A Review of:
*Wealth and Democracy: A Political History of the American Rich*

Within sociology, and more specifically within the world-systems literature, there have been important and insightful analyses of the recent financial crisis. While these works are relevant and certainly important, they tend to retrospectively analyze the financial crisis as an “event.” A more general approach, however, could look at this crisis as part of the United States’ hegemonic decline or the relationship between financial crises and hegemonic decline in general. Was the crisis the result of more general characteristics which are contributing to America’s decline in the world system? Furthermore, is there a broader pattern in world system dynamics that links hegemonic decline and financially based economies? An insightful place to begin such analysis is Kevin Smith’s *Wealth and Democracy: A Political History of the American Rich* (2002). This book, which predated the crisis by at least five years, is useful because it does not focus on a given event, but on rather broader patterns within American hegemony which put it at risk, as well as similarities in these patterns with previous world powers.

It is important to note that Smith is not a social scientist but a columnist and a former analyst for the Republican Party. As a columnist, Smith does not use any specifically sociological methods and his analysis is more historical than sociological. Yet, despite these handicaps, Smith’s work is extremely valuable because of its focus on two fundamental connections: between wealth and political power in the United States, and between economic structure and the historical decline of Western hegemonies. While his conclusions should be seen as preliminary, Smith’s work is descriptive and an important source for theory building which should inspire future sociological analysis.

Kevin Smith’s argument has three different parts. First, he finds that from the 1980s until 2000 a new American plutocracy was created that is analogous to the socioeconomic structure that emerged in the later 19th century in important and dangerous ways. Second, Smith highlights the degree to which contemporary plutocracy, as well as the American economy in general, has become financialized at the expense of industrialization. Of particular importance for world-systems scholars is his argument that this process could be largely responsible for American decline and is similar to the pattern of decline in the other great western hegemons over the past five hundred years (Spain, Holland and England).

*Continued on page 2...*

A Few Words from the Chair

Dear PEWS Members,

Greetings from cold and snowy (yes, snowy) Michigan! I hope the approaching end of the spring semester is a cause for some hope in the midst of rather troubling times. We can certainly look forward to the annual ASA meeting in a few months in Las Vegas, including what should be some very interesting PEWS-sponsored sessions and what I hope will be a very enjoyable section reception.

*Continued on page 3...*
A Review of: Wealth and Democracy
Continued from page 1

Finally, Smith argues that financialized plutocracy creates significant risks for American society and its place in world politics. While his book is very compelling, its methodological limitations and failure to take into account world-systems theory make it problematic. However, Smith does make an extremely compelling case with the resources that he does use, which result in an analysis that deserves to be synthesized with sociological findings and further investigated.

The structure of the book corresponds logically with Smith’s three theses. The analysis begins with a history of the wealthiest Americans of the past three hundred years and the social, political, economic and international implications of their wealth in each period. The first three chapters are dedicated to creating this history of American wealth and provide a fascinating description of the change in the different social processes which were central to wealth creation in America over its history, and ultimately conclude that a new system of plutocracy has emerged. In the next three chapters (4-6), Smith’s analysis is of particular relevance to World Systems scholarship as he focuses on how financialization is central to the new American plutocracy and how this process has been repeated by previous western hegemons. Smith finds that the new plutocracy is distinct from its late 19th century predecessor because it is rooted in high technology, financialization of the US economy, and American dominance is global affairs. Once again turning to historical analysis, Smith finds that over the past five hundred years, the three other western hegemons, “Spain in the 1500s-early 1600s, Holland in the 160s and early-to-mid 1700s, and Britain in the 1800s and early 1900s” (174), all achieved dominance in world affairs and then all began to decline in large part due to the financialization of their respective economies. This dangerous pattern of financialization and subsequent instability is then argued to be characteristic of the American economy in the late 20th century under the new plutocracy. This connection between plutocracy and the financial sector is then analyzed in great detail, and Smith finds that the American federal government, for various reasons, fostered and protected the financialization of its economy, in part through the use of its global power and influence.

Finally, in the last four chapters (7-10), as well as the afterward, Smith focuses on the consequences of American plutocracy across the nation’s history. In chapters 7-9, Smith’s provides a descriptive historical account of the political consequences of plutocracy in America, which include processes of its preservation and promotion, as well as those of resistance, across different time periods. Subsequently, chapter 10 addresses the contemporary polarization of the American political climate, which is seen as the result of the creation of a new system of plutocracy and the financialization of the United States’ economy. Smith describes popular reaction as intensifying resentment and frustration, which focuses on the negative outcomes of the new system but not the system itself. Politicians and political parties then attempt to harness this frustration, with varying levels of success. To conclude, the afterward discusses the potential fallout of the new plutocratic system, and American global dominance in general, and potential directions in which American society could head.

The greatest strength of Wealth and Democracy is its scope. While it is not a sociological analysis and does not directly discuss the recent financial crisis, it could be immeasurably useful in reconceptualizing this crisis as a consequence of the transformation of the United States into a society with a plutocratic, and primarily financial, economy. Using this framework, the recent crisis can be seen as part of a relatively new socioeconomic system in America which puts the nation at risk on a structural level of not only individual financial crises, but of further decline from hegemony in the world system as well. Heuristically, Smith’s point seems to be proven by the transformation in the relationship between the United States and China. While China emerges onto the world stage, it is powered by industrial manufacturing and has been able to change the terms of its relationship with America so as to begin to exert its will on the United States to a given degree. Conversely, America seems to have begun to decline from global hegemony as its income inequality and unemployment skyrocket and it suffers increasing instability due to its financially-based economy.

In conclusion, Wealth and Democracy provides an important descriptive historical account of American wealth and its relationship with the broader society over the past three hundred years. In this light, it can be seen as making a contribution to world-systems theory and to sociology in general. Again, the conclusions made by Smith must be seen as preliminary, but they provide an important foundation for future research, which could evaluate the degree to which financialization and plutocracy are related, as well as their relationship to hegemonic decline in the modern world system.

Luis Vila-Henninger
University of Arizona, Department of Sociology

A Few Words from the Chair
Continued from page 1

On the subject of the ASA, as most of you are aware, a significant restructuring and increase in dues has been proposed by the ASA. A group of sociologists has organized a petition drive that asks important questions about this proposed restructuring and increase (the text of their petition call is included in the following section). I strongly encourage you to consider this issue and your position regarding this potential change to a key aspect of our professional association. Speaking as an individual and not as PEWS Chair, I am highly supportive of the petition effort and very concerned about the manner of and necessity for requesting a large increase in dues, particularly in light of potential impacts on membership in difficult economic and political conditions in higher education and in the U.S. more generally. A strong professional association could play an important role in protecting its members interests in today’s highly politicized climate, but how a professional association should play this role should be driven by its members.

More generally, today’s political climate includes significant threats to the rights of faculty members as teachers, researchers, and public employees. The 2010 elections have emboldened some political actors to challenge the academic freedom and freedom of speech of faculty members in Wisconsin and here in Michigan, as well as the collective bargaining rights of public employees in Wisconsin, Ohio and Michigan. As a member of an AAUP union currently negotiating a new contract under these difficult conditions, these issues are particularly salient for me. However, these issues are far broader and include severe threats to longstanding characteristics of the academy in the U.S. In our community of scholars, questions of power and inequality are fundamental and demand our attention as scholars and as citizens.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate my invitation from the last newsletter to send me any suggestions regarding what the PEWS Section could do to facilitate the work of our members. I look forward to seeing all of you in Las Vegas!

Paul Ciccantell, PEWS Chair
Western Michigan University, paul.ciccantell@wmich.edu

A Call for the ASA to Increase its Transparency

We the undersigned sociologists1 hereby register our concern with the ASA leadership’s recommendation that the membership vote for a significant aggregate dues increase. (See the March issue of Footnotes for the recommendation and rationale).2 We urge ASA members to vote against the proposed dues increase unless the ASA leadership presents a cogent explanation that specifically addresses why a substantial increase in total dues beyond the usual cost of living increase is warranted.

The published rationale argues that ASA dues should be more progressive. Like the ASA leadership, we support progressivity in the distribution of dues payments across the ASA membership. But what of the aggregate size of those payments? As shown in Table 3 of the Footnotes article, the proposal increases dues in every income bracket for employed sociologists.3 The new proposal does much more than just redistribute the dues burden in a more progressive way. It will also generate a substantial amount of new revenue, and the ASA has offered no explanation for why this is needed.

We believe that such a large aggregate increase in dues should be explained to members, before any vote, by a clear account of what more the ASA will be doing or why it needs to raise funds beyond a cost of living increase to continue existing services. This explanation must be specific about the services to be funded by additional dues revenue, and distinguish services that need additional dues funds from those that generate enough revenue on their own to break-even or make a profit. The explanation should also compare dues and services offered by peer organizations like APSA, AEA, and AAA, and provide a compelling explanation of why ASA leadership proposes dues that are higher.4 Unless the ASA leadership provides a compelling justification that meets these criteria before the May elections, we urge ASA members to vote against the new dues schedule. To add your name to the 540+ that have already signed this petition, navigate to: http://asatransparency.org/

Notes:
1. “Sociologists” includes both PhDs and graduate students in sociology, as well as other social scientists who engage in sociological research or teach sociology.
3. The proposal holds student dues steady and decreases dues for unemployed members by twenty dollars (http://www.asanet.org/footnotes/mar11/table3_0311.html), yet it appears the aggregate increase in other categories is far greater than what would be needed to simply balance this decrease for unemployed members.
4. For a comparison of current and proposed ASA dues with other social science organizations, see "A Comparative Look at ASA Membership Costs and Benefits".
In Memoriam
Frank Bonilla, Renaissance Man (1925–2010)

I was privileged to know Frank Bonilla for 40-plus years, from my early graduate-school days in Massachusetts into his retirement years in southern California. Without his mentoring, I would not have stuck with Latin American political studies in an era of cold war scholarship. And subsequently, in the 1970s–1990s, without his colleagueship and intellectual influence, I would not have made the leap into Latino migration studies. I begin with this personal experience because I am only one of many whose careers and lives he touched, shaped, and enriched.

Frank was a multidimensional Renaissance Man. His early life as the son of Puerto Rican parents provided little material wealth but was very rich in instilling values for life. He experienced firsthand the realities of barrio life (in the Bronx and Harlem) and of racial discrimination in other venues and turned these experiences into a lifetime of struggle for social justice and for the rights of the poor, communities of color, and migrants. He must have been born with personal values of basic kindness and respect for those around him, for they characterized his entire 85-year life. As a scholar and professor, Frank began in the early 1960s with the American Universities Field Service in Latin America, including Brazil, where he taught and wrote about agrarian reform and favela poverty, the issues of the day. While an associate professor at MIT (1963–1969), he did pioneering work in Venezuela with José SilvaMichelena of the Centro de Estudios del Desarrollo, writing a piercing critique of the elites and foreign oil interests. Unlike many others during the 1960s, Frank rejected the career rewards of cold war scholarship and used his pen as a tool for social equality. During his professorship at Stanford University (1969–1972) his graduate seminar “Structures of Dependency” became legendary, and transformative for students.

It was after his return to New York, going back to his roots, in 1973 that Frank made his most lasting contributions. He founded and for 20 years directed the City University of New York’s Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños, eventually housed at Hunter College. One of his seminal collaborative studies, published by the Centro’s History Task Force, Labor Migration under Capitalism (1979), while focused on the Puerto Rican experience, became a paradigmatic work for understanding migration circuits and cycles and, indeed, a model for Latino migration and diaspora studies for generations of scholars. But the Centro was not simply one more unit for academic research. It was infused by Frank’s dedication to addressing the problems facing communities of color, such as over-imprisonment of African-Americans and Latinos and the need to expand educational opportunities for these communities. Through New York City’s Puerto Rican Hispanic Leadership Forum and the Empowerment Institute of the Community Service Society (City of New York), to mention only two, Frank maintained direct advocacy involvement with the community. Nationally he served on the National Commission on Minorities in Higher Education, among other entities.

In 1983 Frank and three colleagues on other campuses initiated the founding of the Inter-University Program for Latino Research, which has united over 20 interdisciplinary research centers in Latino studies and created a national forum and voice on issues affecting Latino communities. Through IUPLR, Frank and his colleagues expanded the boundaries of collaborative research on Latinos in the Americas and in a globalizing economy and on the Latinization of the United States. He coordinated the project “Latinos in a Changing U.S. Economy.” In 1986 Frank was appointed Thomas Hunter Professor of Sociology at Hunter. Frank was always pushing the limits of existing scholarship and breaking new intellectual ground. He never viewed the production of knowledge as an individual task. He was always seeking input from those around him, at the dining table or around the ironing board at home or in his office or those of colleagues at the university, revising and perfecting phrases for a speech he had to give the next day or finalizing an article for a looming deadline. Frank influenced dozens of Latin American Perspectives editors of several generations. He will be greatly missed by these and thousands of other colleagues, many of them also close friends, across the nation and the world. Frank Bonilla, ¡Presente!

Susanne Jonas, University of California, Santa Cruz

See the full article, appearing in the May 2011 issue of Latin American Perspectives.

There will be a public tribute/memorial to Frank Bonilla at Hunter College on June 9, 2011. Please visit the Hunter College website for the edition of El Boletín dedicated to Frank: http://centropr.hunter.cuny.edu/sites/default/files/pictures/frank_final.pdf

Cancun and After: A Sociology of Climate Change

Who benefited from the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCC) held in Cancun, Mexico, in December 2010? Answer: COP16 closed by advancing the economics, politics and culture of competitive neoliberalism, reinforcing the interests of the transnational ruling class. And this was no surprise, for as the international peasant and Indigenous organization Via Campesina observed at the start of the meeting:

Continued on page 5...
“The agenda imposed in Cancun is that of the banks and investment funds, of the major gas, petroleum, carbon, electricity and automotive companies, of the agribusiness corporations and others who ... speculate on the climate and nature…”

The 1997 Kyoto Protocol and 2007 Bali Agreement are built on fair and democratic principles, like ‘the polluter pays’ and ‘international cost sharing’. But affluent industrial polluter states consistently ignore such an approach. Instead, as Eco-Equity campaigner Tom Athanasou points out, there is emerging in Europe and the United States a mood of austerity — arguments for contracting foreign aid abroad, minimizing social services at home, and facilitating North–South technology and investment co-operation. It needs to be said that this approach to climate change is an ecological modernist one, embracing a social vision not all that different materially from the industrial capitalism that it seeks to correct. This is an environmentalist equivalent of the classic social democratic welfare state, and as such serves the interests of the Western — now also non-Western —middle class. In fact as climate crisis opens up opportunities for an emancipatory politics at the geographic periphery of corporate capitalism, it simultaneously demands a new cultural reflexivity from those classes, races and genders that benefit from the hegemony of the global North. In short: middle-class environmentalists should be asking themselves if they are not complicit with the neo-colonial agenda of the transnational economic elite. Many activists in the global South actually see technology transfer for adaptation to and mitigation of climate change as a mopping up operation for polluter states in the global North and an imposition on their own way of life.

Prior to the Cancun meeting, President Evo Morales called a People’s Climate Summit in Cochabamba, Bolivia in April 2010. This was hosted by the Indigenous peoples and the women of that plurinational state. Some 35,000 activists from around the world came to formulate new resolutions for the December COP16 in Cancun. Among the ideas to emerge from Cochabamba was a Universal Declaration of the Rights of Mother Earth and an International Climate Tribunal to test crimes against nature and peoples, not least, climate refugees. The Cochabamba Declaration also demanded: no carbon markets, instead less consumption in affluent countries; payment of ecological debt owed for the ravages of colonialization; 6 per cent of the North’s GDP to go to the South; no more nature commodification, and respect for Indigenous rights; no intellectual property rights over climate mitigation technologies; 50 per cent reduction of emissions by 2017, with temperature stability at 1°C, and carbon at 300 ppm. Despite the efforts of Bolivia’s UN Ambassador Pablo Solon, these people’s recommendations were not taken up into the UNFCCC negotiating documents for Cancun. And despite massive grassroots support from people worldwide, Bolivia remained a lone dissenting voice among the governments at Cancun, ultimately silenced by the gavel.

At Cancun, Via Campesina mounted its own Global Forum for Life, Environmental and Social Justice, claiming that ‘The people hold thousands of solutions in their hands’. They pointed to attempts by the transnational ruling class to privatize common lands, thus undercutting the independence of meta-industrial livelihoods. And they denounced the trend to ever more complex hierarchies of speculative carbon trading. They also condemned as false climate solutions technology transfer for mitigation and adaptation, geo-engineering and nuclear power generation, as well as the Clean Development Mechanism. Via Campesina recommends alternative development models designed for food and water sovereignty; models inspired by the long-established low-carbon economies of the global South and local techniques for water catchment management.

A Cancun wrap-up from Patrick Bond, of the Centre for Civil Society in Durban, reports that members of the Indigenous Environmental Network (IEN) were harassed, and their leader Tom Goldtooth was denied entry to official proceedings. It is not only the meta-industrial class of peasant and Indigenous voices that is excluded from the formulation of climate policy; women have been trying to introduce gender balance into the UNFCCC process from the outset. However, women’s efforts to make gender transparent at the United Nations by demanding gender-disaggregated statistics from governments continually falls flat. Women constitute half the global population, so should have an equal voice in every decision making arena. But after hour after hour, decade upon decade of struggle within the UNFCCC, women are barely heard.

More climate meetings are coming — COP17 in Durban 2011, the Rio Earth Summit plus 20, and one might hope, a second People’s Conference on Climate Change and the Rights of Mother Earth. But for now, given the old cultural dualisms that prop up the ideology of transnational domination, the UNFCCC is split in two. Unless some self-searching reflection takes place, climate talks will simply lurch along—humans versus nature, white versus black, men versus women, North versus South. The achievement of Cochabamba, the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Mother Earth, offered the masters of globalization a chance to escape their unhappy world of failing markets, failing governments, failing relationships and failing souls. Can these big men receive the gift of history that is being handed to them?

Ariel Salleh, University of Sydney

See the full article: “Cancun and After: A Sociology of Climate Change” in Arena Magazine, 2011, No 110.
National Borders in the 21st Century:
Political Economy of the World-System XXXVth Annual Conference
April 28-30, 2011 Stony Brook University, SUNY

CONFERENCE PROGRAM:

Thursday April 28th, Stony Brook University (Humanities 1006)
4:30pm Opening Remarks and Introduction: Timothy P. Moran, Stony Brook University, SUNY
Keynote Address: Immanuel Wallerstein, Senior Research Scholar, Yale University “Borders Borders Everywhere and Not a Drop to Drink.” Reception to follow, Humanities 1009.

Friday April 29th, Stony Brook University (Wang Center 201)
9:15 – 10:45am Nation States and the Politics of Inclusion and Exclusion Chair: Wolf Schäfer, Stony Brook University
John Torpey, CUNY Graduate Center “The Rise of States and the Regulation of Movement”
David Abraham, University of Miami School of Law “Immigration and Social Solidarity in a Time of Crisis: Europe and the US in the New Century”
Jose Itzigsohn, Brown University “The Shifting Boundaries of Belonging and Citizenship: Migration and Political Rights”
10:45 – 11:00am Coffee Break
11:00 – 12:30pm Keynote Address: Ulrich Beck, Professor of Sociology, University of Munich & Visiting Centennial Professor at the London School of Economics “Remapping Social Inequality in the Age of Climate Change.”
12:30 – 1:30pm Lunch, Jasmine Restaurant, Wang Center
1:30 – 3:00pm Immigration Debates in the Rich World Chair: Gallya Lahav, Stony Brook University
Mónica Verea, Center for Research on North America, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México “Anti-Immigrant Attitudes: A Growing Resentment During the First Decade of the 21st Century”
Eric Mielants and Terry-Ann Jones, Fairfield University “Political Extremism and Manifestations of Xenophobia in Core Zones”
3:00 – 3:15pm Coffee Break
3:15 – 4:30pm National and Postnational Human Rights Chair: Daniel Levy, Stony Brook University
David Jacobson, University of South Florida & Fellow, Exeter Center of Ethno-Political Studies, University of Exeter “How Postnational Citizenship Resolves Problems it Did Not Create, and Creates Problems it Cannot Resolve: The Paradoxes of Human Rights in Europe and Beyond”
Aristide Zolberg, Walter Eberstadt Professor of Political Science and History, New School for Social Research “Citizenship: Responses to Globalization”
5:30 – 7:00pm Cocktail Reception, Danford’s Inn and Marina, Port Jefferson, NY

Saturday April 30th, Stony Brook University (Wang Center 201)
9:00 – 9:15am Continental Breakfast, Wang Center
9:15 – 10:45am Nation States and the Politics of Social and Human Rights Chair: Michael Schwartz, Stony Brook Univ.
Elisabeth Beck-Gernsheim, University of Trondheim “Constellations of Inequality: From Patriarchal Authority to Global Care Chains”
Louis Esparza, California State – Los Angeles “Human Rights and Dependency Networks in Bogota”
Hwaji Shin, University of San Francisco “Globalization and Citizenship in 21st Century Japan”
Aaron Major, University at Albany – SUNY “Transnational State Formation and the Politics of Austerity”
10:45 – 11:00am Coffee Break
11:00 – 12:15pm Civil Society and Transnational Social Movements Chair: Roberto Patricio Korzeniewicz, U of Maryland
Jackie Smith, University of Notre Dame “Social Movements and Hegemonic Decline: From Transnational Organizing to the WSF Process”
12:15 – 1:15pm Lunch, Student Activities Center, Stony Brook University

Continued on page 7...
### National Borders in the 21st Century: PEWS Conference Program
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session Description</th>
<th>Chair/University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:15 – 2:45pm</td>
<td>Illicit Flows and Borderlands</td>
<td>Chair: Paul Gootenberg, Stony Brook University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antonio Brussi, Universidade de Brasília “The Golden, the Gilded and the ‘Pyritic’ Ages of World Capitalism: Businesses Practices and Illicitness as Structures”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mélissa Gauthier, Binghamton University, SUNY “Illicit Cross-Border Flows in the Mexican Northern Borderlands”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas D. Hall, DePauw University “Comparison of Two Southwestern Frontiers and Borderlands: lessons from Ancient to Modern Borders”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 – 3:30pm</td>
<td>The World-Economy and the World Environment</td>
<td>Chair: Arnout van de Rijt, Stony Brook University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Jorgenson, University of Utah “Globalization, the Sociology of Ecologically Unequal Exchange, and Carbon Dioxide Emissions, 1960-2005”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Shandra, Stony Brook University, SUNY “The International Finance Corporation and Forest Loss: A Cross-National Analysis”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30pm</td>
<td>Closing Remarks &amp; Adjourn</td>
<td>Timothy P. Moran, Stony Brook University, SUNY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Announcements!!!

- Salvatore Babones recently put up a new website at [http://benchmarkingamerica.com](http://benchmarkingamerica.com). The goal of the site is to promote awareness about facts that are relevant for American social and economic policy. You are invited to download the graphs from the site for use in your own lectures. He’d also really appreciate it if you would Facebook “like” the site by clicking the little thumbs-up symbol. Thanks!

- Melsome Nelson-Richards has recently established an organization and website concerning underdevelopment and other important research topics related to poverty in the world-system. Check it out at: [http://www.lemeheuxinternationaldevelopment.org/](http://www.lemeheuxinternationaldevelopment.org/)

### Awards & Recognitions


Peter Adams, a sociology senior at Northern Michigan University, has been awarded the “Outstanding Graduating Senior Award” from the Department of Sociology/Social Work.

Sociology Professor Ligaya Lindio-McGovern received the Excellence in Research Award by Indiana University, Kokomo for an outstanding record in research. In addition, Ligaya Lindio-McGovern was selected by the Indiana University Office of the Vice-President for International Affairs to be an Exchange Faculty/Scholar with Hamburg University in Germany in Spring 2011. During her term, Ligaya Lindio-McGovern will conduct part of her research on the international migration of health care professionals (focusing on nurses and doctors) into healthcare systems including the US, selected European countries and Scandinavian countries, and she will give a public lecture on the preliminary findings of her research at Hamburg University.

Eugene (Gene) Rosa has been selected to receive the “Outstanding Career Achievement Award” from the College of Liberal Arts, at Washington State University.
Call for Papers: Journal of Globalization Studies

Thomas D. Hall has been asked to edit a special issue of Journal of Globalization Studies, and is looking for submissions. The title of the special issues is: “Globalization in Historical Retrospective: World System Approaches”, and will be published in 2012. This journal is edited by Andrey Korotayev and Leonid Grinin. A brief description of the theme is given below:

Scholars continue to discuss the timing of the start of globalization (whether it has been going on since 1918, 1945, or since the late 1980s). However, there is no doubt that the whole of the world history (at least since the Agrarian Revolution) is a history of globalization. The world-system approach actually deals with the processes of globalization and inter-societal integration through-out a few millennia of the world history. Although there is a number of viewpoints as regards the dating of the emergence of various world-systems in general, and the Afroeurasian world-system (the World System) in particular, the main stages and results of the old globalization seem to be quite evident: the formation of the West Asian center of agricultural production, the start of the Urban Revolution in South-ern Mesopotamia, emergence of the “imperial belt” (belt of empires stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific) in the 1st millennium BCE, formation of transcontinental trade route in the late 2nd century BCE, emergence of a network of particularly intensive trade and cultural links throughout the major part of Afroeurasia in the 13th and 14th centuries, formation of the planetary World System in the long 16th century, industrial and communication revolution that in the 19th century linked rather tightly all parts of the world and transformed it in a rather radical way. Each of those stages was accompanied by immense changes in the ways of life, culture, political organization, and so on.

The present day world to a certain degree faces the systemic tasks similar to the ones encountered by the archaic societies, namely: to increase and integrate and still preserve own identity and image. In the distant past the process was also going on which can be named using the modern popular word a globalization, as, indeed, what was that rapid transformation of the previously autonomous territories into a part of huge empires if not a globalization within the frameworks of the medieval world?

A better understanding of the past allows a clearer understanding of the present day phenomena and finding the way to weaken the negative processes of breaking national cultures, traditions, self-identity, as well as making modern tendencies serve every country’s interests and the mankind as a whole. The fact is that by attentive and creative approach one can trace many similarities in ancient and modern times.

In this connection we invite world-system scholars to present their ideas and studies connected with the analysis of the globalization processes throughout the world history. What are the common features of the historical and modern globalization? What are the similarities? What are the roots of the modern globalization processes?

For other info on the journal see: http://old.uchitel-izd.ru/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=228&Itemid=61
Deadline for submissions will be late 2011 or early 2012. For further details contact issue editor Thomas D. (Tom) Hall at: thall@depauw.edu
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Job Posting
University of Houston: Assistant or Associate Professor in Journalism

The Jack J. Valenti School of Communication at the University of Houston invites applicants for two junior or mid-level tenure-track positions in journalism. A successful candidate must have a PhD. and substantial professional experience as a journalist. The positions call for specialization in at least one of the following: convergent technology, computer-assisted reporting, media law and/or media studies. The candidate needs to have demonstrated teaching excellence, research/publication/creative ability, and/or journalistic work.

Continued on page 10...
Job Posting

University of Houston: Assistant or Associate Professor in Journalism

Continued from page 9

The successful candidate will be expected to teach undergraduate journalism courses in a program that focuses on writing, editing, convergent news production, media law, investigative/civic journalism, and the political economy of the media. In addition, the candidate may teach graduate courses in mass communication. The position start date is for the fall of the 2011-2012 academic year.

Candidates may obtain additional information about the Valenti School at www.valenti.uh.edu/. The University of Houston is the flagship campus of a system that enrolls 50,000 students in a vibrant city, which has multi-national industry, a world-class Medical Center, a robust arts community, and professional sports. Houston takes an entrepreneurial approach to new technologies, especially biotechnology, and is a world capital for petroleum exploration. The Valenti School prides itself for its role in working with a diverse student population. The student body is working-class with a median age of 27, and most students have full-time or part-time jobs.

Review of applications has begun and will continue until the positions are filled. Send a letter of application, CV, three letters of recommendation, a sample of published work, journalistic clippings, and official transcripts to:

Beth Olson, Ph.D.
Director, Jack J. Valenti School of Communication
101 Communication Building
University of Houston
Houston, TX 77204-3002
bolson@uh.edu

The University of Houston is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity employer. Minorities, women, veterans and persons with disabilities are encouraged to apply.