogenous shocks (Piore & Sabel, 1984), but what is clear is that many places in the North Atlantic that had powered the post-war economic miracle entered a prolonged period of decline. Bluestone and Harrison (1982, p. 4) lamented that ‘[t]he system that seemed so capable of providing a steadily growing standard of living during the turbulent 1960s had become totally incapable of providing people with a simple home mortgage, a stable job, or a secure pension’.

The 1970s’ economic crisis disrupted the wage bargain in the United States and reactivated dormant hostilities between capital and labour. Industrial capital sought to ‘outrun’ labour by relocating from its traditional bases of operation in the American Northeast and Midwest to the Southern states where labour was less organized (Bluestone & Harrison, 1980). Capital’s sojourn in the American South was a brief layover in a much longer journey overseas to so-called ‘Third World’ countries (Bluestone & Harrison, 1980; Dicken, 2015; Fröbel et al., 1980). Offshoring accelerated in the 1980s and 1990s as advancements in information and communication technology and international institutions allowed multinational corporations to develop global value chains (Baldwin, 2016; Castells, 1996; Gereffi & Korzeniewicz, 1994). Cities that had been centres of production and affluence were profoundly impacted by disinvestment and descended into ‘paroxysms of devaluation and deindustrialization’ (Harvey, 1989, p. 185). The speed of this decline was remarkable, and in many instances, it occurred before policy-makers could devise a meaningful response. Storper and Walker (1989, p. 90) noted that ‘[w]ithin a few years, or even months, the economic base of a community can disappear, leaving the empty hulks of obsolete factories and decaying infrastructure’.

The socio-spatial impacts of deindustrialization in the North Atlantic were explored at the urban scale by geographers and sociologists who sought to understand how the various trajectories of the post-industrial transformation of cities contributed to growing inequalities through the processes of gentrification and abandonment. From the 1970s, gentrification research was characterized by a debate between consumption- and production-side approaches that explained gentrification either as a product of the growth of a ‘new middle class’ employed in service industries (Leys, 1996) or as the reinvestment of capital in previously disinvested inner-city neighbourhoods (Smith, 1979). Despite disagreement over the specific causes of gentrification, both approaches understood gentrification as the outcome of structural changes associated with the loss of industry (Ghertner, 2015). Against the background of this debate, researchers have explored the urban impacts of deindustrialization by documenting processes of neighbourhood change and class-based displacement in post-industrial cities such as New York and London (Curran, 2004; Davidson & Lees, 2005). In contrast to gentrification researchers’ focus on the *displacement* that results from the reinvestment of capital, other researchers have focused on places that continue to be characterized by high levels of abandonment. Wacquant’s (2008) comparative study of ‘advanced marginality’ in the post-Fordist city argued that deindustrialization and ‘deproletarianisation’ have resulted in the *concentration* of the urban poor in stigmatized ‘neighborhoods of relegation’, such as Chicago’s poorest neighbourhoods and Parisian *banlieues*.

A field of scholarship emerged to capture the broad-based impacts of industrial decline, that is referred to here as *deindustrialization studies*. Its initial focus on political economy has expanded and it has become truly interdisciplinary. The field broadened in line with general trends in social science, most notably the rise of postmodernity and cultural studies in the 1980s (Strangleman & Rhodes, 2014). Scholarship focused on plant closures and struggles between unions and corporations gave way to the reappraisal of deindustrialization as a ‘more socially complicated, historically deep, geographically diverse, and politically perplexing phenomenon than previously thought’ (Cowie & Heathcott, 2003, p. 2). Scholars engaged with the complexity and far-reaching consequences of deindustrialization, not least of which is the profound transformation of place and the disintegration of communities and ways of life (Cowie & Heathcott, 2003; High & Lewis, 2007; Linkon, 2018; Mah, 2012). Although deindustrialization studies has evolved thematically, its geographical imaginary has curiously remained stunted. As noted above, deindustrialization in Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa has been severe; in the case of the former, the ‘magnitude of adverse employment effects ... is even larger than in developed economies’ (Rodrik, 2016, p. 19). However, deindustrialization studies has remained steadfastly rooted in the industrial heartlands of the North Atlantic, and has only recently begun to account for deindustrialization elsewhere in the OECD (High et al., 2017). The Global South remains a vague construct, which, when it appears at all, is as a homogenized recipient of offshored industry.

The failure of deindustrialization studies to account for events in the Global South is mirrored by the neglect of deindustrialization in postcolonial urban studies. The latter has critiqued the Western-centric character of mainstream urban studies, with many scholars heeding Roy’s (2009, p. 820) call to ‘blast open theoretical geographies, to produce a new set of concepts in the crucible of a new repertoire of cities’. Whereas high-profile debates around world/global cities privileged a small number of wealthy cities in discussions of urban modernity, scholars such as Robinson (2006) and Roy (2009) have argued for a postcolonial approach to urban studies that flattens hierarchies among cities and incorporates the experiences of diverse urban contexts into the generation of new theories of urbanity. In this context, there is a growing enthusiasm for comparison as a tool for challenging and rethinking established theories, as well as generating new concepts from locations previously marginalized in urban studies (McFarlane, 2010; Robinson, 2016). However, this body of scholarship has tended to highlight aspects of cities in the South that render them different from their OECD counterparts (Bhan, 2019; Lawhon & Truelove, 2019; Parnell & Robinson, 2012; Schindler, 2017; Simone, 2010). Indeed, it is the existence of these differences that justifies the very notion of ‘postcolonial’ or ‘Southern’ urban studies, yet the imperative to highlight difference has meant that postcolonial urban scholars have avoided interrogating phenomena that are typically associated with cities in the North Atlantic. In this paper deindustrialization is recognized as a common process occurring across the North and South, while also remaining sensitive to the importance of ‘historical difference’ in shaping how its varying trajectories manifest at the urban scale (Roy, 2016, p. 203).

By shifting the geographical focus of research on deindustrialization to the South, this paper speaks to ongoing debates in urban studies surrounding the comparability of cities (Peck, 2015; Roy, 2016; Scott & Storper, 2015). Deindustrialization in the Global South tends to appear in social science scholarship as a background context for other processes, such as urban transformation or the erosion of working conditions, rather than a phenomenon worth researching in its own right (Bremen’s, 2004, study of industrial decline in Ahmedabad is an important exception). For example, Harris (2008, p. 2421) finds that gentrification in Mumbai has occurred in the context of ‘local deindustrialisation processes’, such as the relocation of textile mills to the hinterland. Elsewhere, deindustrialization is portrayed as a precondition for widespread precarity in post-apartheid Johannesburg (Barchiesi, 2011) and

the *Zambian Copperbelt* (Ferguson, 1999). Meanwhile, the decline of state-owned enterprises in north-east China, and the disappearance of the basket of social benefits that they provided, serves as the basis for claims-making among retrenched workers (Kwan Lee, 2007). What remains unclear, however, is the extent to which these local episodes can generate novel insights into the variegated character of global deindustrialization processes. Rodrik's (2016) research provides a tantalizing clue. He notes that in contrast to deindustrialization in the OECD, deindustrialization in the South is not necessarily accompanied by increased productivity in the service sector. As the case of Brazil demonstrates, it can even be driven by a reprimarization of the economy as capital is disinvested from manufacturing and reinvested in the extraction of resources and agriculture (Gorenstein & Ortiz, 2018; Jenkins, 2015). Following Robinson's (2016, p. 20) encouragement to theorize from 'anywhere' the identification of these local variations raises an important question: How can cities in the Global South inform wider theoretical discussions of the impacts of deindustrialization at the urban scale? The case studies presented below speak to this question by showing how deindustrialization has unfolded in cities in India, Turkey, Tanzania and Argentina.

## CASE STUDIES OF DEINDUSTRIALIZATION

The series of case studies are situated at the intersection of deindustrialization studies and urban studies from India, Turkey, Tanzania and Argentina. Different methods were used in each case, such as the analysis of land-use planning documents, analysis of urban political economies and ethnography. Each case employs a lens that enables an appreciation of different aspects of deindustrialization as it unfolds in the Global South: the case of India demonstrates how the drivers and dynamics of deindustrialization can differ between cities even within the same country; the case of Turkey explores how the relationship between deindustrialization and urban transformation is mediated by national politics; the case of Tanzania highlights the impact of deindustrialization on labour, livelihoods and capabilities; and the case of Argentina draws attention to the importance of iterative processes of deindustrialization and reindustrialization for analysing the changing geography of cities beyond the North Atlantic. Taken together, they demonstrate that deindustrialization serves as a useful entry point for understanding the variegated nature of 21st century globalization and urbanization.

### Variegated deindustrialization in urban India

Much has been written about the liberalization of the Indian economy in 1991, and the impacts that this has had on urban regions (Ahluwalia, 2000; Shaw, 1999; Shaw & Satish, 2007). Following liberalization, public sector industries were seen as bureaucratic, inefficient and badly managed (Khanna, 2015), resulting in disinvestment and an imperative to attract investment from the private sector. In many Indian metros there has been a gradual dismantling and/or relocation of industrial infrastructure and manufacturing units. However, a full understanding of the drivers and implications of deindustrialization on urban space and residents requires looking beyond national-level data to study deindustrialization within specific cities. Here recent research in Mumbai and Bangalore was drawn upon to illustrate different techniques through which one can learn about the patterns, processes and implications of deindustrialization.

City-level economic and employment data demonstrate the extent of deindustrialization in Mumbai. Manufacturing's share in district GDP fell from 39.10% in 1993/94 to 25.04% in 2009/10, while that of services increased across the period from 59.64% to 73.94% (Pethe, Nallathiga, Gandhi, & Tandel, 2014). The city's employment structure has also experienced a parallel shift towards services. Manufacturing employment as a proportion of total



employment fell from 36.0% to 28.5% between 1980 and 1990, while in the same period the trade, finances and services sector increased from 52.1% to 64.3% (Banerjee-Guha, 2002).

Deindustrialization in Mumbai was orchestrated by governments at various scales in pursuit of a decades-old national policy commitment to relocate industries to underdeveloped areas beyond the city centre. This imperative accelerated after the political defeat of Mumbai's working class in the failed textile mill strike of 1982–83, and the emergence of a Indian urban regime that has been called the 'cabal city' (Heller, Mukhopadhyay, & Walton, 2016). The argument is that a cabal is a small group of actors who collude across state and market boundaries to maximize returns to scarce resources, and in this particular case their focus is on urban land. Logan and Molotch's (1988) 'growth machine' is geared towards the augmentation of land value 'subject to coherent governance and an overall economic logic' that results in growth that is 'sustainable and inclusive, if not equitable'. By contrast, the primary objective of the cabal is to extract land-centric rent through the management of spatial transformation. The drive to maximize the extraction of rent from urban land means that the development schemes they pursue are rarely aligned with long-term economic growth or competitiveness (Heller et al., 2016). Thus, officialdom in Mumbai and powerful elites in the private sector pursue urban development strategies that prioritize increasing the value of land in the short term, rather than establish the conditions for long-term economic prosperity or competitiveness.

Mumbai's cabal is enabled by increasing centralization of power in the state government and the disempowerment of local government, even as civil society is selectively empowered. Thus, key planning and policy decisions have become the domain of the Urban Development Department of the government of Maharashtra (Patel, 2015). The Chief Minister of Maharashtra, who is typically an elected representative of a distant rural constituency, also chairs key parastatals that determine redevelopment and infrastructure building initiatives, and ultimately wields greater power over the built environment in Mumbai than the elected municipal corporation. The vision for Mumbai's future that has guided urban development since the early 2000s has been the city's 'Shanghaification', to which both central and state governments were committed. These commitments emerged from the famous 'Vision Mumbai' document produced by McKinsey & Co. in 2003 at the request of Bombay First, a non-governmental organization (NGO) floated by the local business community in 1995, modelled on London First. Mumbai's manufacturing sector was to be relocated to the urban periphery, while the plan envisioned the tertiarization of the city centre.

In practice, the city's transformation is guided by instrumental concerns of those with the power to determine land use. Mumbai's cabal overrides the disciplinary logic and practice of 'technical planning' by trained professionals in state organizations, and instead it leverages 'sovereign planning' by fiat from the highest level of the subnational government (Krishnankutty, 2018). The resulting urbanism is marked by a tension between, on the one hand, an aspirational and discursive ideal that may be called 'engine urbanism' (Burte, 2016–17) and, on the other, the realized urbanism founded on land-centric rent extraction favouring the cabal. Indeed, it is through the transformation of urban space – that is, from derelict textile mills to gated communities – that rent is generated. However, urbanism founded on land-centric rent extraction favours a small elite whose strategic positions allow them to capture the revenue generated – formally and informally – by the transformation of the urban fabric (cf. Chattaraj & Walton, 2017; Nijman, 2000). An illustrative example is the 1996 intervention by the government of Maharashtra (of which Mumbai is the state capital) to override the municipal corporation's more equitable proposal for urban development, which allowed textile mill owners to retain land leased to them for industry and redevelop it for non-industrial purposes (Adarkar & Phatak, 2005). This enabled inequitable land rent extraction following deindustrialization, as industrial land was converted to real estate.

The repercussions of the cabal city are experienced in Mumbai in many forms: by its unsystematic urban development that favours land-rent extraction over other social or even capitalistic objectives; in its prioritization of interventions with short-term efficacy but long-term unsustainability that are implemented with scant local political oversight through parastatals: in the four years from 1997, for example, approximately 40 flyovers were built in the city, flying in the face of any transportation planning logic; in the opaque and often contradictory logic embraced by officials situated at various scales; in the splintering of classes and communities that has been deepened on the ground (Anand, 2006; Zérah, 2008); and in the violence it has enacted on the poor and in the scattered practices of coping and contestations that it has catalysed (Bhide, 2013; Burte & Kamath, 2017). The shift in priority from a model of urban development in which industry played a role, however small, in the city's economy, to a regime geared towards land-rent extraction means that sovereign planning in Mumbai has consisted of selective interventions largely designed to augment lucrative real estate and infrastructure projects that are necessarily out of the reach of the majority of the population, including retrenched workers, thereby deepening Mumbai's housing crisis. Meanwhile, pro-poor projects that may reduce inequalities, such as improvement of the uneven and inadequate water-supply systems and sanitation provision across the city, have been largely postponed or even ignored (Zérah, 2008) as they are less monetizable. For example, transportation planning has moved in the opposite direction from inclusive mobility through the rapid expansion of car-friendly road infrastructure (including a sea-link and an upcoming coastal road). This infrastructure has opened up new peri-urban lands for real estate development and also reinforced the centrality of the central business district (CBD) and South Mumbai, contradicting the state's own historical commitment to deconcentration.

Bangalore's economy exhibits a shift from industrial to post-industrial sectors reminiscent of processes played out in cities in the OECD. Municipal authorities are involved in the real estate sector (Goldman, 2011), but in contrast with Mumbai's cabal whose efforts are often at odds with stated planning objectives, their efforts to capture rents have complemented the city's very real shift to post-industrial sectors and its emergence as India's premiere high-tech hub. The impacts on the city's manufacturing base have been significant. An analysis of land use in Bangalore's spatial planning documents highlights a clear shift from public investment in manufacturing to private investment in services and real estate.

Industrial transformation has had a significant impact on Bangalore's urban form and the urban economy, visible through an analysis of successive master plans and changing land-use plans. Post-independence Bangalore's urban form was determined largely by the creation of five large public sector units (PSUs) that focused mainly on manufacturing for defence, national security and other sensitive industries. These industries not only are employers but also are industrial townships on the urban periphery that provided housing, schools, healthcare and other amenities to employees and their families. These PSUs encouraged the development of auxiliary micro-, small and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) throughout the city. As Bangalore's economy has become increasingly service oriented – primarily driven by information technology companies – its PSUs and MSMEs are gradually shutting down or moving out of the city. These shifts have had profound impacts on the city's built form. Large tracts of vacant former industrial land are increasingly being converted to high-end residential and/or commercial uses. One illustration of this is the case of the Hindustan Machine Tools (HMT) watch factory that was shut in 2016. The factory land has been parcelled into smaller units, with 10 acres converted into mixed-use real estate and 210 acres sold to the Indian Space Research Organization.

Analysis of land use of the 2004, 2015 and 2031 Bangalore master plans shows that land allocated to industrial use within the city's boundaries has been declining over the last two decades, with industrial land gradually being converted to (primarily) residential land (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Existing land use (ELU) and proposed land use (PLU) planning in Bangalore's master plans

Land use	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )			
	ELU, 2004	PLU, 2015	ELU, 2015	PLU, 2031
Residential	159.76	460.61	270.40	348.00
Commercial	13.37	19.04	29.60	12.44
<b>Industrial</b>	<b>58.80</b>	<b>98.22</b>	<b>41.13</b>	<b>35.13</b>
Open spaces and green parks	13.10	71.06	30.23	24.20
Water bodies	34.30	38.00	42.10	55.20
Agriculture	591.73	343.00	150.00	168.00
Public and semi-public space	53.50	46.00	60.00	72.00
Vacant land		85.20		
Transportation	42.56	25.00	46.50	
Defence	35.27	35.65	35.27	42.05

Analysis of specific parcels on the northern and eastern peripheries of Bangalore reveals that nearly 2500 hectares of industrial land has been converted primarily into residential use. Industries are being relocated to the urban periphery where Karnataka Industrial Areas Development Board (KIADB) land banks are being consolidated in ways that favour formal capital-intensive industrial production. These reallocations are consistent with broader national government plans to build industrial corridors and new industrial settlements, though it is unclear whether these settlements will house existing plants that are being relocated from within the city or new emerging industries. Initial analysis therefore indicates that manufacturing is declining within the city, particularly with reference to SMEs and the informal sector.

The current trend of dismantling industry and manufacturing in Bangalore seems to sit in contradiction with the national and regional governments' push to promote manufacturing and establish new industrial settlements throughout industrial corridors. Furthermore, it exacerbates a mismatch between the city's labour force and the kinds of investments that are being made as part of the new wave of urban development which favours capital-intensive high-tech industry and globally oriented information-technology enabled services. There is also a growing presence of global actors in the development of these new industrial settlements, as investors, developers as well as tenants, which has further implications for how peri-urban industrialization takes place.

The two case studies presented here indicate that deindustrialization can be driven by state disinvestment in manufacturing and industry, tied to a rebalancing of the economy towards finance and service sectors, and tied up in intricate – and informal – coalitions of rent-seeking state and non-state actors prioritizing profit over more equitable development. There is also a clear trend towards spatial transformation that is emerging in these cities that favours particular types of urban development, focusing largely on real estate development. It is increasingly apparent that deindustrialization in its current form will leave a legacy, because many urban residents will neither benefit from employment opportunities within the new economy nor be able to afford housing in redeveloped areas.

## State-coordinated urban transformation in Turkey

Turkish industry is highly competitive in some sectors, and its profile is increasingly shifting from low- to medium-skilled sectors (Hallward-Driemeier & Nayyar, 2018). However, as a percentage of GDP manufacturing peaked at 23% in 1989 and remained more or less constant until 1998 when it began to fall.<sup>2</sup> The downward trend continued until 2010 when manufacturing comprised 15% of GDP and it then began inching upwards. While Turkey's global share of manufacturing increased between 1994 and 2014, the share of manufacturing value-added in GDP decreased (Hallward-Driemeier & Nayyar, 2018). Government spending has sought to counter lagging demand, particularly since the coup attempt in 2016, and this has led to unsustainable levels of borrowing (OECD, 2018). The national government has channelled this money into the built environment, housing and infrastructure.

This section focuses on deindustrialization in Turkish cities in general, given the fact that state-coordinated efforts designed to catalyse urban transformation are situated at the national scale. Thus, while the reverberations of the Justice and Development Party's (AKP) ambitions are most evident in İstanbul (Kuyucu & Ünsal, 2010; Lovering & Türkmen, 2011), it is important to note that analogous processes are playing out in less dramatic fashion in Turkey's largest cities.

From the early 2000s onwards, public spending targeted infrastructure and housing projects, and this fostered a boom in the construction sector, which, as a percentage of GDP, increased from 11.5% in 2008 to 17.0% in 2017 (OECD, 2018). The centrality of the construction sector – which is often included in 'manufacturing' data – belies a broader shift in Turkey's political economy that favours urban transformation at the expense of manufacturing. Indeed, the rapid transformation of Turkish cities is a cornerstone of the ruling AKP's claim to legitimacy. Since coming to power in 2002 under the leadership of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan in the wake of an economic crisis, the AKP has consolidated a national development strategy geared towards urban transformation. Its claim to success rests on its ability to manage fundamental urban transformation across Turkey in ways that incorporate a diverse range of stakeholders. This national-led urban development strategy extends the promise of new forms of urban citizenship to conservative and poor populations in Anatolia, and especially to those in metropolitan cities who the AKP (and its predecessor, the National Vision Movement)<sup>3</sup> has claimed to be marginalized by the secular regime since the inception of the republic in 1923. Leaving behind the anti-West/globalization/neoliberalism attitude of its predecessor, the regime established by the AKP is anchored by a politics of hope whereby it speaks to the aspirations of Turkey's urban poor and the middle class, and extends the promise of what Brand and Wissen (2018) refer to as an 'imperial mode of living'.

The AKP's urban transformation strategy enjoyed broad-based support, and its power was rooted in the formation of a coalition after the 2002 elections that included the conservative urban poor, Anatolian bourgeoisie, political Islamists and Westward-looking secular middle class (Somel, 2011; Türkay, 2011). It was financed by an inflow of capital from global investors in the form of cheap bank credit (Balaban, 2011; Savran, 2013), which prioritized urban development schemes over investment in capital goods and manufacturing. The result was a booming urban property market that encouraged industrialists and other fractions of capital to invest in the (re)development of urban land. This regime is anchored by a carefully constructed notion of urban citizenship designed to appeal to populations that were marginalized before the AKP's rise to power. Rather than one's status as a waged labourer, membership in the political economy of Turkey's largest cities became based on property ownership, and for the first time, poor conservative populations were able to enter the formal real estate market en masse (Doğan, 2016; Karaman, 2013; Şengül, 2013). For this rather precarious population, the ownership of assets (e.g., real estate) offset the negative consequences of

deindustrialization, at least in the short term. The rents generated by Turkey's booming state-supported real estate market were distributed to the AKP's constituents through patronage networks, while the bourgeoisie was able to earn handsome profits through its connection to the construction sector (Doğan, 2016). Elsewhere the central government was directly involved in the production of housing (Balaban, 2012), and it established a delicate balancing act in which the proceeds of urban transformation were (re)distributed through negotiation among diverse actors at multiple scales (government ministries, municipalities, investors, residents, businesses, religious charities) (e.g., Bedirhanoğlu, 2015; Penpecioglu, 2016). Thus, in contrast to the traumatic effects of deindustrialization in the West (Strangleman & Rhodes, 2014), the AKP's urban strategy fostered deindustrialization, while simultaneously offering hitherto excluded sections of society a 'modern' urban (Islamic) lifestyle via newly built spaces of habitation and consumption (Bayırbağ & Penpecioglu, 2017).

The AKP's response to the global economic crisis of 2008 was to deepen and widen its efforts to transform urban areas, which was enabled further by quantitative easing and low interest rates in the United States and Europe. It was as if the AKP were riding a bicycle ever faster in order to maintain its balance, and the result was a deepening reliance on financialization of the urban built environment while manufacturers struggled as demand from world markets declined (Aalbers, 2013; cf. Akçay & Güngen, 2014, p. 200; Bayırbağ, 2013b). Slackening demand was offset by a dramatic increase in public spending on large-scale infrastructure projects, which initiated a wave of urban transformation projects across the country and opening of new areas for the construction sector (Kayasü & Yetişkul, 2014; Şengül, 2013; Topal, Yalman, & Çelik, 2019). The cracks in this regime began to show in the late 2000s as short-term gains were unable to offset the long-term costs of (1) excessive public spending, (2) prioritization of investment in the built environment over more productive sectors of the economy and (3) the controversial impacts of total urban transformation.<sup>4</sup> Thus, following the 2011 elections, the AKP's urban development regime increasingly relied on coercion rather than consent. It was apparent that Turkey's household and private-sector debt was unsustainable, and to this discontent was added the colonization of public and common spaces by construction firms friendly with the AKP.

Unrelenting pressure on public space in Turkish cities fostered a tense environment, and public anger exploded in İstanbul over the proposed redevelopment of Gezi Park in 2013 (Bayırbağ, 2013b; Gündoğdu, 2013; Şengül, 2015). Furthermore, Turkey's political and economic crises have mounted since the coup attempt in 2016, and the constitution and the politico-administrative system of the country have been radically altered to institutionalize authoritarianism in its aftermath. National politics play out at the urban scale given the centrality of the transformation of cities in the AKP's political platform. Given that the AKP emerged from a nationwide urban hegemonic project led by the National Vision Movement (Bayırbağ, 2013a), most of the major figures of the AKP first entered the national political arena in 1994 as mayors from the Welfare Party (most notably Erdoğan as Mayor of İstanbul). The AKP's candidates lost municipal elections in most metropolitan cities in 2019 (including their stronghold, İstanbul), and although it is too soon to tell whether this signals the beginning of the end of its grip on power at the national scale, it does seem to indicate that its regime of urban transformation has reached its limits. Any new model of development will likely require a concerted effort to reindustrialize Turkey's cities and rebalance manufacturing capacity vis-à-vis the construction sector.

The case of Turkey offers several lessons on the spatio-temporality of deindustrialization. First, this case demonstrates that urban transformation can act as a driving force, rather than simply an outcome, of deindustrialization. Whereas Smith (1979) and Marcuse (1985) found that deindustrialization in US inner cities created the conditions for subsequent processes of gentrification, Curran (2004) demonstrates that gentrification can also contribute to the

displacement of industry from urban areas. Similarly, deindustrialization in Turkey has occurred due to an influx of investment in the built environment, especially financial capital from abroad. Indeed, state-coordinated urban transformation in Turkey has been shown to trigger, or at least accelerate, deindustrialization. Second, the term ‘deindustrialization’ often refers to a historical rupture where industrialization is replaced by urbanization as a mode of wealth creation and (re)distribution. However, the example of Turkey indicates that it is important to detect continuities between those two moments of capitalism, and their coexistence takes the spatial form of heterogeneous geographies of accumulation, lending support to a point made by Henri Lefebvre that ‘so-called underdeveloped countries are now characterized by the fact that they undergo the rural, the industrial, and the urban simultaneously’ (Lefebvre, 2002, p. 32). Finally, departing from the caveat that ‘[i]t is crucial that we resist the temptation to explain urbanization as a straightforward manifestation of global capitalism’ (Schindler, 2017, p. 6), this case demonstrates the importance of accounting for the variegated ways in which global capitalism is translated by national political-economic regimes that are manifested in cities.

### Precarity, work and intergenerational tension in Tanzania

East Africa experienced an industrial boom in the decade following the Second World War, and Tanganyika (Tanganyika and Zanzibar established a union in 1964 and became Tanzania) was no exception, with its exports growing from £8.6 million to £48.3 million between 1945 and 1952 (Burton, 2005, p. 214). Tanzanian manufacturing was largely state owned, and most subsectors peaked in the early to mid-1970s (Coulson, 2013). The slowdown was caused by a combination of factors including mismanagement, drought and a costly war with Uganda, and by the early 1980s there was a full-blown crisis (Tripp, 1997). In spite of continued public investment, Tanzanian industry shrank by 11.2% in 1981 (Tripp, 1997), and by the late 1990s most large-scale textile mills had been closed (Government of Tanzania, 1996). Workers suffered tremendously during the crisis, as real wages fell by 83% between 1974 and 1988 (Tripp, 1997).

Industry in Tanzania was initially clustered almost exclusively along Pugu Road in Dar es Salaam, from where it expanded to other parts of the city and other cities (Iliffe, 1979). Several parastatals were established in Arusha and became national champions. Despite enjoying more reliable water and energy supply than their counterparts in Dar es Salaam, many did not survive the crisis (de Valk, 1996). Indeed, empty and derelict factories are testament to the scarcity of opportunities for Arusha’s working class. By 2012, only 12% of Arusha’s formal-sector workforce was employed in the manufacturing sector (National Bureau of Statistics (NBOS), 2015). Three key issues around the lingering effects of the economic crisis in Arusha are notable: its influence on youth livelihood outcomes; intergenerational tensions; and a deterioration of working terms and conditions. Arusha’s young men and women find themselves in increasingly competitive labour markets, rarely able to find stable work and reliant upon informal, irregular and insecure work opportunities. While young people constitute nearly half of Arusha city’s population, they are overrepresented in unemployment rates. These stand at 8.4% for young people and 3.3% for adults (NBOS, 2016). In the disadvantaged ward where the present research took place, rates of youth unemployment were significantly higher: 37% and 53% for young men and women, respectively (Banks, 2016).

This has serious implications for sociality and livelihoods. Work is key to social acceptance and recognition, allowing young people to achieve other important cultural markers of adulthood: getting married, establishing their own house, having children and becoming recognized as legitimate citizens. Land ownership and the establishment of a family have served as avenues to respectability in Tanzania, yet these are unattainable by the youth who lack stable livelihoods. Youth under- and unemployment has also fuelled

widespread stereotypes of young people as criminals, or '*wahuni*' in Swahili (Burton, 2005), further limiting the institutional support afforded to them from the community. Households in this disadvantaged ward traditionally stop supporting their young people after finishing school. Where they cannot find work to meet their needs, assumptions are made that they must be supporting themselves through crime, including theft and prostitution.

The inability of parents and elders to help young people navigate this precarious labour market exacerbates these impacts. Many made the transition to adulthood in the 'golden age' of Arusha's industrial past. Community leaders spoke of how it was 'easy and smooth' to get a job before all the factories closed. While small business was still a preferred form of work, large numbers were employed in factories, and this fuelled a thriving local economy. Limited opportunities for wage labour and widespread poverty have left parents ill-equipped to guide their children in these challenging labour markets. Parents had put their faith in the education system, hoping that it would equip their children with labour market-relevant skills and knowledge. However, amidst large youth populations and tight labour markets, the payoffs from education are ambiguous. Intergenerational tensions emerge as young people are frustrated that their parents have not provided them with the guidance, education or skills investment they can use to find gainful employment. Meanwhile, parents claim that un(der)employed youth are distracted by leisure opportunities offered by the city and 'stop listening'. They interpret this as a rejection of traditional values, further exacerbating tensions. Local leaders said that young people have 'chosen globalization to be their parents' so that they can 'copy and paste' the lives they admire further afield.

This large-scale shortage of jobs also has repercussions on the wages and working conditions of remaining factory work. Factory work is far from a desirable job for young people, who voice concerns around the low pay, the arduous work, the long hours and its impacts on health. One young man who had to leave a job at a cement factory due to respiratory problems explained that once you have left for a 'personal problem' a factory will not take you back. Not only are wages low but also young people tend to be offered short-term contracts and are paid less than their senior colleagues. After seeing multiple older workers being recruited onto permanent contracts over the two years he had worked at a factory, one young man got together with some friends to ask the manager why their positions remain tenuous and impermanent. The manager took umbrage and they were sacked. Despite repeated attempts to secure compensation through formal channels, they were unsuccessful. 'We saw such pain in having to fight for it,' the young man stated, 'but we wanted to know why they were not treating us like human beings.' Amidst the scarcity of formal-sector work, there is little incentive for employers to offer better working conditions or more stable contracts. Where one young person is unhappy with their conditions, another will be willing to take his or her place. Indeed, each week on the recruitment day of one of Arusha's few remaining factories, large crowds wait outside factory gates in the hope they will be selected. As one young man explained, 'There may be 10 or 15 getting in on a good day, but there will be 70 people waiting at the gate!' Thus, deindustrialization has not only disrupted social reproduction but also resulted in intergenerational conflict and rivalry.

Processes of deindustrialization have fundamentally changed the economic and social landscape of Arusha. The oversupply of youth labour in combination with its stagnant labour market has resulted in insecure and exploitative working conditions. While the social and cultural changes accompanying urbanization are not driven solely by deindustrialization, the widespread poverty and insecurity left in its wake has exacerbated social problems and limited the ability of parents and elders to support young people. Frustrations, limited ambitions and a 'transitional limbo' characterize the experience of youth in Arusha.

## Crisis and contested deindustrialization in Argentina

One of the first countries in the Global South to experience large-scale industrial development, Argentina also constitutes a significant case of premature deindustrialization (Castillo & Martins Neto, 2016). Argentina has a long history of industrial decline interspersed with periods of reindustrialization (Basualdo, 2001; Cohen, 2012; Waisman, 1987). Cycles of de- and re-industrialization have been closely related to the national development strategies pursued by successive Argentinian governments in the latter half of the 20th century (Rock, 2002). Import substitution under successive post-war governments gave way to export-oriented industrial growth under Carlos Menem in the 1990s (Cohen, 2012; Waisman, 1987). This chapter of Argentine history ended with one of the most severe economic crises recorded in recent history (Epstein & Pion-Berlin, 2006; Varesi, 2010). Between 2003 and 2015, Nestor and Cristina Kirchner cultivated a demand-driven recovery of industry by protecting local industries and workers from global competition and subsidizing domestic consumption. In addition to these shifts in trade and industrial policy, successive governments have responded to deindustrialization by incentivizing speculative investments in urban-based sectors such as property development, consumer services and the creative industries. As a result, Argentina's largest cities have been transformed into mosaics of socioeconomic inequality, characterized by fragmented land-use and chaotic territorial governance regimes.

These trends are particularly evident in the Buenos Aires Metropolitan Region, Argentina's largest demographic and industrial agglomeration with over 15 million residents. An extensive literature in the interdisciplinary field of urban studies documents the socio-spatial changes that emerged during the last military dictatorship (1976–83) and accelerated during the long neoliberal decade of the 1990s (1989–2001) (DuBois, 2005; Janoschka, 2002; Silvestri & Gorelik, 2000). Scholars have documented how the industrial metropolis associated with post-war Argentine developmentalism was transformed into an unevenly globalized post-industrial city-region characterized by large swaths of derelict and environmentally degraded industrial space, bubbles of luxury real estate development and concentrations of long-term unemployed workers in informally built and underserved neighbourhoods (Janoschka, 2002; Kanai, 2011; Prevot Schapira, 2002; Svampa & Pereyra, 2003; Torres, 2001).

Argentina is once again experiencing a major economic crisis that threatens to reverse the industrial gains made in the long decade of Kirchnerism following the neoliberal debacle. Although industry benefited from increased domestic demand during the protectionist Kirchner years, export commodities such as soy crops were the primary driver of national economic growth. As such, the Kirchners' development strategy failed to establish the conditions for more sustainable and inclusive manufacturing growth (Teubal & Palmisano, 2015). Furthermore, economic recovery was cut short by the imposition of a new programme of economic liberalization and conservative policy reforms under President Mauricio Macri (2016–19), whose administration aspired to establish a new model of accumulation with a set of policies including the lifting of previous currency exchange controls, economic deregulation and fiscal reform. The intention of this model was to integrate the Argentine economy more thoroughly, and not only through primary exports, into global value chains. While the foreign investments that the Macri government sought to attract have failed to materialize, Argentina is once again on the brink of economic crisis and experiencing deindustrialization (Natanson, 2019). Particularly hard hit are the SMEs located in metropolitan Buenos Aires that serve the domestic market and face shrinking aggregate demand.

The deepening transnationalization of Argentina during the Macri years may not have ushered in an era of investment-driven industrial competitiveness and innovation, but it did have important implications for the geography of metropolitan Buenos Aires. One dimension of Macri's strategy to attract foreign investment featured infrastructure upgrading, particularly



focused on the transport and energy sectors. In fact, during its temporary presidency of the G20, Argentina identified infrastructure investments as one of the overarching aims for the year's agenda. Thereby, the country sought to participate in the emerging global model of infrastructure-led development and capture some of the North to South capital flows focused on infrastructure projects (Kanai & Schindler, 2019; Schindler & Kanai, 2019). In Buenos Aires, this has translated into a thorough revamping of logistics connectivity. The city's single largest infrastructure project is a controversial US\$700 million underground roadway corridor stretching 7 km, and linking the southern and northern highways with the city centre (Vallejos, 2017). While industrial parks in outer-ring suburbs are likely to benefit from improved connectivity with the city's port, disused factories and other industrial spaces in the central city and inner suburbs have either been redeveloped for commercial and residential uses or simply left derelict (Dinardi, 2019).

Macri's defeat in the October 2019 elections may signal a return to more protectionist approach reminiscent of the Kircher era. It is also important to recognize that the model described above has provoked grassroots contestation. For example, popular struggles against deindustrialization have animated worker-led occupations of shuttered factories and the establishment of democratically managed cooperatives. Furthermore, an urban environmental movement has emerged to demand state action to address the hazards that the city's residents face as a result of inadequately regulated industrial production, such as exposure to floods and air pollution (Abrutzky, Dawidowski, Murgida, & Natenzon, 2014; Auyero & Swistun, 2009). Proposals to improve environmental conditions through, for example, increasing the amount of green/blue infrastructure in the city envision abandoned industrial spaces as opportunity areas to implement such innovations. In this sense, Buenos Aires is not only an important case study to analyse the drivers and consequences of deindustrialization in Latin America but also a site from which to learn how grassroots' mobilization could lead to the realization of more-just and more-than-industrial urban futures.

## CONCLUSIONS

The diverse cases discussed in this paper illustrate that processes of deindustrialization have significantly different influences on the geography and political economy of cities in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East. As such, it demonstrates that there is a pressing need for researchers to pay greater attention to the relationship between deindustrialization and urban transformation in cities of the Global South. This research can make a significant contribution to the ongoing project to shift the focus of urban studies away from a small number of privileged cities in the North (Roy, 2009). Indeed, by exploring the urban dynamics of deindustrialization outside of cities traditionally understood as 'post-industrial', this research on cities in the South has the potential to disrupt outmoded epistemological distinctions between 'modern' and 'developing' cities (Robinson, 2006). In the process, it can build on the comparative turn in urban research in order to question and rethink established urban theories, and to generate new theoretical accounts in the process (McFarlane, 2010; Robinson, 2016).

Although a systematic comparison is beyond the scope of this paper, when taken together, the cases indicate several fruitful avenues for future research. First, the case of India illustrates that the relationship between deindustrialization and urban development can vary between cities within the same country. While both Mumbai and Bangalore have undergone what Shatkin (2016) refers to as a 'real estate turn', Mumbai's is driven by a cabal, while Bangalore's transformation is underpinned by an unmistakable shift to a post-industrial economy. Second, the paper indicates the need for comparative research to explore the variegated relationship between economic change and urban transformation in different cities, both across the South and between OECD and Southern cities. Although the deindustrialization of US cities often

precipitated urban processes of capital reinvestment and gentrification (Marcuse, 1985; Smith, 1996), the case of Turkey indicates that investment in the built environment may in some instances precipitate industrial decline (although see Curran, 2004, for a similar phenomenon in the United States). As such, a more globally oriented deindustrialization studies can contribute new insights into the relationship between primary and secondary circuits of capital in particular urban contexts (Shin, 2014).

The relationship between processes of deindustrialization and dynamics of social inclusion/exclusion is not predetermined and will be contingent on the political-economic dynamics of specific urban contexts. Whereas deindustrialization in Tanzania has contributed to the exclusion of young people from formal wage labour, the AKP's regime of urban citizenship in Turkey demonstrates that its shift of emphasis from industrialization to urbanization can potentially be mobilized to create new forms of inclusion on the basis of asset ownership. Further research should explore whether new modes of citizenship are emerging in contexts where participation in the formal labour force is no longer a realistic aspiration (Ferguson, 2015), and where urbanization is likely to proceed without significant industrialization. Finally, the case of Argentina demonstrates that deindustrialization – and periods of reindustrialization – is a process that can be contested and subverted. In Buenos Aires there is a history of contestation, as with the occupied factories movement and more recent environmental movements. As such, future scholarship on the urban politics of deindustrialization should attend to the agency of city dwellers who may not necessarily be workers and the emergence of new sites of value creation and struggle. For example, Gago (2017) showed how a market on the periphery of Buenos Aires where land ownership was indeterminate became a hive of transnational economic activity that allowed many retrenched workers to create and capture value during the 2001 crisis. The cases discussed in the present paper indicate possible methodological avenues for researching deindustrialization at the urban scale, including: political-economic analysis to understand how state actors have sought to respond to and shape processes of economic change; analysis of spatial planning documents and remote sensing to track changes in the built environment over time; and ethnographic methods to understand city dwellers' lived experience of deindustrialization.

In conclusion, scholarship on deindustrialization has become thematically and theoretically sophisticated, yet it has failed to keep up with the 21st century's evolving geography of deindustrialization. Meanwhile, urban scholars have begun to craft a body of scholarship focused on the novelty of urban processes in the Global South, in the world's largest and most dynamic cities. However, this scholarship has paid insufficient attention to deindustrialization. In this paper, initial steps have been taken to bridge these two bodies of scholarship. Hopefully, future research will build on this paper to create a more globally oriented deindustrialization studies.

## DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## FUNDING

This work was supported by the British Academy [grant number NAF2R2\100172]; the Economic and Social Research Council [grant numbers ES/K009729/1 and ES/R008159/1]; the Development Studies Association (travel bursaries); and UK Research and Innovation [grant number ES/P011055/1].

## NOTES

1. US policy differed significantly in the so-called ‘Third World’ where it tasked military-led counterinsurgency states with ‘modernization’ (Simpson, 2008).
2. See <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NV.IND.MANF.ZS?locations=TR>.
3. The National Vision Movement (Milli Görüş Hareketi) dates from the late 1960s. Thanks to their hegemonic discourse and strategy targeting those ‘excluded’ by the secular regime and the post-1980 neoliberal policies, they captured the major metropolitan municipalities in 1994, when the leader of the AKP, Erdoğan, was elected the mayor of İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality. The AKP was founded in 2001 as a splinter party by the ‘reformist’ wing of the movement (Bayırbağ, 2013a).
4. For a detailed discussion of the destructive impact of this strategy on the urban poor in İstanbul, see Karaman and Islam (2012), Kuyucu and Ünsal (2010) and Lovering and Türkmen (2011); and for the urban poor in İzmir, see Demirtaş-Milz (2013). For its broader impact in the form of increasing household indebtedness in Turkey, see Ergüder (2015).

## REFERENCES

- Aalbers, M. B. (2013). Neoliberalism is dead ... Long live neoliberalism! *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(3), 1083–1090.
- Abrutzky, R., Dawidowski, L., Murgida, A., & Natenzon, C. E. (2014). Contaminación del aire en la Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires: El riesgo de hoy o el cambio climático futuro, una falsa opción. *Ciència & Saúde Coletiva*, 19(9), 3763–3773.
- Adarkar, N., & Phatak, V. K. (2005). Recycling mill land: Tumultuous experience of Mumbai. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 40(51), 5365–5368.
- Adas, M. (2006). *Dominance by design: Technological imperatives and America's civilizing mission*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ahluwalia, M. S. (2000). Economic performance of states in the post-reforms period. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 35(19), 1637–1648.
- Akçay, Ü., & Güngen, A. R. (2014). *Finansallaşma, Borç Krizi ve Çöküş: Küresel Kapitalizmin Geleceği*. Ankara: NotaBene.
- Anand, N. (2006). Disconnecting experience: Making world-class roads in Mumbai. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 41(31), 3422–3429.
- Auyero, J., & Swistun, D. A. (2009). *Flammable: Environmental suffering in an Argentine shantytown*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Balaban, O. (2011). İnşaat Sektörü Neyin Lokomotif? *Birikim*, 270, 19–26.
- Balaban, O. (2012). The negative effects of construction boom on urban planning and environment in Turkey: Unraveling the role of the public sector. *Habitat International*, 36(1), 26–35.
- Baldwin, R. (2016). *The great convergence: Information technology and the new globalization*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap of Harvard University Press.
- Banerjee-Guha, S. (2002). Shifting cities: Urban restructuring in Mumbai. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 37(2), 121–128.
- Banks, N. (2016). Youth poverty, employment and livelihoods: Social and economic implications of living with insecurity in Arusha, Tanzania. *Environment and Urbanization*, 28(2), 437–454.
- Barchiesi, F. (2011). *Precarious liberation: Workers, the state, and contested social citizenship in postapartheid South Africa*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Basualdo, E. M. (2001). *Sistema político y modelo de acumulación en la Argentina*. Universidad Nacional de Quilmes Ediciones. Bernal, Argentina: Universidad Nacional de Quilmes Ediciones.

- Bayırbağ, M. K. (2013a). Continuity and change in public policy: Redistribution, exclusion and state rescaling in Turkey. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(4), 1123–1146.
- Bayırbağ, M. K. (2013b). 'Homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto': Kurtuluş yok tek başına! *Praksis*, 7(16), 7–16.
- Bayırbağ, M. K. (2017). Kentsel Politika Planlaması. In S. S. Özdemir, B. Özdemir-Sarı, & N. Uzun (Eds.), *Kent Planlamaya Giriş* (pp. 427–452). Ankara, Turkey: Imge.
- Bayırbağ, M. K., & Penpecioglu, M. (2017). Urban crisis: Limits to governance of alienation. *Urban Studies*, 54(9), 2056–2071.
- Bedirhanoğlu, P. (2015). Corruption and state under the AKP rule in Turkey: Retreat from the modern bourgeois state? *Research Turke*. Retrieved from <http://researchturkey.org/corruption-and-state-under-the-akp-rule-in-turkey-retreat-from-the-modern-bourgeois-state/>
- Bhan, G. (2019). Notes on a Southern urban practice. *Environment and Urbanization*, 31, 639–654.
- Bhide, A. (2013). *The city produced: Urban development, violence and spatial justice in Mumbai*. Mumbai: Centre for Urban Policy and Governance, TISS.
- Bluestone, B., & Harrison, B. (1980). *Capital and communities: The causes and consequences of private disinvestment*. Washington, DC: Progressive Alliance.
- Bluestone, B., & Harrison, B. (1982). *The deindustrialization of America: Plant closings, community abandonment, and the dismantling of basic industry*. New York: Basic.
- Brand, U., & Wissen, M. (2018). *The limits to capitalist nature*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bremen, J. (2004). *The making and unmaking of an industrial working class: Sliding down the labour hierarchy in Ahmedabad, India*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Burte, H. (2016–17). Engine urbanism. *India International Centre Quarterly*, 43(3–4), 199–209.
- Burte, H., & Kamath, L. (2017). The violence of worlding: Producing space in neo-liberal Durban, Mumbai and Rio de Janeiro. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 52(7), 66–74.
- Burton, A. (2005). *African underclass: Urbanisation, crime and colonial order in Dar es Salaam, 1919–1961*. Oxford: James Currey.
- Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the network society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Castillo, M., & Martins Neto, A. (2016). *Premature deindustrialization in Latin America*. Production Development Series (205). Santiago de Chile: UN-ECLAC.
- Chattaraj, S., & Walton, M. (2017). Functional dysfunction: Mumbai's political economy of rent sharing. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 33(3), 438–456.
- Cohen, M. A. (2012). *Argentina's economic growth and recovery: The economy in a time of default*. New York: Routledge.
- Coulson, A. (2013). *Tanzania: A political economy (second edition)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cowie, J., & Heathcott, J. (2003). *Beyond the ruins: The meanings of deindustrialization*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Curran, W. (2004). Gentrification and the nature of work: Exploring the links in Williamsburg, Brooklyn. *Environment and Planning A*, 36(7), 1243–1258.
- Davidson, M., & Lees, L. (2005). New-build 'gentrification' and London's riverside renaissance. *Environment and Planning A*, 37(7), 1165–1190.
- de Valk, P. (1996). *African industry in decline: The case of textiles in Tanzania in the 1980s*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.
- Demirtaş-Milz, N. (2013). The regime of informality in neoliberal times in Turkey: The case of the Kadifekale urban transformation project. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(2), 689–714.
- Dicken, P. (2015). *Global shift, seventh edition: Mapping the changing contours of the world economy*. New York: Guilford.
- Dinardi, C. (2019). Grassroots creative hubs: Urban regeneration, recovered industrial factories and cultural production in Buenos Aires and Rio de Janeiro. In R. Gill, A. C. Pratt, & T. E. Virani (Eds.), *Creative hubs in question* (pp. 299–317). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Doğan, S. (2016). *Maballedeki AKP*. İstanbul: İletişim.

- DuBois, L. (2005). *The politics of the past in an Argentine working-class neighbourhood*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ekbladh, D. (2009). *The great American mission: Modernization and the construction of an American world order*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Epstein, E., & Pion-Berlin, D. (2006). *Broken promises?: The Argentine crisis and Argentine democracy*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Ergüder, B. (2015). 2000'li Yıllarda Türkiye'de Hanehalkı Borçlanması: Konut Kredileri ve Toplumsal Refah. *Praksis*, 38, 99–128.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1996). After the golden age?: Welfare state dilemmas in a global economy. In G. Esping-Andersen (Ed.), *Welfare states in transition: National adaptations in global economies* (pp. 1–31). London: Sage.
- Ferguson, J. (1999). *Expectations of modernity: Myths and meanings of urban life on the Zambian Copperbelt*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ferguson, J. (2015). *Give a man a fish: Reflections on the new politics of distribution*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Fröbel, F., Heinrichs, J., & Kreye, O. (1980). *The new international division of labour: Structural unemployment in industrialised countries and industrialisation in developing countries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gago, V. (2017). *Neoliberalism from below: Popular pragmatics and baroque economies*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Gereffi, G., & Korzeniewicz, M. (1994). *Commodity chains and global capitalism*. London: Praeger.
- Ghertner, A. (2015). Why gentrification theory fails in 'much of the world'. *City*, 19(4), 552–563.
- Goldman, M. (2011). Speculative urbanism and the making of the next world city. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 35(3), 555–581. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2010.01001.x
- Gorenstein, S., & Ortiz, R. (2018). Natural resources and primary sector-dependent territories in Latin America. *Area Development and Policy*, 3(1), 42–59.
- Government of Tanzania. (1996). Sustainable industries development policy (1996–2020). Dar es Salaam: Ministry of Industry and Trade.
- Gündoğdu, İ. (2013). Haziran isyanının iki temel dinamiği üzerine. *Praksis*, 7(16), 35–44.
- Hallward-Driemeier, M., & Nayyar, G. (2018). *Trouble in the making?: The future of manufacturing-led development*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. doi:10.1596/978-1-4648-1174-6
- Harris, A. (2008). From London to Mumbai and back again: Gentrification and public policy in comparative perspective. *Urban Studies*, 45(12), 2407–2428.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The condition of postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hassink, R., Hu, X., Shin, D.-H., Yamamura, S., & Gong, H. (2018). The restructuring of old industrial areas in East Asia. *Area Development and Policy*, 3(2), 185–202.
- Heller, P., Mukhopadhyay, P., & Walton, M. (2016). *Cabal city: Regime theory and Indian urbanization*. Providence, Rhode Island: The Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs, Brown University.
- High, S., & Lewis, D. W. (2007). *Corporate wasteland: The landscape and memory of deindustrialization*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- High, S., MacKinnon, L., & Perchard, A. (2017). *The deindustrialized world: Confronting ruin in postindustrial places*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Iiffe, J. (1979). *A modern history of Tanganyika*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511584114
- Janoschka, M. (2002). El nuevo modelo de la ciudad latinoamericana: Fragmentación y privatización. *Eure (Santiago)*, 28(85), 11–20.
- Jenkins, R. (2015). Is Chinese competition causing deindustrialization in Brazil? *Latin American Perspectives*, 42(6), 42–63. doi:10.1177/0094582X15593553
- Kanai, J. M. (2011). Barrio resurgence in Buenos Aires: Local-autonomy claims amid state-sponsored transnationalism. *Political Geography*, 30(4), 225–235.

- Kanai, J. M., & Schindler, S. (2019). Peri-urban promises of connectivity: Linking project-led polycentrism to the infrastructure scramble. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 51(2), 302–322.
- Karaman, O. (2013). Urban renewal in Istanbul: Reconfigured spaces, robotic lives. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(2), 715–733.
- Karaman, O., & Islam, T. (2012). On the dual nature of intra-urban borders: The case of a Romani neighborhood in Istanbul. *Cities*, 29, 234–243.
- Kayasü, S., & Yetişkul, E. (2014). Evolving legal and institutional frameworks of neoliberal urban policies in Turkey. *Metu İfa*, 31(2), 209–222.
- Khanna, S. (2015). The transformation of India's public sector: Political economy of growth and change. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 50(5), 47–60.
- Krishnankutty, M. (2018). Fragmentary planning and spaces of opportunity in peri-urban Mumbai. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 53(12), 68–75.
- Kuyucu, T., & Ünsal, Ö. (2010). 'Urban transformation' as state-led property transfer: An analysis of two cases of urban renewal in Istanbul. *Urban Studies*, 47(7), 1479–1499.
- Kwan Lee, C. (2007). *Against the law: Labor protests in China's rustbelt and sunbelt*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lawhon, M., & Truelove, Y. (2019). Disambiguating the southern urban critique: Propositions, pathways and possibilities for a more global urban studies. *Urban Studies*, 57, 3–20
- Lefebvre, H. (2002). *The urban revolution*. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.
- Leys, C. (1996). *The rise and fall of development theory*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Linkon, S. L. (2018). *The half-life of deindustrialization: Working-class writing about economic restructuring*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Logan, J. R., & Molotch, H. L. (1988). *Urban fortunes: The political economy of place*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lovering, J., & Türkmen, H. (2011). Bulldozer neo-liberalism in Istanbul: The state-led construction of property markets, and the displacement of the urban poor. *International Planning Studies*, 16(1), 73–96.
- Mah, A. (2012). *Industrial ruin, community and place: Landscapes and legacies of urban decline*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Marcuse, P. (1985). Gentrification, abandonment, and displacement: Connections, causes, and policy responses in New York City. *Wash. UJ Urb. & Contemp. L.*, 28, 195–2540.
- McFarlane, C. (2010). The comparative city: Knowledge, learning, urbanism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 34(4), 725–742.
- Natanson, J. (2019). Argentina en su laberinto. *Andlisis Carolina*, 4. Retrieved from <https://www.fundacioncarolina.es/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/AC-4-Natanson.pdf>
- National Bureau of Statistics (NBOS). (2015). *Integrated labour force survey 2014: Analytical report*. Dar es Salaam: The National Bureau of Statistics.
- National Bureau of Statistics (NBOS). (2016). *Arusha region: Basic demographic and socioeconomic profile, 2012 population and housing census*. Dar es Salaam: The National Bureau of Statistics.
- Nijman, J. (2000). Mumbai's real estate market in 1990s: De-regulation, global money and casino capitalism. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 35(7), 575–582.
- OECD (2018). Economic Surveys: Turkey. Retrieved from the OECD website: <http://www.oecd.org/economy/surveys/Turkey-2018-OECD-economic-survey-overview.pdf>
- Parnell, S., & Robinson, J. (2012). (Re)theorizing cities from the Global South: Looking beyond neoliberalism. *Urban Geography*, 33(4), 593–617.
- Patel, S. B. (2015). When planning becomes a ritual. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 50(21), 16–19.
- Peck, J. (2015). Cities beyond compare? *Regional Studies*, 49(1), 160–182.
- Penpecioglu, M. (2016). Urban development projects and the construction of neo-liberal urban hegemony: The case of Izmir. *METU Journal of Faculty of Architecture*, 30(1), 165–189.
- Pethe, A., Nallathiga, R., Gandhi, S., & Tandel, V. (2014). Re-thinking urban planning in India: Learning from the wedge between the de jure and de facto development in Mumbai. *Cities*, 39, 120–132.

- Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Cambridge: Belknap of Harvard University Press.
- Piore, M., & Sabel, C. (1984). *The second industrial divide: Possibilities for prosperity*. New York: Basic.
- Prevot Schapira, M. F. (2002). Buenos Aires en los años 90: Metropolización y desigualdades. *EURE (Santiago)*, 28(85), 31–50.
- Robinson, J. (2006). *Ordinary cities: Between modernity and development*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Robinson, J. (2016). Thinking cities through elsewhere: Comparative tactics for a more global urban studies. *Progress in Human Geography*, 40(1), 3–29.
- Rock, D. (2002). Racking Argentina. *New Left Review*, 17, 55–86.
- Rodrik, D. (2016). Premature deindustrialization. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 21(1), 1–33.
- Roy, A. (2009). The 21st-century metropolis: New geographies of theory. *Regional Studies*, 43(6), 819–830.
- Roy, A. (2016). Who's afraid of postcolonial theory? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 40(1), 200–209.
- Savran, S. (2013). *Üçüncü Büyük Depresyon: Kapitalizmin Alacakaranlığı*. İstanbul: Yordam Kitap.
- Schindler, S. (2017). Towards a paradigm of Southern urbanism. *City*, 21(1), 47–64.
- Schindler, S., & Kanai, J. M. (2019). Getting the territory right: Infrastructure-led development and the re-emergence of spatial planning strategies. *Regional Studies*, 1–12. doi:10.1080/00343404.2019.1661984
- Scott, A. J., & Storper, M. (2015). The nature of cities: The scope and limits of urban theory. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39(1), 1–15.
- Şengül, H. T. (2013). Kentsel dönüşümün güncel tarihi: Distopya ve ütopya (Tarık Şengül ile mülakat). *Bir +Bir*, 21, 20–26.
- Şengül, H. T. (2015). Gezi Başkaldırısı Ertesinde Kent Mekanı ve Siyasal Alanın Yeni Dinamikleri. *Metu Jfa*, 32(1), 1–20.
- Shatkin, G. (2016). *The real estate turn in policy and planning: Land monetization and the political economy of peri-urbanization in Asia* (Vol. 53 doi:10.1016/j.cities.2015.11.015). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Shaw, A. (1999). Emerging patterns of urban growth in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 34(16–17), 969–978.
- Shaw, A., & Satish, M. K. (2007). Metropolitan restructuring in post-liberalized India: Separating the global and the local. *Cities*, 24(2), 148–163.
- Shin, H. B. (2014). Contesting speculative urbanisation and strategising discontents. *City*, 18(4–5), 509–516.
- Silvestri, G., & Gorelik, A. (2000). Ciudad y Cultura Urbana 1976–1999: El fin de la expansión. In J. L. Romero & L. A. Romero (Eds.), *Buenos Aires, historia de cuatro siglos, Tomo 2* (pp. 523–547). Buenos Aires: Altamira.
- Simone, A. (2010). *City life from Jakarta to Dakar: City life at the crossroads*. London: Routledge.
- Simpson, B. R. (2008). *Economists with guns: Authoritarian development and U.S.–Indonesian relations, 1960–1968*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Smith, N. (1979). Toward a theory of gentrification: A back to the city movement by capital, not people. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 45(4), 538–548.
- Smith, N. (1996). *The new urban frontier: Gentrification and the revanchist city*. New York: Routledge.
- Somel, C. (2011). Son dönem kalkınma tartışmaları: Değişen dünya, değişen paradigmlar. *İktisat Dergisi*, 519, 5–46.
- Storper, M., & Walker, R. (1989). *The capitalist imperative: Territory, technology, and industrial growth*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Strangleman, T., & Rhodes, J. (2014). The 'new' sociology of deindustrialisation? Understanding industrial change. *Sociology Compass*, 8(4), 411–421.
- Svampa, M., & Pereyra, S. (2003). *Entre la ruta y el barrio. La experiencia de las organizaciones piqueteras*. Buenos Aires: Biblos.
- Teubal, M., & Palmisano, T. (2015). ¿Hacia la reprimarización de la economía? En torno del modelo extractivo en la posconvertibilidad. Instituto Argentino para el Desarrollo Económico. *Realidad Económica*, 296, 55–75.
- Topal, A., Yalman, G. L., & Çelik, Ö. (2019). Changing modalities of urban redevelopment and housing finance in Turkey: Three mass housing projects in Ankara. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 41(5), 630–653.

- Torres, H. A. (2001). Cambios socioterritoriales en Buenos Aires durante la década de 1990. *Eure (Santiago)*, 27(80), 33–56.
- Tripp, A.M. (1997). *Changing the rules: The politics of liberalization and the urban informal economy in Tanzania*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Türkey, M. (2011). Son dönem kalkınma tartışmaları: Değişen dünya, değişen paradigmlar. *İktisat Dergisi*, 519, 5–46.
- Vallejos, S. (2017). Un proyecto nacido viejo: Críticas al Paseo del Bajo y su parque. *Página 12*. Retrieved from <https://www.pagina12.com.ar/16856-un-proyecto-nacido-viejo>
- Varesi, G. Á. (2010). La Argentina posconvertibilidad: Modelo de acumulación. *Problemas del desarrollo*, 41 (161), 141–164.
- Wacquant, L. (2008). *Urban outcasts: A comparative sociology of advanced marginality*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Waisman, C. H. (1987). *Reversal of development in Argentina: Postwar counterrevolutionary policies and their structural consequences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Zérah, M.-H. (2008). Splintering urbanism in Mumbai: Contrasting trends in a multilayered society. *Geoforum*, 39, 1922–1932.