APPENDIX B

TEACH THIS BOOK

In addition to this book contributing to the literature on economic change, place, environment, and identity, this book can be used as a teaching tool for upper-level undergraduates and graduate students in the social sciences. Instructors could use this book to challenge students to think historically about contemporary social issues such as economic decline, capital and residential mobility, environmental transformation, and community development. In this section, I propose five teaching frameworks with suggested readings and provide a list of discussion questions.

FIVE APPROACHES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL ENGAGEMENT

Economic History: Build this book into courses committed to covering the long timelines and broad spatial relations of economic history. This book engages substantively with existing research on the boom, bust, and rusting of America's industrial corridors. While much of this scholarship is limited to temporally immediate impacts of industrial closures in either rural or

urban settings, this book considers a multigenerational, temporal range and an urban-rural spatial scope when considering canonical questions of out-migration, unemployment, and environmental crises following plant or mine closures. Such comparisons enable a more precise analysis of how the passage of time and relative geographical remoteness affects place attachment, socioeconomic challenges, and possible futures in postindustrial landscapes. I recommend that students read the introduction and chapters 1 and 2 with a comparative sensibility. Have students pay particular attention to how rural and urban contexts offer differing sets of resources for processes of economic development and dismantling. Ask students to debate questions of path dependence and identify how macroeconomic structures might limit options for on-the-ground residents. Complementary readings include High's *Industrial Sunset* (2003), Cowie and Heathcott's *Beyond the Ruins* (2003), and Mah's *Industrial Ruination, Community, and Place* (2012), as well as case-specific studies from Bensman and Lynch (1989), Dudley (1994), or Hackworth (2019).

Place and space: Integrate this book—particularly the introduction and chapters 1 and 4—into lectures on theories and experiences of place. I converse with conceptions of space and place offered by classical geographers such as Tuan (1971 and 1990) and Relph (1976), as well as more contemporary work that contemplates the changing nature of place in the face of globalization, such as Massey (1994). My discussions of the meanings of place for long-term residents draw on both rural sociological research on community affection for rural landscapes and livelihoods (e.g., Harrison 2012; Wuthnow 2015) and place attachment scholarship concerned with the social-psychological forms of attachment between individuals and their landscapes (e.g. Low

and Altman 1992, Stedman 2003). My analysis of the landscape-scale change of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, as well as the return to nature on postindustrial landscapes today, builds on work on the changing social construction of nature done by environmental historians such as Cronon (1991) and environmental sociologists such as Pellow and Park (2011).

Rust Belt experiences and the working-class: Pair this book with other writing on emotions and the American Rust Belt, particularly from and about the role of the working class in contemporary politics. Have students compare and contrast books that address perception and affect of working-class voters with chapters 2, 5, and 6. See work by Wuthnow (*The Left Behind*, 2018), Hochschild (*Strangers in Their Own Land*, 2016), or Cramer (*The Politics of Resentment*, 2016). Notably, even though my research took place before and after Trump's election, when populist sentiment seemed to be driving a return to far-right political opinions particularly in rural and white regions, these themes did not emerge in my research process. In Chapters 5 and 6, my interviewees voiced discontent with the government. But it was local governmental failings rather than national level policy-making to which my interviewees vociferously objected. Likely they were simply too familiar with the realities of both macroeconomic trade policies and the logistical challenges of their long-deindustrialized communities to put much stock into presidential campaign rhetoric about bringing factories back home.

Trauma, disasters, and risks: Drawing from scholarship on disasters and hazards, offer students alternative cases of crisis and ask them to trace how and why historical processes of the social construction of home—and specifically geography, community,

and economy—shape outcomes. Students can use my typology of home to consider theories of risk, material entanglement, and cultures of loss offered by environmental sociologists researching their own case studies of residential stability in the face of acute environmental crisis. Students should read Chapters 1 and 2 in tandem with Erikson's classic *Everything in Its Path* (1976), Jerolmack's *Up to Heaven and Down to Hell* (2021), Elliot's research on climate change and loss in *Underwater* (2021), Kimbro's book *In Too Deep* (2021), or Gray's *In the Shadow of the Seawall* (2023).

Globalization and mobility of people and capital: Students can bring this book into conversation with scholarship on globalization and its attendant flows of capital and people. Chapters 2, 3, and 4, respond to scholars of migration, both classical (e.g., Blau and Duncan 1967) and contemporary (Rapport and Dawson 1998), by highlighting how and why people may *not* out-migrate after a localized, economic collapse. Students could read chapters 1 and 2 to engage with commodity chain literatures, particularly those concerned with the flows of natural resources across time and space (e.g., Bunker and Ciccantell 2005), those interested in what happens when a commodity chain disarticulates (e.g., Werner and Bair 2011), and those committed to tracing the transnational consequences of the mobility of capital (e.g., Broughton 2015). Finally, chapters 5 and 6 might be placed alongside environmental historians' and sociologists' insights into the environmental health consequences of such immobility, like Brown's *Toxic Exposures: Contested Illnesses and the Environmental Health Movement* (2007), Taylor's *Toxic Communities: Environmental Racism, Industrial Pollution, and Residential Mobility* (2014), or Pellow's *Garbage Wars: The Struggle for Environmental Justice in Chicago* (2004).

CHAPTER-BY-CHAPTER DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

INTRODUCTION

1. How do the people introduced in the two vignettes discuss the problems and potential of their deindustrialized homes?
2. What assumptions do you have about how people could and should respond to large-scale disasters or crises like deindustrialization?
3. What three concepts will be used to build the definition of home in this book? How do you see those three concepts in your personal experience of home, place, and crisis?
4. What are the core methods used to gather data for this book?
5. What is gained from looking at two cases rather than just one?

CHAPTER 1

1. What was the role of metals companies in establishing housing in Iron County and Southeast Chicago? How did these nineteenth-century firms exert control over geography, community, and economy?
2. What are some possible impacts of paternalistic company oversight in formerly industrial towns/neighborhoods after the closure of these companies?
3. What is a "worker-citizen"? How did companies create this category? And why is it important to understand interviewees' interpretations of capital, place, and home?
4. Describe how companies used paternalism to manage employees in both Iron County and Southeast Chicago. Although company paternalism was most explicitly popular at the turn of the twentieth century, paternalism still exists today as a managerial strategy. Think of some examples of companies

providing "nonincome benefits" today. Discuss the wins and losses of this approach for employees.

5. How did companies organize community relations in both cases? What stories did the iron and steel industry tell about the purposes of social life? What was the role of unionization? How did race and gender show up in neighborhood-building?
6. How did interviewees' experience of "boom" mirror popular conceptions of the midcentury American middle class? Did company dominance over the social construction of home intensify or alter worker-citizens' expectations for the economic boom?

CHAPTER 2

1. What macroeconomic forces drove the steel industry's collapse? How did these abstract economic changes materialize for residents?
2. How did interviewees interpret these changes? Who did they blame for their changed circumstances? What emotions did they express in interviews?
3. Describe how company closures shifted locals' definitions of home. Specifically, discuss how economic changes altered worker-citizens' experiences of their local geography, community function, and economic well-being.
4. How were the shutdowns of the mines in Iron County and the steel mills in Southeast Chicago communicated and executed differently? Why did these differences impact residents' ability to react to these closures?
5. How did unions in the two cases react differently to company closures?
6. What options did the newly unemployed have to solve their most basic economic problems?

CHAPTER 3

1. What types of jobs did residents take on after industry closures removed many jobs in their areas? What external structures constrained residents' options for finding work?
2. Discuss how job seekers leveraged what geographic and community resources were left behind following company closure in pursuit of economic problem-solving.
3. Define informal labor. This form of work is not only a strategy for the newly deindustrialized. Today, people manage economic risk through variations of informal labor. Provide some examples of informal labor today, and discuss the wins and losses of this strategy for making ends meet.
4. What is megacommuting? Why would unemployed miners choose this strategy to earn an income?
5. What remaining materials and structures did residents rely on for work following mine or mill closures? How do these jobs reflect the continuation of values that were established prior to deindustrialization?
6. What trade-offs did residents have to make when searching for jobs back home?
7. After mines and mills closed, women entered the workforce en masse. Discuss why, and identify some of their employment and educational paths introduced in this chapter.

CHAPTER 4

1. What reasons did residents give for staying in their deindustrialized towns? Describe where each of these reasons would fall on a gradation between material and symbolic rationales.
2. Discuss how homeownership offers benefits and costs? If you were in the same position as the homeowning interviewees in this chapter, what decision would you have made about selling and moving or staying at home?

3. How do rationales interviewees offer for residential stability connect to the histories of their formerly industrial towns and neighborhoods?
4. Through the stories interviewees tell, how do you see residents' definition of home—specifically, geography, community, or economy—shifting? What are some examples of how the long-term residents revised the weight or rewrote the meaning of their home region?
5. How do landscapes and nature matter for interviewees in Southeast Chicago vs. Iron County? How do community relationships keep people at home?

CHAPTER 5

1. When asked about the potential future for their home, what are the core concerns for Iron County residents? How do issues of geography, community, and economy emerge in residents' diagnoses of shared problems?
2. How did the history of mining shape residents' reactions to the GTac mine proposal?
3. What is the concept of a "good company" to Iron County residents? And how did this concept frame discussions about a new generation of mining?
4. Where was there conflict between interviewees concerning various proposed futures for their community?
5. Rurality is a gradient. Using information from this chapter, describe how rural Iron County is. How would you identify the level of rurality in other places?
6. What are the advantages and disadvantages of tourism in Iron County? Why do mining and tourism not conflict in residents' interpretations of future economic prospects?
7. What would be an ideal future for Iron County according to most interviewees? And why? What do you think would be a good future for the region? Why?

CHAPTER 6

1. When asked about the potential futures for their home, what are the core concerns for Southeast Chicagoans? How do issues of geography, community, and economy emerge in residents' diagnoses of shared problems?
2. How does Southeast Chicago's industrial history impact zoning in the area? How do top-down definitions of what the Southeast Side is *for* structure potential futures for this region?
3. What factors must Southeast Side residents weigh when considering industrial growth in their area? How have attitudes toward industry changed since the steel mills closed?
4. What are some examples of how residents are contesting the status quo of second-generation industry?
5. Why is park development a common alternative land use in the region? Why do some residents express ambivalence to park development? In your opinion, are parks a success? Why or why not?
6. Compare and contrast chapters 5 and 6. What similarities do you see between problem diagnosis, economic development options, and the reconstruction of home in each location? How do characteristics of place—extreme remoteness in rural Wisconsin or a peripheral location within a very large city—shape these two cases in different ways?

CONCLUSION

1. How does place-making change for residents of a deindustrializing space?
2. How do the economic hopes for residents reflect expectations established during industry booms?
3. How does this book recontextualize the options and choices of the residents from formerly industrial towns?

4. After reading this book, do you consider residents' ties to place material, emotional, or both? Why, and in what ways?
5. How do these concepts inform your own understanding of "home" and how we create that feeling in geographic locations?