

МИРОВОЙ ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКИЙ КРИЗИС И РЕИНДУСТРИАЛИЗАЦИЯ, ИХ ВОЗДЕЙСТВИЕ НА ГОРОДА

В настоящее время дискуссия о необходимости и возможности реиндустриализации или новой индустриализации ведется среди экономистов, политиков и государственных должностных лиц власти всех уровней. Обсуждаются основные направления этой реиндустриализации и ее «пространственные особенности». Автор намерен ответить на вопрос: имеет ли смысл говорить о какой-либо связи «новой урбанизации» с новой индустриализацией? В статье рассматривается связь между двумя процессами - индустриализация и урбанизация, а также характеристики новой индустриализации. Возможные курсы урбанизации пересматриваются с учетом современных тенденций распределения населения.

Ключевые слова: реиндустриализация, новая индустриализация, урбанизация, распределение населения.

E.R. Meteleva

WORLD ECONOMIC CRISIS AND REINDUSTRIALIZATION, THEIR IMPACT ON CITIES

Nowadays the discussion about necessity and possibility of reindustrialization, or new industrialization, is going on among economics scholars as well as policy makers and public officials of authorities of all levels. The main courses of that reindustrialization and its' spatial features are discussed. The paper intends to answer the question: does it make sense to talk about any 'new urbanization' connection with a new industrialization? The connection between two processes – industrialization and urbanization – is reviewed within the paper, as well as characteristics of new industrialization. Possible courses of urbanization are researched taking into account contemporary tendencies of allocation of population.

Keywords: reindustrialization, new industrialization, urbanization, allocation of population.

The studies done by the experts from the GAWC (Great Britain) examined the shifting of the «command and control functions» of the leading cities under the influence of the world crisis. This analysis had revealed a positive shift of the positions of the capitals of the developing countries-members of the BRIC including Moscow. It seems to be useful to compare, which sectors contributed more than others in the improvement of those cities global positions. While Moscow had improved its' global rating due to the energy sector (Gazprom, Lukoil, Rosneft) and its' affiliated sectors,

Beijing had promoted itself at the expense of finance (Chinese banks), energy sector and industry (rapidly developing car manufacturing industry) [14].

Obviously, the «servicization» (and de-industrialization) process in the developed countries' economies had stopped as the world crisis deepened. The finance sector went through the greatest recession (from 2006 till 2012) in the meaning of weakening of «command and control functions». The ranks of the USA leading cities were corrected due to the crash of the financial sector and the increase of the energy sector. The American energy sector shows a significant growth both in terms of the quantity of companies and strengthening their «command and control functions» (Chevron, ExxonMobil, etc.). The industry, which mainly serves the demand of the US Army, has been realising the compensation function during the world crisis. The telecommunication sector and other services demonstrated the greatest recession in terms of losing «command and control functions» of US cities. Information technologies, financial and energy sector are still remaining the leading ones in the US economy [13].

During the contemporary world crisis many economists realize that «post-industrial economy» («knowledge economy», «information economy») couldn't be considered as a completely established socio-economic formation, which arose to replace the industrial economy. Probably, it makes sense to discuss yet the becoming advanced technology modes based on advanced researches but they neither replace, nor reject the existence of lower level's technology modes [3].

Definitely no need to deny the increasing role of knowledge in the value added production and, obviously, there is a big difference in the profitability of high-tech activities exploiting newest achievements of contemporary sciences and in activities based on more traditional technological modes.

But just the de-industrialization is considered to be one of the reasons of the current crisis. The de-industrialization took place because of the common opinion that the «information economy» is already a fully established technological mode and a hopeful basis for launching and realising long-term successful business strategies. There was a quite understandable intention of the business elites of the developed countries to «exempt» themselves from the less profitable activities by «throwing» them down to the developing countries (first of all, Asian) and concentrating on knowledge producing and advanced producer services providing [9].

The advance of services economy accompanied by the gradual elimination of a government regulation made everybody believe in the idea of «natural and irreversible sunset» of industry.

Two tendencies of 1970s–1980s can help to make clear the current situation. According to the French researcher J.-L. Levet, «Marginalisation of industry and manufacturing in the economy is neither predefined, nor natural. It is the result of a tacit political choice supported by the majority of economists, financiers and researchers» [6].

Complicating of things that are produced and of modes of their production had led to decreasing of the amount of persons employed in industry and to the ejection of

the latter to such extent that even an industrial policy was considered as too expensive and was excluded from the government regulation's instruments.

The dominance of the market natural force and flexibility of a labour timetable had been predominating. «New economy» also encouraged the use of financial instruments and diminishing of financial assets of manufacturing enterprises [7].

The European Union while faced the economic changes, in the opinion of the French researches J.-L. Levet, had been realizing the strategy of developing of services sector and supporting the competition in all directions. At the same time the Asian countries due to the technologies transfer had based their economic growth on launching manufacturing enterprises, i.e. on developing of industry. Many European entrepreneurs moved their production to the Asian countries by «withdrawing» their assets from the Eurozone [7].

However the ongoing crisis had showed that it's quite risky to lean only upon activities belonging to the «knowledge economy» because of three reasons.

First of all, by no means the majority of the population of even the most developed countries employed in the science intensive sectors, i.e. the leading sectors of «knowledge economy». At the average up to the 70 % of the population of the developed countries is occupied in the services sectors. However less than 10 % of the population works in the science intensive sectors while the rest is occupied in other branches of the services sector that are by no means high-profitable [11]. In 2001 the share of the labour force worked in high- and medium-technological sectors of manufacturing industry among the EU countries was the highest one in Germany (11.2 %). In Sweden it was also a bit higher than the average EU level (7.9 % against 7.6 %) [11].

However in connection with the world crisis there is a problem of providing the majority of the inhabitants of developed countries with stable and even growing incomes. This population got used to the high level of welfare and now it has no intention to limit the achieved level of the consumption.

The only country – Germany – kept the high level of industrialization that allowed it to preserve its competitive position in the world economy. So, the share of manufacturing industry in GDP in 2010 in Germany was 20.7 %, in the USA – 12.7 %, un the UK – 11.1 % and in France – 10.6 % [1].

Secondly, there is a problem of deepening of social differentiation between groups of population, i.e. between ones included in the «knowledge economy» and others excluded from it. Moreover while in the period of becoming of the «new economy» the differentiation existed only between inhabitants of developed and developing (underdeveloped) countries, then, as the mentioned economy has been spreading and the manufacturing industry were «throwing down» to the developing countries, the differentiation revealed itself within the developed countries as well.

Thirdly, the situation arose in the world economy when the production of the majority of vitally important goods is concentrated in the Asian countries, more precisely in China, leads to the vulnerability of the population of the developed countries in the face of the possible threat of stopping of those goods supplying in the event of

any political conflicts or emergency cases. The loss of capacity of the vitally important goods' self-providing is an obvious menace for the national security of any country. Considering that the USA is the main world consumer and at the same time the biggest debtor when the largest producer – China – is also the main creditor, such a distribution of «economic roles» multiplies the worries of economists and politics from the developed countries, first of all, those ones from the USA.

Now there is an understanding that Europe can't keep and develop its' world positions if it is going to survive only due to its achievements in the high-tech sector while it has a deficit of the balance of trade.

From the point of view of the new world hierarchy, the importance of the industrial sector is quite obvious, first of all, because of its correlation with the efforts and means involved in R&D. The fact is the industry concentrates about 80% of all researches and technological innovations. The positive externalities of the industrial basis create the employment in other economic sectors.

Now the same French researches passionately call their national Government and businessmen to pay attention to the expediency of the industry developing as a main base and driver of a national economic development. The French economists give Germany as an example. This country is constantly following its industrial way of development chose at the beginning of the XX century [10].

According to the French researches' data, industrial enterprises' expenses on R&D amount about 85 % of such expenses made by all the national enterprises. In France such enterprises are concentrated in four sectors: car manufacturing, pharmaceutical sector, production of materials and composites, and space- and aircraft manufacturing.

Those countries of Northern Europe that mainly avoided the de-industrialisation have got the highest share of R&D expenses in the Value Added (table 1). Yet the UK, which together with the USA actively followed the de-industrialisation policy, has got much lower share of such expenses.

Table 1

Share of expenses on R&D in the Value Added in 2008

Country	Share of expenses on R&D in the Value Added (%)
Sweden	11,1
Finland	10,9
Germany	9,9
Austria	6,7
France	6,5
United Kingdom	4,2

Compiled according to [10].

The profit of manufacturing enterprises is also lower in countries actively implemented the de-industrialisation policy (table 2).

Table 2

Profitability of manufacturing enterprises in 2008

Country	The profitability level (%)
Finland	49,0
Austria	44,5
Italy	41,0
Sweden	39,3
Germany	34,9
France	28,7
United Kingdom	28,7

Compiled according to [10].

The analysis of the German companies' factors of success, performed by the French researcher A. Gauron, led to the conclusion that such characteristics as high quality and adaptability to the clients needs ensure the competitiveness of the German products in much higher degree than innovations. The success of the German companies is determined by their very special features – they have been stably taking a definite market niche for a long time – they have been producing equipment used at the intermediate stages of technological chains. Such outputs require long-term investments, experience and high qualification of human resources, i.e. highly specialized factors of production, which M. Porter mentioned about in his theory of a national competitiveness [5]. Those factors create too high barriers for new competitors entering the market and they consequently reduce the threat of a tense competition. Germany constantly supports its advantages in the industrial cluster (mechanics, equipment, car manufacturing). An industry, to the French researcher A. Gaurond's opinion, forms a solid basis of a national competitiveness, which in turn, serves as a base for the geopolitical influence of any country [10].

At the second half of the XIX century and at the beginning of the XX century a large scale industrialization was accompanied by the process of urbanization that led to the big change of the mode of life of the significant amount of people and to the radical transformation of landscapes of several continents. A huge mass of people were moved from rural areas to urban ones, they were «withdrawn» from the agricultural economy and were embedded into the industrial one. The dramatic destruction of the traditional communal way of life and the transition from the inter-generational family to the nuclear one were the main features of that transformation that led to the necessity of a state intervention into so called «social sphere», which had been being a typical sphere of activity of a private sector of the economy or a civil society for thousands of years [4].

However the urbanization must not be considered as just an accessory process to something else but must be taken as an original and natural-artificial (i.e. specially organized) process of significant changes in the life of any human society. For example, nowadays in China the industrialization process is going on accompanying by the scale urbanization. Huge territories with a numerous rural population are being included in the administrative boundaries of big cities in accordance with the volitional

decision of the Chinese Government. M. Castells refers in his scientific works that this process takes place besides the usual migration of rural population to cities in search of work and wages that is common for all developing countries. The Chinese State intentionally increases the level of urbanization in the country using different schemes: it stimulates the move of rural inhabitants to cities, it annexes rural inhabited areas to big cities, and it organizes the intensive urban building up in rural areas located between big cities [12]. Doing this, the Chinese Government takes some risks because traditional Chinese social values are preserved and supported mainly in the rural area as China had been always being an agricultural country. The rural population, a «keeper» of traditional values, is, of course, still too numerous to the rise of urbanization level would really threaten with a loss of traditional communal values in the nearest future. However the change of the proportion between rural and urban population and spreading of the urban way of life can lead to some irreversible changes in the social value system and in the national mentality (leading cultural values, labour ethics) in the long-term perspective. Those values are considered to be the key factor of a national competitiveness in the contemporary epoch. The consequences of such an intensive urbanization process for the Chinese society will be seen and estimated later.

Nowadays there is a wide discussion of the necessity and possibility of a re-industrialisation (or new industrialisation) initiated in scientific circles and at all the levels of public power of the developed countries [8]. What we can say about that new industrialisation? What are its' basic distinctions from the scale industrialisation of XIX–XX centuries? The main features of this process seem to be as follows.

1. The high intensiveness of the competition between producers from different countries that make this time the producers from the developed countries search for new niches of the world market filled with many competitors [2].

2. A high level of urbanization is already achieved that mean that the contemporary re-industrialisation will not lead to such a large-scale relocation of the population from rural areas to urban ones and, probably, will stop this process or even turn it back. This feature raises some demands to the new industrialization:

- a) unlike the previous industrialization the new one already has a prepared base in the form of cities network;

- б) on the other hand, it doesn't have comparable free human resources for involving them in the industrial production in its traditional forms (big manufacturing complexes with great amount of employees).

3. A mass production is not to be set at new industrial enterprises. New manufacturing is going to be a repetition work or a small-lot production.

4. The contemporary manufacturing industries should be high-profitable that means to be science-intensive in order to compete against Asian goods not by prices but by qualitative features.

5. The contemporary manufacturing industries are not supposed to be labour-intensive because high expenses on a labour force can reduce to naught the competitive advantages provided by such production factor as knowledge.

6. The contemporary manufacturing industries are expected to be environmental friendly ones taking into account the high demands of the western society to the quality of the environment.

7. The modern manufacturing industries are going to be located in traditional industrial zones situated out of cities' residential areas. Still new industrial enterprises will tend to be placed near the big and biggest cities to decrease transportation costs and to approach to the places of human resources living. A contemporary manufacturing enterprises «follow» the labour force – either cheap and hardworking (as in the Asian countries) or highly qualified and well-educated and concentrated mostly in big cities (as in the developed countries).

8. There is a specific demand and an additional condition of the new industrialisation in the developed countries – it is the need to employ the European labour force and to avoid as much as possible inviting of migrants because of the incoming migration had transformed itself from the means of solving problem (migrants do the most unpleasant and simple work for a low wages) into the source of new problems connecting with cultural and civilizational differences.

Is it possible to speak about any new urbanization in connection with the re-industrialisation process? In what way the latter will exert influence on the structure of the population distribution in the XXI century?

The new industrialisation, as it was already pointed, will not demand the high concentration of the population because even the big industrial enterprises will have an automatic and robotic technological processes and the repetition work and small-lot production are going to be the dominate types of production.

To our mind, the dynamic growth of cities as a consequence of the re-industrialisation should not be expected. A slow and gradual urbanization takes place in developing countries due to the intention of low-income groups of population to move from rural areas to cities where there are much more possibilities to get a job and higher wages.

The industrialization process in the developed countries, probably, will not have a significant impact on the proportion between rural and urban population.

Speaking more precisely about Russia, the de-industrialisation realized under the pressure of liberal economists' ideas accompanied by many other negative processes led to the decline of the income of the majority of the population. It stimulated the process the rural population «drain» to cities as it happened one century earlier in all the developed countries.

The re-industrialisation process in Russia has already started although it is still too slow and weak and, to our mind, it will not influence the urbanization process in the country. But the tendency of the population «drain» from rural areas to urban ones will continue that will lead to converting Siberian and Far-Eastern territories into a desert.

References

1. Germaniya: novaya industrializatsiya / D. Kartsev, S. Sumlenny // Russkiy reporter. 2011. № 42 (220).
2. Delyagin M. Drayv chelovechestva. Globalizatsiya i mirovoy krizis / M. Delyagin. M.: Veche, 2008. 528 s.
3. Meteleva E.R. Metodologiya upravleniya razvitiyem gorodov na osnove setevogo podkhoda: monographiya / E.R. Meteleva. Novosibirsk: SibAGS, 2011. 386 s.
4. Meteleva E.R. Razvitiye gorodov v usloviyakh globalizatsii / E.R. Meteleva. Novosibirsk: SIBPRINT, 2010. 160 s.
5. Porter M. Konkurentsiya: Per. s angl. / M. Porter. M.: Izdatelskiy Dom «Viliams», 2000. 495 s.
6. Levet J.-L. Réindustrialisation, J'écris ton nom / J.-L. Levet. Paris: Jean Jaurés Fondation, 2012. 349 p.
7. Levet J.-L. La désindustrialisation n'est pas une fatalité // Le Cercle Les Echos. 2012. 30 avril.
8. Susciter une nouvelle ambition industrielle pour la France // Les Cahiers Lasaire. 2011. № 3.
9. Balazs G., Faguer J.-P., Rimbert P. Compétition généralisée, déclassement et conversions politiques: Les effets différentiels de la crise dans la sidérurgie et dans la haute technologie: Rapport de recherche / G. Balazs, J.-P. Faguer, P. Rimbert. Noisy-le-Grand Cedex: Centre d'études de l'emploi, 2004. № 15. 102 p.
10. Gauron A. L'Industrie a-t-elle encore un avenir en France? // Les Cahiers Lasaire. 2011. № 42.
11. V Evropeyskom Soyuze rastet dolya zanyatykh v naukoymkikh otraslyakh ekonomiki: Electronnaya versiya byulletenya «Naseleniye i obshestvo» Centra demographii i ekologii cheloveka Instituta narodnokhozyaystvennogo prognozirovaniya RAN. 2003, № 139-140 [Electronny resurs] // Demoskop Weekly. URL: <http://demoscope.ru/weekly/2003/0139/barom01.php> (data obrasheniya: 17.05.2013).
12. Castells M. Urbanizatsiya v tretyem tysyacheletii: megapolis [Electronny resurs] // 1997–2009 Baikalskaya mejdunarodnaya biznes-shkola IGU. URL: <http://www.buk.irk.ru/library/book/texts/mankast/chapter6/mega.htm> (data obrasheniya: 27.12.2009).
13. Csomós G. The Command and Control Centers of the United States (2006/2012): An Analysis of Industry Sectors Influencing the Position of Cities [Electronny resurs] // Loughborough University. URL: <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/gawc/rb/rb430.html> (data obrasheniya: 27.12.2013).
14. Csomós G., Derudder B. European Cities as Command and Control Centres, 2006-11 [Electronny resurs] // Loughborough University. URL: <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/gawc/rb/rb402.html> (data obrasheniya: 27.12.2013).

Информация об авторе

Метелева Елена Растиславна – доктор экономических наук, доцент, профессор, кафедра экономики и государственного управления, Байкальский государственный университет экономики и права, 664003, г. Иркутск, ул. Ленина, 11, e-mail: elenameteleva@ya.ru.

Author

Metleva Elena Rastislavna – PhD in Economics, Professor, Department of Economics and Public Administration, Baikal State University of Economics and Law, Russia, Irkutsk, e-mail: elenameteleva@yandex.ru.