

DEINDUSTRIALIZATION X REINDUSTRIALIZATION: FORMS, SCALES, AND AGENDAS IN CONTEMPORARY CITIES

Eduardo A. C. Nobre

Faculdade de Arquitetura e Urbanismo da Universidade de São Paulo | eacnobre@usp.br

Resumo Geral: No início do século XXI, a crescente submissão da produção industrial à lógica do Capitalismo Financeiro trouxe de volta o debate sobre as questões da industrialização tanto no Norte quanto no Sul Global. Desde o início da globalização na década de 1980, a abordagem neoliberal dos governos tem incentivado tanto o desenvolvimento de um sistema de produção controlado por corporações transnacionais monopolistas, quanto a crescente financeirização dos espaços urbanos, resultando em processos de desindustrialização. Esses processos ocorreram primeiro nos países de alta renda, mas recentemente se tornaram relevantes também nos países de média renda. As ameaças representadas pelas crises recentes (ambiental, política, social e sanitária) fizeram com que os governos contivessem sua postura neoliberal, adotando políticas públicas de apoio à reindustrialização. O objetivo desta sessão é avaliar comparativamente essas políticas promovidas por diferentes autoridades supranacionais, nacionais e locais, tentando entender: (1) quais são os potenciais e as contradições desses esforços; (2) qual é o papel da indústria nas cidades contemporâneas; (3) quais os papéis dos estudos espaciais, do planejamento e do projeto urbano para lidar com essa transição a partir de uma perspectiva inclusiva e de antifragilidade; (4) quais as escalas territoriais mais adequadas para entender esse novo fenômeno; (5) nessa nova tendência, qual a incidência da manufatura em comparação à da logística. Para isso, serão avaliadas as experiências de metrópoles de quatro países em diferentes contextos e continentes: Brasil, Itália, Estados Unidos da América e África do Sul.

General Abstract: In the beginning of the 21st Century, the increasing submission of industrial production to the logic of Financial Capitalism has brought back the debate on the issues of industrialization in both Global North and South. Since the start-up of globalization in the 1980s, the governments' neoliberal approach has encouraged both the development of a production system controlled by monopolistic transnational corporations, and the growing financialization of the urban spaces, resulting in processes of deindustrialization. These

processes occurred first in most upper-income countries, but recently they have become relevant in middle-income countries as well. The threats represented by the recent crises (environmental, political, social and health) have caused governments to contain their neoliberal stance by adopting public policies to support reindustrialization. The aim of this session is to assess comparatively the reindustrialization policies promoted by different supra-national, national, and local authorities, trying to understand: (1) which are the potentials and contradictions of these efforts; (2) what is the role of industry in contemporary cities nowadays; (3) which are the roles of spatial studies, planning, and design to deal with this transition from an inclusive and antifragility perspective ; (4) which are the more adequate territorial scales to understand this new phenomenon; (5) in this new trend, what is the incidence of manufacturing in comparison to that of logistics. For this, it will assess the experiences of the metropolises of four countries in different contexts and continents: Brazil, Italy, United States of America and South Africa.

Resumen general: A principios del siglo XXI, la creciente sumisión de la producción industrial a la lógica del capitalismo financiero ha hecho resurgir el debate sobre las cuestiones de la industrialización tanto en el Norte como en el Sur Global. Desde el inicio de la globalización en la década de 1980, el enfoque neoliberal de los gobiernos ha fomentado tanto el desarrollo de un sistema de producción controlado por corporaciones transnacionales monopolistas como la creciente financiarización de los espacios urbanos, lo que ha dado lugar a procesos de desindustrialización. Estos procesos se dieron primero en la mayoría de los países de ingresos altos, pero recientemente han cobrado relevancia también en los países de ingresos medios. Las amenazas que representan las recientes crisis (ambientales, políticas, sociales y de salud) han obligado a los gobiernos a contener su postura neoliberal mediante la adopción de políticas públicas de apoyo a la reindustrialización. El objetivo de esta sesión es evaluar comparativamente las políticas de reindustrialización promovidas por diferentes autoridades supranacionales, nacionales y locales, tratando de comprender: (1) cuáles son los potenciales y las contradicciones de estos esfuerzos; (2) cuál es el papel de la industria en las ciudades contemporáneas en la actualidad; (3) cuáles son los roles de los estudios espaciales, la planificación y el diseño para abordar esta transición desde una perspectiva inclusiva e de antifragilidad; (4) cuáles son las escalas territoriales más adecuadas para comprender este nuevo fenómeno; (5) en esta nueva tendencia, cuál es la incidencia de la manufactura en comparación con la de la logística. Para ello, se evaluarán las experiencias en metrópolis de cuatro países en diferentes contextos y continentes: Brasil, Italia, EE. UU. y Sudáfrica.

DEINDUSTRIALIZATION AND REINDUSTRIALIZATION IN METROPOLITAN SÃO PAULO, BRAZIL: CHALLENGES AND POSSIBILITIES

Eduardo A. C. Nobre

Faculdade de Arquitetura e Urbanismo, Universidade de São Paulo | eacnobre@usp.br

The Metropolitan Region of São Paulo (RMSP) developed throughout the 20th century as a typical peripheral Fordist metropolis. Industrial development began in the late 19th century to support the coffee-exporting economy and increased rapidly between the 1930s and 1970s due to national-development policies, forming the Brazilian Industrial Triangle together with the Metropolitan Regions of Rio de Janeiro (RMRJ) and Belo Horizonte (RMBH).

Since the 1980s, this metropolis has been shifting towards a service-based economy due to a series of factors: the economic crises of the 1970s caused industry to move to other regions in search of greater profitability and cheaper labor; environmental legislation and industrial zoning restricted the installation of new industries; and the neoliberal opening of the Brazilian economy established by the 1994 Real Plan caused a process of an 'early' deindustrialization throughout the country, as it became cheaper to buy imported manufactured goods than to produce them in the country.

From a territorial point of view, the deindustrialization process left a huge amount of abandoned and derelict land in the areas of the First Industrial Revolution, the old industrial districts, rail yards and warehouses along the railway in the metropolis central region, while in the outskirts of the metropolis, areas of more recent industrialization along the highways, the industry still persists and is expanding.

Recent awareness of the problems caused by deindustrialization, mainly due to the environmental, political, economic, social and health crises, led the Federal Government to launch a new industrial policy called *"Nova Indústria Brasil: Plano de Ação para a Neoindustrialização 2024-2026"*.

The objective of this research is to analyze the recent evolution of industrial activities in the metropolis and city of São Paulo, seeking to understand the logic of its geographic location, considering the established deindustrialization process, the potential of reindustrialization and planning policies. Based on the collection of data on land use and employment occupation reports, a mapping is carried out seeking to understand this dynamic in order to provide support for public policies and territorial planning, based on the key question "what is the current and future role of industry in Metropolitan São Paulo"?

MAPPING INDUSTRIAL HERITAGE IN THE SÃO PAULO METROPOLITAN REGION: A PARTIAL OVERVIEW

Clarissa Gagliardi

Escola de Comunicação e Artes, Universidade de São Paulo | clarissamrg@usp.br

Since the 1980s, the Metropolitan Region of São Paulo (RMSP) has been undergoing a process of deindustrialization. Landscapes with a working class tradition, such as the former industrial¹ municipalities of and the East Zone districts of the city of São Paulo have gradually turned into a service sector economy.

A multidisciplinary and inter-institutional research has analyzed the reuse of industrial warehouses in the 39 municipalities of the RMSP in order to understand the advance of the real estate capital over formerly industrial areas. This is part of an ongoing project named *Reconversion of the built environment: from factory warehouses to cultural heritage in the city of São Paulo*, funded by CNPq (National Council for the Development of Science and Technology) since 2022. The main concern is to understand the trajectory of the previous industrial society through its built environment, mapping the use of industrial buildings.

An organized and systematized database is open to public consultation in order to promote debate around the re-appropriation of these factory warehouses in a digital platform <https://patrimoniofabrilrmsp.com.br/>, which is still in the testing phase. For its development, we considered all available sources (bibliographical, documentary, technical, print and electronic media, social networks, websites dedicated to the history of working class neighborhoods, museum collections etc.) In order to check the material obtained from secondary sources, the group carried out a fieldwork in April 2024, in ten São Paulo districts² and in the six former industrial municipalities³. Up to now, the group mapped 99 factory buildings, which were closed between the late 1990s and early 2000s. Based on the original address, the fieldwork sought to identify what has happened to the areas previously occupied by the industrial activity. Despite the preliminary nature of the data organization, the partial results presented here demonstrate the ongoing economic reconversion of industrial activity to the service sector.

¹ Diadema, Mauá, Ribeirão Pires, Rio Grande da Serra, Santo André, São Bernardo do Campo and São Caetano do Sul.

² Água Branca, Belém, Bom Retiro, Brás, Lapa, Mooca, Tatuapé, Vila Leopoldina and Vila Maria

³ Diadema, Guarulhos, Mauá, Santo André, São Bernardo do Campo and São Caetano do Sul,

RISKS OF CONFLICTS BETWEEN DIGITAL AND ECOLOGICAL TRANSITIONS: THE TERRITORIAL IMPACTS OF LOGISTICS, DATA CENTERS AND GIGA FACTORY IN THE MILAN URBAN REGION, ITALY

Stefano di Vita / Research Group ProdAction⁴

Dipartimento di Architettura e Studi Urbani, Competence Center Anti-Fragile Territories, Politecnico di Milano | stefano.divita@polimi.it

The Northern Italy is one of the most important urban macro-regions and productive platforms in Europe, although it is affected by relevant processes of economic transformations, which are radically changing traditional operational geographies. The de-industrialization of some productive urban cores and regional districts, which drove the previous phases of manufacturing development of the country, is counterposed by the consolidation of other industrial cities and regions, which are shifting the Italian economic core from the North West (Milan-Genoa-Turin) to the North East (Milan-Bologna-Venice). At the same time, the 2008-2012 economic crisis and the Covid-19 pandemic have contributed to the proliferation of European, national, and regional policies, which are aimed to support processes of re-industrialization connected to the digital and ecological turn. However, these sectoral policies frequently generate negative landscape and environmental impacts, in contradictions with the targets and the requirements of the European Green Deal, and other ecological policies. Furthermore, in a territorial context characterized by governance complexity and institutional fragmentation, the weakness of spatial policy and planning does not support local institutions in negotiation processes with international economic operators.

On this background, this contribution focuses on the main gateway city of Northern Italy, that is the Milan urban (and logistic) region, formed by the Milan metropolitan city and its surrounding provinces, in their turn distributed among three different administrative regions (Lombardy, Piedmont, and Emilia-Romagna). In this case study – that is characterized by dense urbanizations, but also large open spaces – the research aims to map at multiple scale the growing role of logistics, data centers, and giga-factories in relation to other productive sectors, and to analyze the multi-scalar territorial impacts of these raising economic activities. In particular, this analysis aims to understand which are the risks of further socio-spatial and environmental fragilities determined by these growing economic sectors in comparison to the socio-spatial and environmental fragilities of the already existing spaces of production. As well, the research aims to understand which are the current policy and planning tools and mechanisms enabling and not limiting this economic turn, and which are the design features and technical requirements of its spaces, in order to outline some first suggestions of scales and topics for anti-fragility policies targeted to contemporary territories of productions.

⁴ Coordinated by Cristiana Mattioli and Eugenio Morello, and constituted by Simonetta Armondi, Stefano Di Vita, Alice Franchina, Marcello Magoni, Gloria Pessina, Giulia Setti and Davide Simoni.

DID BIDEN “BUILD BACK BETTER”? PLANNING IMPLICATIONS OF EMERGING INDUSTRIAL (RE)DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS ACROSS METROPOLITAN AMERICA

Yonn Dierwechter

School of Urban Studies, University of Washington – Tacoma | yonn@uw.edu

During his COVID Pandemic-era campaign against Donald Trump in the fall of 2020, Joe Biden promised voters to implement an integrated, innovative, and explicitly “pro-manufacturing” development and climate resiliency strategy, which he marketed initially as part of a larger “Build Back Better” agenda. The Biden administration successfully passed three colossal pieces of domestic legislation in mid-2022 that, taken together, arguably rival Lyndon Johnson's “Great Society” programs of the 1960s, which substantially expanded federal health care benefits, as well as, albeit to a lesser extent, Franklin Roosevelt's signature “New Deal” initiatives in the 1930s, which first introduced federal-scale social security into the country's political economy.

Specifically, Biden's \$1.2 trillion Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) made major (and long overdue) investments in roads, bridges and broadband. The CHIPS and Science Act (CHIPS) then authorized \$280 billion in new funding to boost domestic research and manufacturing of semiconductors. Finally, Biden's \$2.2 trillion Inflation Reduction Act (IRA), while multi-sectoral and complex in reach, has been characterized as “the most significant climate legislation in U.S. history, offering funding, programs, and incentives to accelerate the transition to a clean energy economy [that] will likely drive significant deployment of new clean electricity resources” (EPA, 2024). Although still in the early stages of implementation, and also now potentially subject to Trump's (second term) reversals and countervailing policies, Biden's “Build Back Better” agenda thus represents a substantial outlay of resources with manifold implications for cities and urban regions—and especially for industrial development that supports climate policy. Indeed, the US Department of Treasury suggests that, just since 2021, the United State has experienced “....a striking surge in construction spending for manufacturing facilities” associated rather directly with the IIJA, the IRA, and the CHIPS act.

Within this overall political and historic context, this presentation seeks to provide an initial assessment of some of the many new metropolitan geographies of this “construction spending for manufacturing facilities,” especially as these geographies inform emerging planning challenges. The discussion deploys an analytical framework developed originally by Di Vita and Dierwechter (forthcoming) in order to spatialize (and localize) new pattern in construction spending gleaned from multiple sources of data at diverse scales of metropolitan-level development.

URBANISATION AND RE-INDUSTRIALISATION – CONTRADICTIONS ON SOUTH AFRICA’S POLICY AND PRACTICE

Cecil Madell

School of Architecture, Planning and Geomatics, University of Cape Town | Cecil.Madell@uct.ac.za

Urbanization and re-industrialization are stated and desired goals of the post-apartheid government in South Africa. These preferred development outcomes are pursued by the state, while advocating an anti-urban policy stance and embracing trade liberalization.

The massive levels of structural unemployment at levels above 30 % for more than two decades have prompted the state to rhetorically want to re-introduce manufacturing, but unable to follow through on appropriate institutional, funding and other required implementation support.

The aim of this paper is to critically review the government’s pursuance of manufacturing as an important policy to stimulate economic growth and employment, in the context of a declining role of manufacturing in the national economy. Efforts at unrealistically emulating the outcomes of 4th industrial revolution advances in the global north and far east have resulted in South Africa ignoring perhaps mundane, but substantive market opportunities on the Africa continent.

This paper will explore the state’s policy contradiction such as rhetorically acknowledging the important of cities and towns, while ignoring the considerable economic and development potential of established core urban areas, in favor of often scattered industrial activities, such as special economic zones in rural areas and on the urban periphery. The incoherency and miss-match between industrial and urbanization policies and practices of the South African state, while pursuing neoliberal macro-economic practices, significantly restrains and undermines the ability of urban planning to pursue goals of social justice, spatial transformation and economic inclusion.