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Dear GATS members,

We are happy to present this semester’s issue of Global Currents. The first thing to notice is its updated formatting, entirely thanks to our new co-editor Jess Kim. She has been a great addition and we look forward to her eventual leadership. We also thank our section chair Michael Kennedy and this semester’s authors. Enjoy the articles and interviews about the sweeping impacts of populism and the quirks of transnational employment, as well as a message from our Student Rep. Orla Kelly.

We hope you enjoy the issue and have a restful break.

-Alex

Dear Section Members,

First, I want to express how excited I am to join the GATS Newsletter Editorial Team! Thank you to my co-editor Alex for taking the lead this semester and showing this newbie how it’s done. Thanks are also due of course to our outstanding members whose content appears in this semester’s newsletter. The thing that struck me most while compiling this newsletter was the vast array of diverse, urgent, and innovative scholarship our members produce in pursuit of a global and transnational approach to Sociology. Thank you for allowing us to showcase your excellence!

-Jess
Message from the Chair
Although you all have heard from me on monthly email blasts, I am delighted to write a bit more substantially to you now about #GATSociology.

For those of you not inclined toward hashtags, let me invite you to click on it; for those who use them, please invoke it on twitter or other media. As I learn more about the work of my colleagues, I reference it so with Twitter’s @Prof_Kennedy. I’m finding that # to be a terrific way to extend, and communicate, a sense of global and transnational sociology. Having the honor to chair this section is one of the very best ways to do that too.

I didn’t come to our section by way of our discipline, even if I have been a card-carrying ASA member since the early 1980s. Landing at the University of Michigan in 1986 after doing fieldwork in Poland in 1983-84 with a dissertation about the Polish Solidarity movement of 1980-81, I was quickly swept up into its Center for Russian and East European Studies. From there, I moved through the administrative ranks of interdisciplinary units addressing various scales and historicities of global, international and area studies.

I thought more across those 20 some years about the world than I did about sociology’s place in it, however. I synthesized that in Globalizing Knowledge (2015), organizing my address of flows, contexts, publics, structures, and conjunctures around questions of intellectual and institutional responsibility. Sociology was a player in that book but it was neither my reference nor interlocutor.

Miguel Centeno and I discussed the discipline’s global sense in 2007, but I had not otherwise thought that much about its schools, emphases, or methodologies. With my comrades in the 1980s, I was of course enthusiastic about Wallerstein and World System Theory, especially for how it could be transforming that macrosociological sense I absorbed from my dissertation chair at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Gerhard Lenski with his ecological evolutionary sociology. My colleagues at UM Sociology were very much defining the terms of comparative and historical sociology, distributed as we were across area and regional expertise in Latin America, the Middle East, Japan, China, and Europe and Eurasia. We were not yet organized with a #GATSociology, but we might have been; we were not at all like what Hughes described, in 1961, as an ethnocentric sociology.

Nor is my current home at Brown University ethnocentric. With a terrific global and transnational sociological sense, grounded in
Latin America and the Caribbean, Europe and Eurasia, East and South Asia, and Africa and their diasporas, my newer, if smaller, department, ranges quite well across the world. But #GATSociology draws in a distinctive fashion.

I started to get more engaged with #GATSociology a few years after its formation when my erstwhile Michigan colleague, Julia Adams, then at Yale, asked my help with section nominations in 2012. My former Michigan, then Berkeley colleague, John Lie became section chair in 2013; Boston College’s Sarah Babb in 2014; my Brown University colleague, Nitsan Chorev in 2015; Wellesley’s Peggy Levitt in 2016; Zsuzsa Gille from University of Illinois Urbana Champagne in 2017; Boston University’s Julian Go in 2018. And following me will be Boston College’s Zine Magubane.

Why all this biography? Beyond the nod to C. Wright Mills and the book we have been assigned in, or still assign to, our majors, it presages things I hope #GATSociology refines: globalizing sociology’s knowledge networks, its contextual expertise, figuring our distinction in the discipline, and our critical engagement with the world.

As to our distinction, Peggy Levitt wrote in her 2016 chair’s message, “We do not take for granted that the nation-state is the logical, automatic, central organizing principle of social experience. That means that, rather than taking the spatial unit of analysis as given, we always ask what the relevant scales and sites are that need to be taken into account for the questions at hand.”

I like that account very much, but empire’s optics do not take nation states as an organizing principle either. Given the discipline’s origins in imperial thinking, as George Steinmetz (2013) and so many others have since argued, #GATSociology could very easily be associated with a globalism hardly appealing to most normative reflections in our section.

The critique of empire is a dominant #GATSociology reflex, one that can be quite devastating for our discipline’s domain assumptions. Indeed, our Student Representative Ricarda Hammer https://www.ricardahammer.com/ challenges with her work the typically national narrative of democracy (specifically of Great Britain and of France) by marking explicitly the imperial problem of analytical bifurcation. Of course our past chair has moved that theme, and other postcolonial questions, to the heart of our discipline and our section. In his last message as #GATSociology chair, Julian Go invoked WEB Du Bois to articulate how “global order follows logics of empire and racial domination”.

In that spirit, I am very glad that Atef Said is organizing a session for #ASA2020 with “Global Crisis and Cultures of Resistance/Transformation”. Its description:

From biophysical catastrophe to the resurgence of white supremacist extremism and more, crisis is properly, even necessarily, posed in global terms in the 21st century. But what articulations mobilize the most innovative, promising and/or resistance and transformation to it? We
invite papers that articulate forms of public engagement reframing the terms of solidarity beyond those typically privileged by the powerful. Whether organized beyond English, across the Global South, or against anti-Blackness, we organize this session around sociologies that illuminate imaginaries of emancipatory and sustainable futures embedded in cultures of transformational practice.

Although I can’t speak for Atef, the papers chosen might speak with a Du Boisian accent, or not. After all, some crises and forms of resistance might demand substantial transformation in order to be consequential. Of course Du Bois also recognized that within his lifetime.

I especially appreciated Julian’s reference in his essay to Du Bois’s work referencing the destruction of Warsaw during World War II. I had myself just referenced for a Polish audience another of Du Bois’s speeches, “Tribute to the Warsaw Ghetto Fighters”, delivered in New York City in 1952. He said,

In the first place, the problem of slavery, emancipation, and caste in the United States was no longer in my mind a separate and unique thing as I had so long conceived it. It was not even solely a matter of color and physical and racial characteristics, which was particularly a hard thing for me to learn, since for a lifetime the color line had been a real and efficient cause of misery. It was not merely a matter of religion... No, the race problem in which I was interested cut the across lines of color and physique and belief and status and was a matter of cultural patterns, perverted teaching and human hate and prejudice, which reached all sorts of people and caused endless evil to all men. So that the ghetto of Warsaw helped me to emerge from a certain social provincialism into a broader conception of what the fight against race segregation, religious discrimination and the oppression by wealth had to become if civiliza-

du Bois concludes his lecture by citing, approvingly, one Gabriel D’Arboussier, an African, who recalled Warsaw’s mausoleum to the Red Army and the “Polish people’s will to peace and its attachment to the Soviet Union”. Du Bois was unlikely to articulate problems with the Soviet occupation of

#ASA2020 Call for Papers:

Session with “Global Crisis and Cultures of Resistance/Transformation”

From biophysical catastrophe to the resurgence of white supremacist extremism and more, crisis is properly, even necessarily, posed in global terms in the 21st century. But what articulations mobilize the most innovative, promising and/or consequential forms of resistance and transformation to it?

We invite papers that articulate forms of public engagement reframing the terms of solidarity beyond those typically privileged by the powerful. Whether organized beyond English, across the Global South, or against anti-Blackness, we organize this session around sociologies that illuminate imaginaries of emancipatory and sustainable futures embedded in cultures of transformational practice.
Poland here, just as he did not celebrate, alongside the Ghetto Uprising, the 1944 Warsaw Uprising.

It’s not only that we should think about how our sociologies can reflect the empires in which we reside, or against which we struggle. We also need to be more aware, I believe, of how our sociologies can be less aware of others’ imperial troubles and histories. Juho Korhonen (2019), for example, has invited us to rethink sociology’s imperial awareness with his dissertation on German socialists and Finland’s democracy in their consuming empires at the start of the twentieth century.

I’ve been especially struck by the ways in which the just struggles of students for recognition along lines of diversity and inclusion within US universities reflect these challenges too. Although they can be quite national in reference, they are increasingly global in articulation as the decolonizing movement would suggest. But those affinities travel far more easily along some lines rather than others, notably with African American and Palestinian solidarities much more rapidly than in the address of Chinese imperialisms. Indeed, this recalls the challenge Du Bois himself faced in recognizing Japanese imperialism in the middle of the twentieth century (Kennedy and Tadesse 2019).

We are more likely to move beyond imperial presumption, whether in affirmation or resistance, to the extent our GATsociology engages questions animating peoples, regions and issues that are not so dominant in US sociology. This anti-ethnocentric disposition is of course facilitated to the extent we bring debates and concerns from beyond the USA, and beyond the English language in particular, to our field.

For that reason, I have organized a session entitled “Global and Transnational Sociology Beyond English” at #ASA2020 with this open invitation:

“Although English may be the hegemonic language of global sociology, to presume that the most critical insights in such a transnational sociology are offered in English reproduces a deeply problematic assumption. We invite paper submissions from colleagues engaged in language communities beyond English that reference, empirically, critical questions, concepts, and debates taking place that have not yet, but ought, shape discussions in global sociology’s lingua franca.”

I hope that, if you are involved in debates beyond English, you will consider submitting to this session; I also hope that you might be able to move, if you are not yourself teaching at an institution beyond the USA, a colleague teaching abroad to submit to this session, or to write something with you for it.

We are fortunate, too, that Zine Magubane is organizing another session completely open to all GATsociology proposals, and Sasha White our roundtables (be sure to check out our terrific research clusters too as you imagine your proposals there -- https://asaglobalandtransn.wixsite.com/asa-gts/research-clusters-1).

I am myself organizing another session at #ASA2020 to engage another challenge well beyond our global and national differences. Here, I’m especially intrigued to consider just how distinctive GATsociology is from the larger ASA itself.

Peggy is quite right to mark our resistance to methodological nationalism, and Julian to mark our potential penchant for the critique, or unwitting reproduction, of empire. But we are far from alone.

One of the things that struck me during our ASA convention last year was the number of sections that have anew, or for some time, embraced the global reference in their organizing. Following my own scholarly penchant, then, I will be inviting distinguished colleagues to help us with this matter in next year’s conference in a session jointly sponsored with cultural sociology. This is the motive:

“To what extent are the global and transnational styles of reasoning, types of questions, and forms of evidence organizing different knowledge cultures of sociology convergent? With ASA sections as one way to operationalize these
knowledge cultures, we invite proposals from members of various sections to elaborate the principal concepts, contests, regional references and transnational connections organizing a scholarly field’s globalizing knowledge culture. Through discussion, we hope to identify the extent to which GATsociology might aspire to both greater breadth and coherence as an intellectual field or, alternatively, embrace a sense that only references to scale are the principal object of the #GATsociology distinction.”

In the end, and extending the theme of my first email blast to you, I hope you will remember my chairing of this section as a time of opening and mutual learning. I have my theoretical penchants, regional referents, and critical and substantive priorities, but I see globalizing sociology knowledge to be one that is, itself, quite reflexive. Or at least it ought to be. Recognizing contradictions helps.

Sociology is, of course, rooted in a nuclear contradiction. Alvin Gouldner noted,

When sociologists stress the autonomy of sociology – that it should (and, therefore, it can) be pursued entirely in terms of its own standards, free of the influences of the surrounding society – they are giving testimony of their loyalty to the rational credo of their profession. At the same time, however, they are also contradicting themselves as sociologists, for surely the strongest general assumption of sociology is that men (sic) are shaped in countless ways by the press of their social surround (p.54).


---

**#ASA2020 SESSION**

**“Global and Transnational Sociology Beyond English,” Open Invitation:**

“Although English may be the hegemonic language of global sociology, to presume that the most critical insights in such a transnational sociology are offered in English reproduces a deeply problematic assumption. We invite paper submissions from colleagues engaged in language communities beyond English that reference, empirically, critical questions, concepts, and debates taking place that have not yet, but ought, shape discussions in global sociology’s lingua franca.”
With that inspiration, I hope we might not only find our globalizing knowledge to be in sync with our predispositions, whether around excellence, empire, or language, and rather seek questions that are themselves difficult, if critical, to pose. We are aided in that quest when we develop knowledge networks that diversify, and not only consolidate, our predispositions and explode those contradictions.

How global, and diverse, are the knowledge networks in our section? If you look at the history of our chairs, we do reflect quite well various demographic origins and abiding regional interests. But note that we are all from US institutions, with most of us having US pedigrees in higher education. We can use quite a range of different languages too, but most of us publish our leading work in English and with US publishers.

Our council this year, and in past years, extends our capacities to recognize the challenge of global hegemonies, and the value of critical difference, quite well. I’m grateful to Melanie M. Hughes, Evan Schofer, Jeong-Woo Koo, Smitha Radhakrishnan, Carolina Bank Muñoz, Victoria Reyes and Ricarda Hammer, and all of our GATSociology contributors, for this refinement.

The only problem is that we are not together enough! But we don’t always have to wait for ASA meetings. I know that Carolina and I will enjoy talking about Victoria’s latest book in a meeting of the Eastern Sociological Society in an author meets the critics session in February. See you there?

I’m also very appreciative of our election committee for the coming year -- Genevieve Zubrzycki, Karida Brown, Ghassan Moussawi, Kristin Surak, and Marcelo Bohrt -- for moving critical interlocutors into my, and my colleagues’, succession. Thank you in advance!

With all these engagements anticipating our next meeting, and with my invitation to you to respond to me on email – Michael_Kennedy@Brown.Edu -- I anticipate not only an even more vibrant and critical global and transnational sociology. It might even grow. Recruit your fellow travelers and renew your association with #GATSociology in 2020!!!!

-Michael D. Kennedy
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Representative Reflection
Reflections from the outgoing Student Representative:
Orla Kelly

It has been a privilege to serve as a student representative for the global and transnational sociology section. The experience was professionally enriching and personably enjoyable. When I began my doctorate in sociology, global and transnational scholarship provided me with the intellectual framework to link my professional international development experience to the broader field of sociology. Becoming student representative allowed me to get to know the scholars in this community more fully, to contribute to the section, and to understand the generous, collective efforts of the section officers, council, and volunteers that keep this community so vibrant.

I first met the section council members, the ingoing and outgoing elected representatives, and other section members, at the GATS business meeting in Philadelphia. I quickly learned that GATS was a diverse, lively, and inclusive space, with a highly invested membership. Through this experience, I have come to appreciate the number of helpful resources available to junior scholars in the section. For example, our mentorship event organizing committee arranged a terrific Graduate Student and Postdoc Mentoring event in New York this year. I highly recommend these events to other graduate student members. Student mentoring meetings offer a unique opportunity to receive career advice from faculty outside of one’s department on topics such as job market, dissertation writing, work-life balance. It is also an excellent opportunity to build social networks and friendships with others at similar career stages, which make the conference experience more enjoyable! Finally, unlike some other sections, our section provides a dedicated webpage with many great resources. For example, some generous members have uploaded syllabi to the site. These syllabi are a helpful guide for those of us designing GATS related courses for the first time.

It has been exciting to witness the section’s greater emphasis on issues of race under the
previous, current, and incoming section leadership. Encouraging, too, are the growing efforts to include more Southern scholars and scholarship through initiatives such as the South-South Critical Ethnography Workshop. In my work, I have found the scholarship of Southern feminist environmentalists, such as Bina Agrawal (1992), invaluable for understanding how and why dominant institutions of development are exacerbating the environmental crisis.

In the future, I look forward to being part of the continued and growing engagement from this section on issues related to the climate crisis and sustainability, through, for example, the section’s Global Environmental and Climate Crisis research cluster. While the consequences of climate change are increasingly felt at an individual level; the dominant root causes are structural and global. So too, are many of the proposed solutions. For example, the current 2030 United Nations Sustainable Development Agenda, which frames global goals and targets that the international community sets for itself, calls on nation-states to achieve sustainable development in three dimensions – economic, social, and environmental – in a balanced and integrated manner (United Nations 2015). The tripartite conceptual framework of sustainability has been part of mainstream development discourse since at least the 1980s (Purvis, Mao and Robinson 2018). However, the SDGs are perhaps the first global framework to position social and economic development, with ecological sustainability, as cohesive, as opposed to parallel objectives.

From a sociological perspective, we know that the concept of sustainability is elusive, complex, and often misused (Lockie and Wong 2018). Nonetheless, this framework does provide a basis for cooperation and accountability (Leblanc 2015). Scholars from the GATS subdiscipline have produced a wealth of theories and empirical tools to illuminate whom such international agendas serve, and how we might better understand social drivers of environmental change at a global level. In this climate emergency, I hope our engagement with this issue can continue to grow.

Finally, I want to extend my
sincere thanks to the section officers, council, and volunteers who make this section a hub for thoughtful scholarship and professional development.

-Orla

Orla Kelly
Boston College
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Special Feature
WHITHER A GLOBAL WAVE OF POPULISM

A Conversation with Edwin Ackerman and Marco Garrido

By Benjamin H. Bradlow and Johnnie Anne Lotesta

While there is a common perception that a “populist wave” is sweeping the globe, a closer look suggests a more varied set of figures, goals, trajectories, and ideological commitments than such classification suggests. To name just a few, the category of populism has been used to describe ...[cont’d]
...presidents Donald Trump in the U.S., Andres Manuel Lopez Obrador in Mexico, Jair Bolsonaro in Brazil, and Rodrigo Duterte in Philippines. It has also been applied in reference to the 2016 Brexit vote in the U.K. and to a slew of political parties of diverse programmatic flavors, including Podemos in Spain, Rassemblement Nationale in France, and Alternatif für Deutschland in Germany.

We are scholars of democratic change and politics in very different parts of the world. Ben currently researches democracy and urban politics in Brazil and South Africa; Johnnie examines subnational variation in right-wing politics in the United States. In order to encourage a more global view of contemporary populism, we talked to two leading scholars on populist politics in the Global South: Edwin Ackerman, who has written about party formation in Mexico and Bolivia, and Marco Garrido, who researches class and dissensus in Filipino politics.

Three key themes emerged from our conversation. First, the significance of populism depends on your vantage point. For political leaders, populism can be described as a technique of political incorporation. For ordinary citizens, the populist appeal lies in a sense of marginalization from the political system. Second, populist developments are embedded within class and status divisions, which are open to reinterpretation by populist leaders and nascent publics. It is these divisions that contain the seeds for novel political formations. And third, we should tread carefully when classifying diverse persons, events, and movements as a unified “global wave” of populism. Sociology as a discipline has much to contribute via “thick descriptions” of actually existing populisms on the ground, as well as careful comparisons that identify both shared characteristics and variation within the broad category of “populism”.

What follows is a transcript of our conversation, abridged for concision and clarity. We hope section members find it equally generative in reflecting on our present moment.

* * * *

JL: Edwin and Marco, as you both know, political theory has been characterized by long debates over what populism, as a category, is. How are you defining populism in your own work?

EA: What’s been useful for me is to think about populism as a type of mobilization strategy. This distinction is to separate [populism] from a specific set of policy goals, or even a specific kind of ideological commitment – to think about it as a style, a technique of political mobilization. What’s specific to this [technique] is an anti-elite discourse and the centrality of rituals that re-create the sense of ‘the people.’ The obvious example here is the mass rally. This is a useful way to think about populism, because it captures, in my view, the similarities and the differences between left wing and right wing populism.

MG: I find the traditional definition, the definition
used mainly by Latin American scholars, most useful and precise. That definition views populism as a mode of political incorporation of excluded or disenfranchised sectors, usually through the figure of a charismatic leader. The definition can be revised to include people who feel excluded or who feel disenfranchised in order to accommodate so-called right-wing populism. But this notion of political incorporation, I think, is crucial. Especially incorporation through the charismatic leader, as opposed to modes of institutional incorporation. I think that's compatible with Edwin's definition of populism as a style of political mobilization.

BB: Latin American populism tended to be associated with at least a nominal left ideology. Yet, what you described just now as the original Latin American school of populism is very open to a broad ideological spectrum. How do you square that?

MG: In the Philippines or Brazil or India, a lot of the focus is on the middle class. There is a sense of their being disenfranchised either electorally or through populist policies by the local government. And it’s that grievance that is propelling their support of populist leaders. This understanding, for me, highlights a number of things. One, institutional exclusion, or people who don’t feel represented by democratic institutions, and hence feel aggrieved. What’s important is the feeling of not being represented. Traditionally, as you point out, Ben, populism applied to the so-called "popular sectors" in Latin America – the urban poor and workers. With right-wing populism that’s not so much the case. But you can revise that definition to include these people who feel that they’re disenfranchised in some ways, even if they’re privileged in others.

JL: This makes me think of Arlie Hochschild’s work on Louisiana Tea Party members and the sentiments of marginalization that her respondents expressed, even as we outside observers may not think of them as a particularly disadvantaged group. I wonder then how much you see populism as an integration strategy specific to political outsiders, as it is sometimes defined, or if we also need to rethink the category of outsider as well?

EA: I’d say that in modern democracies there’s a permanent tension between a populist pole and a technocratic pole. That is, both emerge as challenges to monarchical, arbitrary government. What you have in populism is a phase of struggle of the populist pole
against the technocratic pole. The “outsider” comes in a time when the technocratic pole of the democratic arrangement has cemented, become isolated, and therefore is vulnerable to critique which will be, by definition, from the outsider. But I would say we’re going to try to redefine in firmer terms what the outsider means: the revolt of the populist wing of democracy against the technocratic. And in that sense too, I think it remains a question, to me at least, whether populism can be a form of permanent mobilization.

MG: Rather than outsider, I would emphasize a crisis of representation – the sense that people aren’t being represented properly or in the way that they want to be represented. Populism is a mode of representation. The populist leader articulates a set of grievances and in this way represents people who feel unrepresented. So populism is a mode of identity building, with the identity being articulated around the figure of the populist leader. And so supporters understand their solidarity in terms of the leaders they support, whether Duterte or Bolsonaro or Modi or Trump. Rather than outsider, which is a slippery word, I would suggest representation is what is central here. Populist support speaks to a crisis of representation.

BB: We seem to be talking about somewhat commensurate but also disparate types of leaders and political phenomena when we compare across cases like Brazil, Mexico, India, the Philippines, and the U.S. Do you think that there really is a global “wave” of populism that is unique to this moment?

EA: What I would say is global about it is that it is a reaction against neoliberalism. That is, the reaction might be captured as different forms of “post-neoliberal” projects. The post-neoliberal project has to do not just with the economics of neoliberalism but also — to get more to the point of what Marco is calling a political crisis of representation — with a particular form of political mobilization — or lack of mobilization — that accompanies neoliberalism: its technocratic element. And that makes neoliberalism very vulnerable to attack by an outsider.

MG: I’m wary of this phrase “global wave of populism,” because I think it risks glossing over significant differences in the kinds of leaders and movements supposedly included in this category… I’m not saying that we throw out these macro-level explanations. I’m saying that… These leaders, they emerge out of particular histories. They mobilize local meanings that have been decades in the making."
structures like globalization or neoliberalism or the global rise of the middle class. I’m not saying that we throw out these macro-level explanations. I’m saying that focusing only on this level may lead us to misunderstand what’s really going on. These leaders, they emerge out of particular histories. They mobilize local meanings that have been decades in the making.

Rather than think globally, we should think transnationally. By this I mean that we should group together cases that make sense together for clear reasons; developmental trajectory, for instance, or experience with democracy. For example, Duterte’s election in the Philippines has to do with a number of things, including the growth of the middle class and their experience of democracy over the course of the last thirty years. It has to do with the middle class’ concentration in cities and how these cities have been changing in ways that underscore class identity and foster class contention. In making comparisons, the question to ask is where else do we see these dynamics, not do the leaders in these countries act the same. It makes sense, then, to look at cases of rightwing populism among third wave, middle-income democracies like the Philippines, India, and Brazil. It makes a little less sense to compare leaders or movements in these countries to ones in the US and Europe.

EA: I generally agree with the hesitation to describe populism in global terms. Though I should say that I’m a comparative-historical sociologist, so my instinct is precisely in the opposite direction as yours, Marco. That said, I definitely understand the hesitation. The problem is quite obvious, which is that you lump into the category a bunch of things that don’t actually match. People lump them in because it so happens that populism is a tool in a very specific political struggle within Western countries. Which is liberals punching to their right and to their left. So populism in one way is an insult launched by people in a particular political position against anybody who’s not in their political position. But I do think that one can think of this as a broad global phenomenon given a certain definition of the phenomenon. There are trends that are shared at a global level, increasingly so. And I think neoliberalism is one of them.

BB: Our last question for you is this – what do you think is the particular contribution of a sociological perspective to the study of populism?

EA: On the one hand, a sociological approach allows you to think about there being a difference between how lay people use the concept versus a more analytic concept. On the other
hand, sociology allows you to not simply take all purportedly existing cases of populism and then to try and draw out what is shared with all of these cases. Sociology allows you to construct the category in an abstract sense that enables comparison in a historicized way without over-defining the term to the point of it becoming useless.

MG: Look at political theory. It’s been stuck in an endless debate over what populism is. The debate’s been going on for the last fifty years. As sociologists, our approach should be primarily empirical. We should aim to provide thick descriptions of populism, not waste time on parsing definitions even further. We should be making sensible comparisons (of the kind I just described). This approach plays to our discipline’s strengths. Sociology has a great tradition of doing comparative-historical work and of paying attention to things like conjuncture, sequence, and timing. We should be understanding outcomes in their multiple contexts, especially time and place. We need more ethnographies and comparative-historical work on populism. This is how sociology can contribute to the study of populism.

Edwin Ackerman is Assistant Professor of Sociology at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University.

Benjamin H. Bradlow is a PhD candidate in Sociology at Brown University and a Visiting Democracy Fellow at the Harvard Kennedy School’s Ash Center for Democratic Governance and Innovation.

Marco Garrido is Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of Chicago.

Johnnie Anne Lotesta is a Postdoctoral Democracy Fellow at the Harvard Kennedy School’s Ash Center for Democratic Governance and Innovation.
Announcements
Social Research and Public Policy Professor – Tenured

*New York University: NYU - Global: Abu Dhabi*

**Location**
Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

**Open Date**
Oct 7, 2019

**Description**
The Division of Social Science at NYU Abu Dhabi is searching for new faculty to conduct cutting edge research and teach the next generation of global leaders.

We are inviting applications from sociologists and related disciplines for a tenured faculty member to join the program in Social Research and Public Policy, for appointment in September 1, 2021, or September 1, 2022, subject to final budget approval. We will consider applicants with an active research agenda in all areas of theoretically-informed social research, but are especially keen on strengthening our faculty in any of the following areas: social theory, political sociology, comparative-historical research, qualitative methods, migration, gender, and race/ethnicity.

NYU Abu Dhabi’s unique location in the Middle East makes it an ideal headquarters for social scientists working to better understand global societies, both past and present.

**Qualifications**
This position requires a Ph.D. in Sociology or related disciplines.

We seek individuals who have a strong record of scholarship, teaching, and mentoring, and have the ability to develop and lead high-quality research.

**Application Instructions**
To apply for this position, please submit the following items:
- CV
- Cover Letter
- Statement of Teaching Interests
- Recent Teaching Evaluations (if available)
- Statement of Research Interests
- Three (3) Representative Writing Samples
- List of three references that may be contacted at a later date.
About NYU Abu Dhabi

NYU Abu Dhabi is a pioneer of higher education in a global world, dedicated to excellence in teaching and research, while advancing cooperation and progress on humanity’s shared challenges. Part of the NYU global network, NYU Abu Dhabi offers an outstanding liberal arts and science education to students from the United Arab Emirates, United States, and around the world, focusing on intercultural understanding and leadership. It supports innovative research that pushes the frontiers of knowledge forward and responds in powerful and interdisciplinary ways to vital global and local questions. NYU Abu Dhabi advances NYU as a model university for the 21st century and contributes in multiple ways to the development of a sustainable, knowledge-based economy in Abu Dhabi.

As an international center of excellence in teaching and research, our goal is to attract outstanding faculty who are leaders in their fields, encouraging them to create programs that draw outstanding students, and providing an intellectually rich environment. Students are drawn from around the globe, surpassing all traditional academic benchmarks. The NYU Abu Dhabi undergraduate student body has garnered an impressive record of scholarships, graduate-school appointments, and many other honors.

Working for NYU Abu Dhabi

A world-class institution deserves world-class benefits. At NYUAD, we recognize that Abu Dhabi is more than where you work, it’s your home and in order for you to research, teach, and thrive, we’re offering a comprehensive benefits package to our top talent. Start with generous relocation allowances to ensure a smooth transition to Abu Dhabi, followed by competitive salaries, housing and transportation allowances, and educational assistance for your dependents. Health and wellness services round out our offerings, plus more. Click here for more information on benefits for you and your dependents.

We will begin looking at applications on November 1, 2019, and will continue until the position is filled. https://apply.interfolio.com/69732

For questions about this position, please email nyuad.socialscience@nyu.edu.
New Harmonized International Social Survey Data Available:

The Survey Data Recycling (SDR) project has deposited master data files with full documentation for accessing and using for cross-national analyses. In SDR.1 version, survey data are derived from 22 well-known international social survey projects and include 1,721 national surveys covering 142 countries between 1966 and 2013 combined with national attribute statistics. The harmonized variables are especially relevant for those studying comparative social stratification, population change, protest and political participation. Documentation and data files in version SDR.1 are available for download at Harvard Dataverse: https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/sdr. Currently the SDR.2 project is sponsored by the Mershon Center for International Security Studies, the Dept. of Sociology, Ohio State University, and the Polish Academy of Sciences, and it is directed by K. Maciek Slomczynski, Irina Tomescu-Dubrow and J. Craig Jenkins. Drawing on National Science Foundation funding (#1738502), SDR.2 will deposit for public access an extended dataset for ca. 3,500 national surveys with harmonized variables pertaining to political participation, social capital and well-being. An overview of the methodological approach is available at several publications available at https://www.asc.ohio-state.edu/dataharmonization/publications/.

New Newsletter on Survey Data Harmonization:

Survey data harmonization and big data are innovative forces that are leading to new, emergent and interdisciplinary knowledge across the social sciences. The Survey Data Recycling (SDR) project, funded by National Science Foundation (#1738502), is sponsoring a newsletter on survey harmonization: Harmonization: Newsletter on Survey Data Harmonization in the Social Sciences. The newsletter provides a forum for researchers to share news and communicate with the growing community of scholars, institutions and government agencies who work on harmonizing social survey data and other projects with similar focus. It pays special attention to the methodology of survey data harmonization and contributes to the development of international research and standards on methodological issues such as data comparability, data quality, proper data documentation, and data storage and access, as well as analytic procedures that can contend with the demands of harmonized data. The current issue for Volume 5, No. 1 and back issues as well as signups for the newsletter are available at: https://www.asc.ohio-state.edu/dataharmonization/newsletter/.
Global and Transnational Sociology Best Scholarly Book Award

The Global and Transnational Sociology Section solicits nominations (including self-nominations) for the 2020 Best Scholarly Book Award, recognizing an outstanding book published in 2018 or 2019 in the area of Global and Transnational Sociology. When nominating a book, please include a brief comment (a couple of paragraphs) on its contribution to the global and transnational sociology field. Please note that second editions, translations, and edited volumes are not eligible. The deadline is March 1, 2020.

Please send a copy (or ask the publisher to send copies) of the book and the supporting materials to each of the 3 members of the Committee. If you have a question, please contact the chair of the committee, Zine Magubane magubane@bc.edu.

⇒ Zine Magubane magubane@bc.edu, Committee Chair.
   Boston College Department of Sociology
   McGuinn Hall 426 140 Commonwealth Ave. Chestnut Hill MA 02467

⇒ Gianpaolo Baiocchi gb97@nyu.edu
   New York University
   411 Lafayette Street / 305
   New York, NY 10012

⇒ Fatma Müge Göçek gocek@umich.edu
   Department of Sociology University of Michigan - Ann Arbor
   Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
Global and Transnational Sociology Best Scholarly Article Award

Deadline: 3/1/2020

The Global and Transnational Sociology Section solicits nominations (including self-nominations) for the 2020 Best Scholarly Article Award, recognizing an outstanding article published in 2018 or 2019 in the area of Global and Transnational Sociology. When nominating an article, please include a brief comment (a couple of paragraphs) on its contributions to the global and transnational sociology field. The deadline is March 1, 2020. Please direct any inquiries to the committee chair Carolina Bank Muñoz, cbmunoz@brooklyn.cuny.edu.

Please email an electronic copy of the article and supporting materials to all members of the Best Scholarly Article Committee.

⇒ Carolina Bank Muñoz cbmunoz@brooklyn.cuny.edu, committee chair.

⇒ Atef Said atefsaid@uic.edu

⇒ Kristin Surak kristin.surak@soas.ac.uk
Global and Transnational Sociology Best Publication (Article) by an International Scholar Award

Deadline: 3/1/2020

The Global and Transnational Sociology Section solicits nominations (including self-nominations) for the 2020 Award for Best Publication by an International Scholar. The award will recognize an outstanding article published in 2017, 2018 or 2019 in the area of Global and Transnational Sociology. The author or authors must not be resident in the United States. When nominating a book, please include a brief comment (a couple of paragraphs) on its contribution to the global and transnational sociology field. The deadline is March 1, 2020. With deep apologies for our linguistic limitations, we can only accept publications that have been written in or translated into English. International scholars may not submit the same work for consideration in other award categories. Please direct any inquiries to the committee chair Smitha Radhakrishnan sradhakr@wellesley.edu.

Please email a copy of your submission to all members of the Best Publication by an International Scholar Award Committee at:

⇒ Smitha Radhakrishnan sradhakr@wellesley.edu, committee chair
⇒ Victoria Reyes vreyes@ucr.edu
⇒ Besnik Pula bpula@vt.edu
Global and Transnational Sociology Best Graduate Student Paper Award

Deadline: 3/1/2020

The Global and Transnational Sociology Section invites nominations (including self-nominations) for the 2020 Best Graduate Student Paper Award, recognizing an outstanding paper, published or unpublished, in the area of Global and Transnational Sociology. The author must be a graduate student who has not received the PhD by March 1, 2020. For co-authored papers, all authors must be graduate students. When nominating an article, please include a brief comment (a couple of paragraphs) on its contributions to the global and transnational sociology field. The deadline is March 1, 2020. Please direct any inquiries to the committee chair Melanie Hughes hughesm@pitt.edu.

Please email an electronic copy of the paper to all members of the Best Graduate Student Paper Award Committee.

⇒ Melanie Hughes hughesm@pitt.edu, committee chair.
⇒ Jean Beaman jbeaman@ucsb.edu
⇒ Ricarda Hammer Ricarda_Hammer@brown.edu
Member Publications
Books


What makes domestic work a bad job, even after efforts to formalize and improve working conditions? Erynn Masi de Casanova’s case study, based partly on collaborative research conducted with Ecuador’s pioneer domestic workers’ organization, examines three reasons for persistent exploitation. First, the tasks of social reproduction are devalued. Second, informal work arrangements escape regulation. And third, unequal class relations are built into this type of employment. Accessible to advocates and policymakers as well as academics, this book provides both theoretical discussions about domestic work and concrete ideas for improving women’s lives. Drawing on workers’ stories of lucha, trabajo, and sacrificio—struggle, work, and sacrifice—*Dust and Dignity* offers a new take on an old occupation. From the intimate experience of being a body out of place in an employer’s home, to the common work histories of Ecuadorian women in different cities, to the possibilities for radical collective action at the national level, Casanova shows how and why women do this stigmatized and precarious work and how they resist exploitation in the search for dignified employment. From these searing stories of workers’ lives, *Dust and Dignity* identifies patterns in domestic workers’ experiences that will be helpful in understanding the situation of workers elsewhere and offers possible solutions for promoting and ensuring workers’ rights that have relevance far beyond Ecuador.


Sometimes leaving home allows you to make an impact on it—but at what cost? Exit and Voice is a compelling account of how Mexican migrants with strong ties to their home communities impact the economic and
political welfare of the communities they have left behind. In many de-centralized democracies like Mexico, migrants have willingly stepped in to supply public goods when local or state government lack the re-
sources or political will to improve the town. Though migrants’ cross-
border investments often improve citizens’ access to essential public
goods and create a more responsive local government, their work al-

tows them to unintentionally exert political engagement and power,
undermining the influence of those still living in their hometowns. In
looking at the paradox of migrants who have left their home to make an
impact on it, Exit and Voice sheds light on how migrant transnational
engagement refashions the meaning of community, democratic govern-
ance, and practices of citizenship in the era of globalization.


*Citizenship 2.0* focuses on an important yet overlooked dimension of globalization: the steady rise in the
legitimacy and prevalence of dual citizenship. Demand for dual citizen-
ship is particularly high in Latin America and Eastern Europe, where
more than three million people have obtained a second citizenship from
EU countries or the United States. Most citizenship seekers acquire EU
citizenship by drawing on their ancestry or ethnic origin; others secure
U.S. citizenship for their children by strategically planning their place of
birth. Their aim is to gain a second, compensatory citizenship that would
provide superior travel freedom, broader opportunities, an insurance
policy, and even a status symbol. The book draws on statistics, interviews
and fieldwork in three study cases: EU dual citizenship in Serbia and in
Israel, U.S. dual citizenship in Mexico. Through the analysis of these ma-
terials, Harpaz reveals the growth of instrumental attitudes toward citi-
zenship: individuals worldwide increasingly view nationality as rank
within a global hierarchy rather than as a symbol of a unique national
identity. *Citizenship 2.0* sheds light on a fascinating phenomenon that is
expected to have a growing impact on national identity, immigration,
and economic inequality.

In *Social Democratic Capitalism*, Lane Kenworthy shows that this system improves living standards for the least well-off, enhances economic security, and boosts equality of opportunity. And it does so without sacrificing other things we want in a good society, from liberty to economic growth to health and happiness. Its chief practitioners have been the Nordic nations. The Nordics have gone farther than other rich democratic countries in coupling a big welfare state with public services that promote high employment and modest product- and labor-market regulations. Many believe this system isn't transferable beyond Scandinavia, but Kenworthy shows that social democratic capitalism and its successes can be replicated in other affluent nations, including the United States.


Recent years have seen renewed interest in the study of revolution. Spurred by events like the 2011 uprisings in North Africa and the Middle East, the rise of Islamic State, and the emergence of populism, a new age of revolution has generated considerable interest. Yet, even as empirical studies of revolutions are thriving, there has been a stall in theories of revolution. *Anatomies of Revolution* offers a novel account of how revolutions begin, unfold and end. By combining insights from international relations, sociology, and global history, it outlines the benefits of a ‘global historical sociology’ of revolutionary change, one in which international processes take centre stage. Featuring a wide range of cases from across modern world history, this is a comprehensive account of one of the world’s most important processes. It will interest students and scholars studying revolutions, political conflict and contentious politics in sociology, politics and international relations.

Growing protests in non-democratic countries are often seen as signals of regime decline. China, however, has remained stable amid surging protests. Playing by the Informal Rules highlights the importance of informal norms in structuring state-protester interactions, mitigating conflict, and explaining regime resilience. Drawing on a nationwide dataset of protest and multi-sited ethnographic research, this book presents a bird's-eye view of Chinese contentious politics and illustrates the uneven application of informal norms across regions, social groups, and time. Through examinations of protests and their distinct implications for regime stability, Li offers a novel theoretical framework suitable for monitoring the trajectory of political contention in China and beyond. Overall, this study sheds new light on political mobilization and authoritarian resilience and provides fresh perspectives on power, rules, legitimacy, and resistance in modern societies.


The U.S. military continues to be an overt presence in the Philippines, and a reminder of the country’s colonial past. Using Subic Bay (a former U.S. military base, now a Freeport Zone) as a case study, Victoria Reyes argues that its defining feature is its ability to elicit multiple meanings. For some, it is a symbol of imperialism and inequality, while for others, it projects utopian visions of wealth and status. Drawing on archival and ethnographic data, Reyes describes the everyday experiences of people living and working in Subic Bay, and makes a case for critically examining similar spaces across the world. These foreign-controlled, semi-autonomous zones of international exchange are what she calls global borderlands. While they can take many forms, ranging from overseas military bases to tourist resorts, they all have key features in common. This new unit of globalization provides a window into broader economic and political relations, the consequences of legal ambiguity, and the continuously reimagined identities of the people living there. Rejecting colonialism as merely a historical backdrop, Reyes demonstrates how it is omnipresent in our modern world.
In *Home Rule* Nandita Sharma traces the historical formation and political separation of Natives and Migrants from the nineteenth century to the present to theorize the portrayal of Migrants as “colonial invaders.” The imperial-state category of Native, initially a mark of colonized status, has been revitalized in what Sharma terms the Postcolonial New World Order of nation-states. Under postcolonial rule, claims to autochthony—being the Native “people of a place”—are mobilized to define true national belonging. Consequently, Migrants—the quintessential “people out of place”—increasingly face exclusion, expulsion, or even extermination. This turn to autochthony has led to a hardening of nationalism(s). Criteria for political membership have shrunk, immigration controls have intensified, all while practices of expropriation and exploitation have expanded. Such politics exemplify the postcolonial politics of national sovereignty, a politics that Sharma sees as containing our dreams of decolonization. *Home Rule* rejects nationalisms and calls for the dissolution of the ruling categories of Native and Migrant so we can build a common, worldly place where our fundamental liberty to stay and move is realized.


In this timely book, Shefner and Blad trace the 45-year history of austerity policies and how they became the go-to policy to resolve a host of economic problems. Using a variety of cases from the Global North and South, the book answers a number of important questions: why austerity persisted as a policy aimed at resolving national crises, despite evidence that it often does not work; how the policy itself evolved over recent decades; and who and what the powerful people and institutions are that have helped impose it across the globe. This book will appeal to students, researchers, and policy-makers interested in austerity, globalization and development, political economy, and economic sociology.
Articles and Book Chapters


Hanrieder, T. 2019: "How Do Professions Globalize? Lessons from the Global South in US Medical Education." International Political Sociology
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