



Chase-Dunn's Scholarship on Cities and Urbanization

Michael Timberlake

University of Utah

timber@soc.utah.edu

This essay is intended to be a hybrid scholarly and personal review of Christopher Chase-Dunn's contributions to urban sociology and urban studies more broadly. The essay points out that these contributions have been significant, and they have often been indirect via his influence on students and other of his professional associates. That I have been among those influenced by his work and by my association with him contributes to the personal tone of the essay. We will see that Chase-Dunn's research featuring cities is strikingly expansive, both in terms the huge swathes of human history that it covers as well as its eagerness to embrace multiple academic disciplines—e.g., sociology, archeology, history, and urban studies—for both theoretical and empirical fuel for his scholarship. And, we will see that his scholarship on cities was fundamentally global long before “globalization” became understood as a ubiquitous organizing principle for human affairs.

Globalizing the Study of Cities in Relation to “Development”

Today, in 2017, it seems commonplace for urban studies scholars to take into account global processes and structures when their attention is focused on understanding urbanization and contemporary urban problems, such as gentrification, urban informality, social and spatial polarization—particularly by class, and race/ethnicity, slums and poverty, and urban economic



New articles in this journal are licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 United States License.



This journal is published by the [University Library System](#), [University of Pittsburgh](#) as part of its [D-Scribe Digital Publishing Program](#) and is cosponsored by the [University of Pittsburgh Press](#).

development. However, for much of the twentieth century, with a tiny number of exceptions, sociologists as well as urban studies scholars in other disciplines who were engaged in this enterprise assumed urban social phenomenon to be influenced by actors and institutions confined to national boundaries at the broadest, if not to even narrower boundaries such as cities or metropolitan areas. For example, in the comparative study of urbanization in the 1960s and 70s, sociological research often concerned urban patterns and processes in the global South, viewing them in relation to “modernization.” Scholars, particularly American sociologists perhaps, regarded as “abnormal” the rapid growth of large cities and the sudden shift of the share of national populations from country to cities in the absence of industrial development (e.g., Breese 1969). Their theories attributed such imbalances to policies favoring urban elites that made cities more attractive superficially to non-elite potential migrants, many of whom left behind rural villages only to end up unemployed or working in the underground economies and slums of Third World cities (e.g., Gugler and Flanagan 1977). While field research in such countries usually provided more nuanced perspectives (e.g., Peattie 1968), the take-away for much of the assigned reading on cities and development in graduate curricula of the 1960s and 1970s was that urban problems outside of Western Europe and the white settler colonies stemmed from poor governing practices in Third World countries, cultural backwardness, and demographic factors.

When urban studies scholars more generally focused their attention on American cities, they were usually unlikely to look for explanations for what caught their attention that went beyond city hall, the board rooms of cities’ dominant firms, or the allegedly dysfunctional cultures of the residents of slums and ethnic neighborhoods (e.g., Banfield 1970). Again, ethnographic research often challenged the dominant sociological positions on these issues (e.g., Gans 1962), and some of these critiques indeed did make it onto the graduate reading lists of those of us in doctoral programs in the 1970s.

In the late 1970s and 80s in American sociology, a number of emerging sociologists began exploring the ways in which urbanization processes and urban social structures might be related systematically with socioeconomic processes operating “cross-nationally” (as we may have put it in those days). Moreover, many of us found it useful to deploy critical structural analytical categories—often Marxist and neo-Marxist—in this pursuit even as we often utilized quantitative strategies befitting mainstream American sociology (and our own training) but unlike the critical, heavily theoretical—and often historical—work that may have inspired us (e.g., Frank 1966, Carodoso 1972, Walton 1977, Wallerstein 1974). The titles of our dissertations are telling: *Economic Dependence, Internal Urban and Labor Force Structure and Problems of Development: A Quantitative Cross-National Study* (Timberlake 1979); *Urbanization in the World Economy: A Cross-National and Historical Structural Approach* (Smith 1984); *Urbanization and Economic Expansion in Post-Independence Kenya* (Bradshaw 1987), for example.

Many of us who were working in this vein at this time were influenced directly or indirectly by Christopher Chase-Dunn's pioneering scholarship combining a careful analysis of macro-comparative theory with systematic, often quantitative, analyses exploring and testing the implications of his interpretations of these theories. His 1975 article in the *American Sociological Review*, estimating the statistical effects of national-level dependence on foreign capital on economic growth and income inequality became a model for how to begin operationalizing critical political economy theory in relation to issues of comparative international development to many of us. I am sure this paper will be covered in more detail in other chapters in this volume. The importance of it for this essay is that it served as a critical and crucial strategy template that many "coming of age" sociologists began to use for deploying critical development theory to analyze pressing issues of the day in a manner that the guardians for the scientific rigor of the discipline's flagship journals had to take seriously. This is not to suggest that Chase-Dunn or those others of us who adopted this strategy were somehow insincere in our efforts. We have proven ourselves to be just as effective at insisting on methodological rigor as the earlier generations, even as we are often more eclectic in terms of theory.

Before moving away entirely from this brief reference to his 1975 article, let me add an autobiographical note that is relevant to the issue of how Chase-Dunn has influenced research in urban studies. At the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association in Montreal (1974), I attended the session in which Chase-Dunn presented an early version of this article. At the end of the session, I made a point to introduce myself to him and let him know that I was working on testing the effects of relative economic dependence of low income countries on various "problems" related to urbanization but was having trouble finding different indicators of dependence. By the end of the conversation, he generously agreed to send me his data which then provided me with one of the two key measures of my independent variable in my subsequent dissertation research, along with other measures.

Chase-Dunn's work became increasingly informed by the world-system perspective which Immanuel Wallerstein introduced and as modified and elaborated by, among many others, Wallerstein himself, Andre Gunder Frank, and Chase-Dunn (culminating, but not ending with his book, *Global Formation*, published in 1989). Simultaneously, he began turning his attention to urbanization patterns and city formation in relation to the structure and dynamics of, first, the capitalist world-system and increasingly in relation to historical world-systems more broadly.

Cities, Urbanization, and City-Systems in Chase-Dunn's Research

In the remainder of this essay, I will, first, discuss a few exemplars of Chase-Dunn's urban-related research in some detail. I will then argue that his research has not had a large, direct impact on urban studies scholarship. Instead, it has had an indirect effect on urban studies via the work of those of us whom he has influenced and inspired. Next, I will also note that there are two broad reasons why his direct impact has been minimal on urban studies. One is that this interdisciplinary area tends to be devoted to contemporary issues affecting individual cities or groups of cities within regions to the exclusion of the long historical sweep with which Chase-Dunn's work is consumed. The second reason is that he uses data on cities and urbanization patterns to test hypotheses about the causal processes at work in shaping world-systems, or civilizations. This has been Chase-Dunn's fundamental project for many years, and it is one which raises a set of concerns that are far beyond "the urban." I will then conclude with a discussion of the considerable indirect effects on comparative urban studies Chase-Dunn has had through his influence on those of us who study world cities/global cities, urbanization, and global city networks.

Chase-Dunn is not primarily an urban sociologist. He is a macro-comparative social scientist whose career has been dedicated to theorizing and empirically exploring basic features and processes of historical world-systems: how they are organized, how they reproduce, how they change, how they cease to be. One recurring subject in his research has been exploring how properties and processes of world-systems shape various features of human settlements and their interrelationships. His scholarship is characterized by a commitment to marshal systematic, often quantitative data, that allow him and his collaborators, who are often students, to evaluate hypotheses related to this theoretical problematic. An early effort to that end was Chase-Dunn's National Science Foundation-funded project housed in the Social Relations Department of Johns Hopkins University in the early 1980s.¹ A chief aim of this project was to collect estimates of the world's cities' population sizes for various time points from 800 to 1975 or 1980. He and his students used these data to evaluate a number of hypotheses relating his understanding of Wallerstein's world-system perspective to urbanization patterns. Along the way, he identified and made contact with other scholars who were beginning similar endeavors.²

He is clear about this approach in proposing a strategy for studying urbanization in relation to the capitalist world-system in a 1983 article that is related to the NSF project. While acknowledging the pioneering work of Marxist urban scholars, such as Castells (e.g. 1977) for

¹ As a postdoctoral fellow in the department from 1980-82 I benefitted from participating with the team he assembled for the project, which included Jeffrey Kentor, Jeff Lunday, Joan Sokolovsky, and Pamela Walters, all of whom were doctoral students in the department at that time.

² A book that I edited (Timberlake 1985) is collection of research papers authored by several of these people and is a product of my time working with Chase-Dunn as a postdoctoral fellow.

arguing that national urbanization processes needed to be understood as part of the social, cultural and political contexts in which they were embedded (i.e., capitalism), Chase-Dunn argues that those contexts are too often restricted to national boundaries. This is too limiting. The Dependency School begins to offer a broader perspective by understanding urbanization patterns in dependent countries as a manifestation of their economic and political subordination to the Western nations and transnational firms. Chase-Dunn advocates an even broader perspective by adopting Wallerstein's world-system perspective which includes understanding "dependency" as an enduring feature of the capitalist world-system. Such a core-periphery division of labor has been a central feature of this world-system since it emerged in 15th and 16th centuries. Thus, he proposed that connections between urbanization patterns such as national-level primate city size distributions be examined in relation to regular features of the world-system: the core-periphery division of labor, cycles of hegemony, state formation, and so on. Another structural feature of this world-system, he notes, is its political multicentricity (in contrast to world-empires), suggesting that "...there are several world cities at any point in time and these are separate contending sources of economic and political power" (1983: 44). And he also suggests that examining the world city size distribution itself might well reveal changing patterns over time that "...are related to cycles or trends of the capitalist world-economy" (44). This is quite prescient of more recent studies of "world cities" and "global cities," and a few of these recent studies have noted the rise of some Asian cities (in China especially) within the overall global hierarchy of cities (e.g., Alderson, et al. 2010; Mahutga et al. 2010) which can be related to the development dynamics of upwardly mobile semiperipheries.

In a 1985 article, Chase-Dunn (1985a) begins to show how he will go about answering such questions on the basis of evidence. He deploys some of the city size data gathered in the course of his NSF project to address the question of why Latin American countries seemed have unusually primate city size distributions. It is important to note that, in doing so, he does not fetishize city systems' population size distributions. He makes it clear that population size is an imperfect indicator of more fundamental urban network properties, for example commodity flows or power relationships, for which no data exist. Of course, there was already a considerable body of theory and research on city systems in general, and urban primacy in particular. In this piece he compares the shape of national city systems in about 20 Latin American countries to those in about 15 "developed" countries of the West, and he does so over a considerably longer period of time than previous studies of urban primacy. Using Walters' SPI Index (1985) as a measure of the degree of primacy, he shows that from 1800 to 1975, urban primacy became more extreme in Latin American countries, in general, but much of the increase occurred in the 1930s and 1940s. During the same 150 years, Western countries' city systems became, first, more primate, and then less primate in the last couple of decades of that time period, overall, than they had been in the middle

decades, and they were far less primate in 1975 than the Latin American countries. In the urban primacy literature this suggests that these core countries (in terms of the world-system perspective) had balanced distributions of cities, indicating more spatially even development patterns, whereas the Latin American countries had uneven development. In making this two-fold comparison—over time and across zones of the world-economy—Chase-Dunn is able to evaluate—and reject—several hypotheses that had been advanced in the literature on Latin American urban primacy, including that it was primarily an outcome of colonialism and that it stems from import substitution industrialization during global stagnation of the 1930s. While this analysis is preliminary, he concludes that “contextual world-system properties...may be responsible” for the observed patterns (1985a: 28).

In the same year that this article was published, the edited volume, *Urbanization in the World-Economy* was published (Timberlake 1985). This volume was largely the result of Chase-Dunn’s research group at Johns Hopkins and his efforts to make connections with other scholars whose research conceived of urbanization processes as having transnational concomitants. He contributed a chapter—one that the editor inexplicably buried near the end of the volume—which extended his analysis of city systems to world economies. Using the data on city sizes developed in his project, he calculated urban primacy scores based on the West’s ten largest cities at 200- to 50-year intervals beginning in 800 AD, and with additional calculations for cities in the Roman Empire in 100 and 350 AD. Again, these scores are estimates of the extent to which the population sizes of cities are ordered hierarchically (with a steep gradient from the most populous to the smallest) versus “flat” (with an absence of large differences in city sizes). And, again, population size rankings of cities in national territories have been long argued theoretically to provide rough indicators of the degree to which the cities are integrated into a single system. His purpose in this piece is to investigate

...the extent to which it is fruitful to view the cities of the capitalist world-economy as participating in a single interactive spatial system, albeit one that differs substantially from those most usually found within nation states. Is there a system of world cities that exhibits regular tendencies of hierarchy and specialization analogous to those found in smaller areas? I argue that the correct specification of the boundaries of the capitalist world-economy, and an understanding of its political and economic structures and processes can be used to explain the nature and varying features of the system of world cities (Chase-Dunn 1985b: 269).

Though McKenzie (1926) hinted at such a global system of cities, Chase-Dunn's evocation of the notion here maybe the first time it was explicitly suggested (but also see Friedmann and Wolf 1982 and Cohen 1981). Today, there is a large literature on the global system of cities and there have been methodological advances in mapping them and studying them (e.g., Taylor 1997; Derudder and Witlox 2008; Smith and Timberlake 1995). But is Chase-Dunn's conceptualization of such a system similar to these latter advances? Undoubtedly it is. Asking the reader to imagine a map of the world in 1900 without national boundaries but with the names and locations of cities, he goes on to write, "Now draw lines that indicate the commodity exchanges among the cities and towns of the world-system... What can now be observed is an exchange network among cities that has differential densities within it indicating various national and regional sub-systems, but that also exhibits a transnational structure similar in appearance to a familiar airline route map" (1985b: 271). He then asks the reader to further imagine color coding the lines on the map to indicate differences in the flows of highly processed commodities vs. raw materials, the locations of high level services functions such as "international banking" and headquarters and subsidiaries of transnational firms, and so on. Today, we have studies of the global system of cities that are based on some of these very sorts of indicators, including international air passenger flows between city pairs (Smith and Timberlake 1995a), business class air passenger flows between cities (Derudder and Witlox 2008), the world's top service firms and their back offices (Taylor 2001), Fortune 500 headquarter-subsidiary city linkages (Alderson and Beckfield 2004), financial linkages (Bassens et al 2009) and other direct measures of city-to-city linkages globally.³ In the end of the imaginary map exercise, Chase-Dunn asks the reader to draw the national boundaries back on this map of flows in recognition of the fact that states are fundamental to the operation of the capitalist world-system. Geopolitical competition and even warfare are endogenous to the world-system. This is an important distinction between Chase-Dunn's conceptualization of global city systems and some other, later conceptualizations, such as Sassen's suggestion that global city formation is indicative of the "deterritorialization" of the state (e.g. 2009).

Returning to the actual research reported in Chase-Dunn's chapter that is under discussion, he interprets changes in the index scores that he reports in light of long term changes in the political and economic organization of Europe and the West more broadly as, first, the Roman Empire gives way to feudalism, and then capitalism spreads, rapidly becoming constituted as a world-system. Without attempting to present the complex interpretation of the findings presented in the chapter, the "...general overview [of the observed patterns of changes] can be interpreted in terms of the

³ A list of papers and various global city network mapping exercises found at the website for the Globalization and World City Network can be found on the internet at <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/gawc/>. Founded by geographer Peter Taylor, this network has drawn together scholars and scholarship of which Chase-Dunn foreshadows in this 1985 piece.

demise of the Roman city system into European feudalism, the rise of the capitalist cities and administrative cities of the European nation-states, and then the cycle of core competition (the rise and fall of hegemonic core powers and their world cities)” (1985b: 282). Thus Chase-Dunn finds the shifts in the degree of hierarchy of city system are in line with shifts from a world empire, its devolution and decentralization, and the rise of the capitalist world-system (and its attendant nation states) and then cyclical features of that world-system.

Chase-Dunn’s has revisited cities and city systems in relation to very long run processes and macro socioeconomic and political structures, producing several published and unpublished papers since 1990. In recent years (since 2001), many of these can be found at the website for the Institute for Research on World-Systems (IROWS, <http://www.irows.ucr.edu/>) which he founded and coordinates at the University of California Riverside. Some of them can only be found there, making them both very accessible, in that this site is open access, and at the same time rather obscure because one must know about it and peek into it from time to time. But other pieces have been published, and are either archived at IROWS or reincarnated as Chase-Dunn and his collaborators revise and extend particular pieces on the basis of new analysis, new data, and new theorization. An example of this is his piece, “The Changing Role of Cities in World-Systems” (IROWS v. 8-2-04 2004) which is a revised version of a book chapter that appeared in an edited volume in 1991 (Bornschiefer and Lengyel). Here (and elsewhere many times since), he engages literatures that go far beyond my own scope of experience and expertise, into debates amongst economic historians, archeologists, anthropologists and scholars of civilizations. He engages these by making the argument that world-systems analysis can be fruitfully extended to pre-capitalist modes of production and, more to the point of this piece, that “the analysis of the growth of cities and systems of cities is germane to the many issues which these contending perspectives raise” (2004: 3). Even nomadic peoples, he notes, wander systematically and develop collective settlement sites that are used recurrently, and they develop relationships with other groups, settled or not. Moreover, this observation invites investigations into hierarchical relations among such groups, raising the possibility of core-periphery relations and unequal exchange.

From the late 1990s through the first decades of the present century, Chase-Dunn and his collaborators have returned repeatedly to an analysis of settlement sizes and city size hierarchies within various territorially bounded areas such as regions, nations, empires, and world-systems. The purpose is always more than descriptive exercise. Rather it is to answer questions and evaluate hypotheses about the processes that seem fundamental to large social systems, looking for regularities and “synchronicities” across time and across such territorial units with an eye toward nailing down the causes of change and stability and evaluating claims about from where in the world the chief forces of change originate. Within this body of work are studies of city sizes and the territorial sizes of empires showing that distant, regional interaction systems have experienced

synchronous cycles of expansion and contraction, with shifts in city size hierarchy and absolute sizes of cities mirrored by the territorial size of empires (e.g., Chase, Dunn, et al. 2000; Chase-Dunn et al. 2006; Chase-Dunn et al. 2015).

City-like settlements appear in both complex chiefdoms and then in early state-based systems, both of which evince hierarchical relationships among both classes and spatially, across settlements (Chase-Dunn et al. 2000). He and his co-authors note that the first cities appear in Mesopotamia as nodes in hierarchical settlement systems, and in the context of city-states. Increasing population densities require more intensified production efforts and logically leads to competition "...for land and other resources, which increases the prevalence of warfare." This piece goes on to develop arguments about the role of cities in empires and, with the increasing prevalence of commodification, then emerge specialized, capitalized city-states operating within (or between) empires, and finally the increasing preponderance in Europe of capitalist relations along with the success of capitalist interests in assuming state power and the rise of the nation state. "Now national states and capitalist firms became the main players in a world-system in which the logic of capitalist accumulation had become predominant over other logics of accumulation." At this point in this piece, Chase-Dunn et al. acknowledge the extensive research on cities and city systems in the context of the relatedly contemporary capitalist world-system, but he uses his foray into the role of cities across the millennia to make the point that this other work is myopic. For example, he suggests that many of the changing urbanization patterns that social scientists find unique today are quite similar to changes in settlement patterns during other periods of hegemonic decline. He ends the piece with a hopeful (but possibly Pollyannaish) suggestion that perhaps cities can regain their prominence as sites of progressive agency:

...the role of cities has changed with the rise and fall of different logics of accumulation. Early city-states were protagonists of the tributary mode of production. They developed the techniques of power that made empire formation by conquest possible. Later, in the context of already-formed tributary empires, a few city-states in the semiperiphery became protagonists of the capitalist mode of production. When the capitalist mode became predominant, national states and firms pushed cities out of the transformational role. Is it possible for cities to become important protagonists of socialism?

Citing arguments by Harvey (1985) and Alger (1990) and adding his own twist, Chase-Dunn answers in the positive this rhetorical question. He envisages international inter-urban associations and alliances of social movements for justice, the environment, and mutual aid. "Municipal networks are one form of organization that such movements should utilize."

In another paper involving huge comparisons over stupendous periods of time, Chase-Dunn and Willard (1993) exam changing hierarchical patterns across cities in relation to cycles of political centralization-decentralization of world-systems, comparing eight (Mesopotamian, Egyptian, Mesoamerican, West African, Indic, Far Eastern, Japanese, and the Central world-system "...which eventually engulfed all the others") across nearly 4000 years, hypothesizing that "...city systems will become more hierarchical—that is the largest cities will be much larger than other cities in the same network—when political/military power is more centralized." Carefully using estimates of cities' population sizes, they compute the degree to which city systems of each world-system are hierarchical versus flat at different points in time. They compute the standardized primacy index (SPI), developed by Walters (1985) in Chase-Dunn's NSF project mentioned above, for a number of time points. They then use other scholars' (e.g., Wilkinson [1987], Elvin [1973], Frank [1992]) discussions related largely to historical shifts in concentrations of economic, political, and military power, trade networks, and so on, to interpret shifts in urban populations and city size hierarchy within world-systems over time. They conclude, with considerable caution and nuance, that indeed hierarchical city size distributions do indeed correspond with concentrations of what we would call geopolitical power and, indeed, hegemony within world-systems. This paper is a typical example of meticulous, systematic empirical research brought to bear on otherwise very speculative interpretations of archeological and historical data drawing conclusions about the rise of "civilizations," their expansion/contraction, coherence, and decline.

Chase-Dunn and Manning (2010 [2004]) provide another fine example of using changes in regions' city sizes and city hierarchies to track synchronicities across regions in an effort to challenge or support contentious claims about shifts in the locus of political-economic power in the world over time. Their analysis of data on city sizes and distributions across East Asia, West Asia-North Africa, Europe and South Asia reveal remarkable synchronicity in patterns between the first two regions over the huge swath of time between 1360BCE and 1600 CE. They also show concurrence over more recent time (1400CE to 1850CE), with their data revealing patterns that are consistent with the increasing economic prominence of Europe relative to the other regions. On the basis of these findings, they draw conclusions about some of Frank's arguments about the relative prominence of China and Europe over the history of civilizations (1998). In *ReORIENT*, Frank contends that, before the abrupt ascendance of capitalist Europe, it was a periphery to the core West Asia and North Africa empires of the ancient world, a relationship that was disrupted by the rise of Greece and then Rome, but one which was reestablished with Rome's decline. Analyses of their city data permit Chase-Dunn and Manning to allow Frank this claim. And, the synchronicity in the city size trends across regions, also supports the Frank and Gills (1994) argument that "...an integrated Afro-Eurasian world system [existed] much earlier than most historians and civilizationists suppose" (2010: 113). However, their city data analysis also

challenge Frank's argument that the rise of Europe was permitted primarily by a "...developmental crisis in China. The city population data indicate that an important renewed core formation process had been emerging within Europe since at least the 14th century" (2010: 113). Contrary to Frank, the data indicate a long and relatively gradual increase in the centrality of Europe rather than the rather sudden explosive rise of Europe caused by the conjunction of intensified capitalism in Europe and the crisis in the East. Once again, Chase-Dunn and his collaborators marshal quantitative data on population changes in all the world's cities over huge spans of time in order to both evaluate existing claims about the nature of long term social change as well as to discern patterns of regularity and difference that might suggest alternative explanations of historical change as well as the underlying causal forces behind shifting loci of power and control in world-systems. Chase-Dunn and Manning conclude this paper by noting that the rise of Europe and success of its capitalist world-system has by now led to the incorporation of the entire globe within it. Their data on urban populations show that in recent years, East Asian cities have regained their prominence amongst the world cities, and they note that other research on other sorts of global urban hierarchies also indicates the rise of Asian cities in recent years (e.g., Shin and Timberlake 2000, Ma and Timberlake 2013). But, this is indicative of increasing competition for core power within a single world-system.

Chase-Dunn's interest in cities is mainly tied to what information about their relative sizes, locations, preponderance, and linkages with each other and other territorial units indicate about key structural features and processes of world-systems, which for him is, essentially human history. The framework he and his collaborators use has been elaborated in several books and articles. For example, he and Jorgenson (2003) write, "This theoretical framework deploys what has been called the comparative world-systems approach to bounding social systems. Rather than comparing societies with one another, we compare systems of human societies (or intersocietal systems) and these are empirically bounded in space as interaction networks—bilateral or multilateral regularized exchanges of materials, obligations, threats, and information" (2003: 1). In the papers reviewed above, large cities in terms of population size indicate loci of power; they are found within territories whose inhabitants have been successful in organizing relationships that facilitate the accumulation of resources in these particular places. This is accomplished through the operation of the above mentioned interaction networks. Tracking the relative size of cities located within different, relatively independent systems of human societies and comparing this to how the historical and archeological records have been interpreted by scholars of civilizations has allowed him to confirm or challenge their understandings about the relative success of these different systems as well as mark prominent points of change in their "life cycles." And, tracking their sizes and relative sizes over time has allowed him to evaluate claims about the extent and timing in how societal systems are flourishing or struggling. Moreover, examining information on

population size hierarchies of cities within interacting societal systems can help settle debates about the timing of expansions and contractions of systems and about hegemonic cycles within the core of world-systems.

One of Chase-Dunn's foremost goals exhibited throughout his body of work is explicit in the paper with Jorgenson: "We want to explain expansions, evolutionary changes in system logic, and collapses. This is the point of comparing world-systems" (Chase-Dunn and Jorgenson 2003:9; see also Chase-Dunn and Hall 1997). His research deploying data over long periods of time on the world's cities' populations and their population size hierarchies has been one strategy he has used to accomplish this ambitious goal. So, while his work has not been aimed at contributing to urban studies research per se, he has prominently featured cities, city systems, and urbanization in his research, and he has contributed indirectly to urban studies through his influence on many of us who have worked with him as students and collaborators.

Chase-Dunn's Legacy in Urban Studies?

Although my own research is much more limited in scope, perhaps falling into "...the shallow presentism of most social science ...[that] needs to be denounced at every opportunity" (Chase-Dunn and Jorgenson 2003: 10), Chase-Dunn has influenced it tremendously. While I had already begun linking urbanization and urban social structure to transnational socioeconomic processes and structures in my dissertation work at Brown University under Peter Evans, I was able to sharpen and refine my theoretical understanding about how these linkages operated by working with him and his team at Johns Hopkins in the early 1980s. This experience also gave me an appreciation for the hard work necessary for locating, recording, organizing and analyzing data that would be useful in evaluating the claims that we and others were making about how large, human social systems are organized and change—their rise and demise, their cycles, and their fundamental structures. It was at this time that Chase-Dunn was working on *Global Formation* (1989; see Bair and Werner, in this volume). During my postdoctoral fellowship with him, I was exposed to and involved in many of the theoretical ideas he was honing for this book, and it has shaped my work tremendously. But I was also working with a group of doctoral students that he supported with his NSF grant on urbanization and the world-system.

This research and a resulting edited book, *Urbanization and the World-Economy* (Timberlake 1985) are mentioned above, and some of the contributions in the book are important to mention again here. Many of them are prescient of some of the ways in which scholarship in urban studies became increasingly concerned with connecting urban issues with global currents. The contributors to the book include those who worked with him on the NSF project as well as other scholars whom he located and to whom he reached out who were working on similar issues at the same time. I have already discussed Chase-Dunn's own contribution on the world-system's city

city, a piece that resonates with Friedmann's influential work on "world cities," Saskia Sassen's work on "global cities," and Peter Taylor's work on the "world system's city-system," much of which would appear within the next few years (e.g., Friedmann 1986; Sassen 1991; Knox and Taylor 1995).

Other contributions to my 1985 edited book include a conceptual piece by Kentor on economic development in relation to the global division of labor in which he discusses and schematically presents the notion of territorially nested hierarchies of cities, regions, and zones (core, periphery, semiperiphery) of the world-economy, prescient of the "nested network approach" that Chase-Dunn uses in his work comparing world-systems, especially with Hall (e.g. 1997). Kentor went on to produce several published pieces in which cities and urbanization are the focus, including fascinating research in which he uses interlocking Fortune 500 boards of directors to signal linkages in global city networks (Kentor et al. 2011; see also Kentor 1981; Timberlake and Kentor 1983; and Kentor and Jang 2004). It is in another chapter of this book that one of the project's team, Pamela Walters (1985), develops the measures of urban primacy (SPI), versions of which Chase-Dunn uses throughout much of the work discussed above in which urban hierarchy is featured. All of his project's team members who contributed to the book were deeply influenced by Chase-Dunn's theoretical understanding of the world-system which he elaborates in *Global Formation* (1989) and which I am sure is discussed in more detail elsewhere in this special issue. Moreover, those of us who have brought Chase-Dunn's version of the world-system perspective directly to our understanding of cities and urbanization have collaborated with colleagues and our own students, deploying Chase-Dunn's understandings of the capitalist world-system's chief structures and processes in our research on global and world city networks.

Contributions in the book from scholars to whom Chase-Dunn reached out to find include a piece by Alejandro Portes reprising earlier work he did on the role of the urban informal sector in unequal core-periphery exchange. Of course Portes has written extensively about Latin American cities and urbanization (e.g. 1989). Bruce London, whose later published work contributes to understanding "overurbanization" in low income countries (e.g., London and Smith 1988) contributed a chapter on the international context of problematic city-hinterland relationships in Thailand (London 1985). And, significantly, Saskia Sassen contributed a chapter (Sassen-Koob 1985) on capital mobility and migration in "core cities" that foreshadows her widely read and acclaimed work on "global cities" (e.g. 1991).

David Smith, with Roger Nemeth, also contributed to this edited volume with a piece comparing urban hierarchies in South Korea and the Philippines and explaining their differences through the lens of world-systems analysis. It was in working with Smith as he helped to prepare this chapter for publication in the book that initiated a long collaboration between him and me. We have collaboratively authored about ten urban-related journal articles or book chapters (e.g., 1995

2002 to list two examples) as well as developed a funded National Science Foundation project (with Kentor). With Smith and other collaborators, I have narrowed much of my own focus to conceptually and empirically mapping the present world-system's city system (e.g., Smith and Timberlake 2001) and in research about how a city's location in global city systems and the world-system influence social structure within cities (e.g., Timberlake et al. 2012; Sanderson et al. 2015). Aside from the 1985 edited book, much of the work cited immediately above has appeared in journals squarely in the interdisciplinary area of urban studies, including *Urban Studies*, *Cities and Community*, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, and *Cities*. Other examples of urban studies scholarship conducted by those under Chase-Dunn's direct or inherited influence include work on measuring world city centrality (Boyd, et al. 2013), the likelihood of overurbanization in post-Maoist China (Song and Timberlake 1996), Asia's rising world cities (Ma and Timberlake 2008), and testing world-system effects on the size of countries' informal labor sector (Roberts 2014). While Chase-Dunn's influence was directly personal in some cases—as a mentor and/or collaborator, in other cases it was not. Nevertheless, his theoretical work and his efforts to create networks of scholars who share similar interests stimulated considerable scholarship on urbanization and cities that has had a direct impact on urban studies even as his own research has not.

Conclusion

In this essay I have focused on that portion of Chase-Dunn's research that has featured cities and patterns of urbanization. We have seen that he has often used measures of the world's cities' population sizes and measures of the extent of hierarchy among interacting cities to challenge claims about how civilizations, world-systems, and other territorial human interaction systems have, over the course of the archaeological and historical record, expanded and contracted and become more or less powerful. I have asserted that his research has not directly contributed to urban studies, and the reason it has not is that he has never intended for it to do so. Nevertheless, I have argued that he has indirectly influenced urban studies scholarship significantly in the course of his career. He has done so by developing powerful theoretical tools that many scholars have used to describe and understand changes in urbanization patterns and cities' global interrelationships. He has done so through his work and influence over those with whom he has worked directly, such as doctoral students and various collaborators, and he has done so by bringing together those whose scholarship is concerned with how global forces articulate with local social settings, manifest in the size and social structure of cities and in the ways in which cities are networked with each other and with other territorially organized populations.

Finally, I would argue that urban studies scholarship today is fixated on rather short run and territorially limited “urban problems,” missing the opportunity to encourage scholarship on how cities and urbanization are related to long run historical processes. One needs only to thumb

through recent issues of the chief urban studies journals to appreciate the extent of the myopic “presentism” of this interdisciplinary field. One exception has been the burgeoning area of research of global/world city networks. Research on this subject has boomed in urban studies since the tail end of the 20th Century, and although citation searches using those key words will not generate many references to Chase-Dunn, they will turn up scores of authors whose scholarship in this area has been fundamentally shaped by his vision.

About Author

Michael Timberlake is Professor of Sociology at the University of Utah, whose research centers on urbanization and city systems in relation to the global political economy.

Disclosure Statement

Any conflicts of interest are reported in the acknowledgement section of the article’s text. Otherwise, author has indicated that he has no conflict of interests upon submission of the article to the journal.

References

- Alderson, A. and Beckfield, J. 2004. "Power and position in the world city system," *American Journal of Sociology* 109, 811–851.
- Alderson, A., Beckfield, J, Sprague-Jones, J. 2010. Inter-city relations and globalization: The evolution of the global urban hierarchy 1981-2007, *Urban Studies* 47 (9): 1899-1923.
- Alger, Chadwick. 1990. “The world relations of cities: closing the gap between social science paradigms and everyday human experience.” *International Studies Quarterly* 34, 4: 493-518 (December).
- Bassens, David, Ben Derudder, and Frank Witlox. 2009. “Searching for the Mecca of finance: Islamic financial services and the world city network.” *Area* 42(1): 35-46.
- Banfield, Edward. 1970. *The Unheavenly City: The Nature and the Future of Our Urban Crisis*. New York: Little Brown.
- Bornschier, Volker and Lengyel, Peter (eds.). 1991. *World Society Studies*, Volume 2. Frankfurt and New York: Campus.

- Boyd, John, Matthew Mahutga, and David A. Smith. 2013. "Measuring Centrality and Power Recursively in the World City Network: A Reply to Neal." *Urban Studies* 50 (8): 1641-1647.
- Bradshaw, York. 1987. *Urbanization and Economic Expansion in Post-Independence Kenya*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University.
- Breese, Gerald (ed.). 1969. *Cities in Newly Developed Countries*. Garden City, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Castells, Manuel. 1977. *The Urban Question: A Marxist Approach*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cardoso, Fernando H. 1972. "Dependency and Development in Latin America." *New Left Review* 74: 83-95.
- Chase-Dunn, Christopher. 1975. "The effects of international dependence on development and inequality." *American Sociological Review* 40: 720-739.
- _____. 1983. "Urbanization in the world-system: New directions for research." *Comparative Urban Research* 9(2): 3-9.
- _____. 1985a. "The coming of urban primacy in Latin America." *Comparative Urban Research* 11(1-2): 14-31.
- _____. 1985b. "The system of world cities, A.D. 800-1975." Chapter 12 in M. Timberlake, ed., *Urbanization in the World-Economy*, pp. 269-292, Orlando: Academic Press.
- _____. 1989. *Global Formation: Structures of the World-Economy*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- _____. 2004. "The changing role of cities in world-systems." IROWS Working Papers, <http://www.irows.ucr.edu/>, Institute for Research on World-Systems, University of California, Riverside, v. 8-2-04.
- _____. and Thomas Hall. 1997. *Rise and Demise: Comparing World-Systems*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- _____. and Andrew Jorgenson. 2003. "Regions and interaction networks: an institutional-materialist perspective." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 44(1): 1-18.
- _____. and Susan Manning. 2010. "City-systems and world systems: four millennia of city growth and decline" Chapter 7 in R. Paddison and M. Timberlake (eds.) *Urban Studies: Economy, Vol. 1: What are Cities* (pp. 101-115); reprinted from *Cross Cultural Research*, 36(4) (2002): 379-398.
- Chase-Dunn, C, S. Manning and Thomas Hall. 2000. "Rise and fall: East-West synchrony and Indic exceptionalism reexamined," *Social Science History* 24(4): 727-754.
- Chase-Dunn, C. and Alice Willard. 1993. "Systems of cities and world-systems: settlement size hierarchies and cycles of political centralization 2000 BC-199 AD." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, Acapulco, March 24.

- Chase-Dunn, Christopher, Alexis Alvarez, Andrew Jorgenson, Richard Niemeyer, Daniel Pasciuti and John Weeks. 2006. "Global city networks in world historical perspective." IROWS Working Paper #28, <http://irows.ucr.edu/papers/irows28/irows28.htm>
- Chase-Dunn, Christopher, Hiroko Inoue, Alexis Alvarez, Rebecca Alvarez, E.N. Anderson and Teresa Neal. 2015. "Uneven urban development: largest cities since the late Bronze Age." IROWS Working Paper #98, <http://irows.ucr.edu/papers/irows98/irows98.htm>
- Cohen, R.B. 1981. "The new international division of labour, multinational corporations and urban hierarch. In M. Dear and A. Scott (eds.) *Urban Planning in Capitalist Society*, pp. 287-315. London: Methuen.
- Derudder, Ben and Frank Witlox. 2008. "Mapping world city networks through airline flows: context, relevance, and problems," *Journal of Transport Geography* 15(5): 305-312.
- Elvin, Mark. 1973. *The Pattern of the Chinese Past*. London: Methuen.
- Frank, Andre Gunder. 1966. "The development of underdevelopment." *Monthly Review* v. 18 (September).
- _____. 1992. *The Centrality of Asia*. Amsterdam: VU University Press.
- _____. 1998. *Re-ORIENT: Global Economy in the Asian Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. and Barry Gills. 1994. "The cumulation of accumulation." In A.G. Frank and B.K. Gills (eds.) *The World System: Five Years of Five Thousand?*, pp. 81-114 London: Routledge.
- Friedmann, John. 1986. "The world city hypothesis." *Development and Change* 4: 12-50.
- Friedmann, John and Goetz Wolff. 1982. "World city formation: an agenda for research and action." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 6:309-344.
- Gans, Herbert. 1962. *Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italian-Americans*. New York: Free Press.
- Gugler, Josef and W. G. Flanagan. 1977. "On the political economy of urbanization in the Third World: the case of West Africa." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 1: 272-292.
- Harvey, David. 1985. *The Urbanization of Capital: Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Harvey, David. 1985. *Consciousness and the Urban Experience: Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kentor, Jeffrey. 1981. "Structural determinants of peripheral urbanization: the effects of international dependence." *American Sociological Review* 46: 201-211.

- _____. and Yung Suk Jang. 2004. "Yes, there is a (growing) transnational business community: a study of global interlocking directorates 1983-98." *International Sociology* 19(-34): 355-368.
- _____, Adam Sobek, and Michael Timberlake. 2011. "Interlocking Corporate Directorates and the Global City Hierarchy." *Journal of World Systems Research* 17(2). Available online at <http://jwsr.pitt.edu/ojs/index.php/jwsr/article/view/415/427>.
- Knox, Paul and Peter Taylor, eds. 1995. *World Cities in a World-System*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- London, Bruce. 1973. *Metropolis and Nation: An Ecological Analysis of Primate City-Hinterland Relationships in Thailand*. University of Connecticut.
- _____. 1985. "Thai city-hinterland relationships in an international context: development and social control in northern Thailand." In M. Timberlake (ed.) *Urbanization in the World-Economy* pp. 207-230. Orlando: Academic Press.
- _____. and David Smith. 1988. "Urban bias, dependence, and economic stagnation in noncore nations." *American Sociological Review* 53(3): 454-463/
- Ma, Xiulian and Michael Timberlake. "Identifying the leading world city in China: a network approach." *GeoJournal* vol. 71, no. 1 (Jan.): 19-35.
- _____. 2013. "World city typologies and national city system deterritorialization: USA, China, and Japan." *Urban Studies* 50(2): 255-275.
- Mahutga, Matthew, Xiulian Ma, David Smith and Michael Timberlake. 2010. "Economic globalization and the structure of the world-city system: the case of airline passenger data." *Urban Studies*, vol. 47(9): 1925-1947.
- McKenzie, Roderick. 1927. "The concept of dominance and world organization." *American Journal of Sociology* 33:28-42.
- Peattie, Lisa. 1968. *The View from the Barrio*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Portes, Alejandro. 1985. "The informal sector and the world-economy: notes on the structure of subsidized labor." In M. Timberlake (ed.) *Urbanization in the World-Economy* pp. 53-62. Orlando: Academic Press.
- _____. 1989. "Latin American urbanization during the years of the crisis." *Latin American Research Review* 24(3): 7-44.
- Roberts, Anthony. 2013. "Peripheral accumulation in the world economy: a cross-national analysis of the informal economy." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 54(5-6): 420-444.
- Sanderson, M., M. Timberlake, B. Derudder, and F. Witlox. 2015 "Are world cities also world immigrant cities? An international cross-city analysis of global centrality and immigration." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 56 (3-4): 1-25.

- Sassen, Saskia. 1991 (updated 2001). *The Global City: New York, London, and Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 2009. "Incompleteness and the possibility of making: towards denationalized citizenship?" *Cultural Dynamics* 21(3): 227-254.
- Sassen-Koob, Saski. 1985. "Capital mobility and labor migration: their expression in core cities." *In M. Timberlake (ed.) Urbanization in the World-Economy pp. 231-265. Orlando: Academic Press.*
- Shin, Kyung-Ho and Michael Timberlake. 2000. "World cities in Asia: cliques, centrality and connectedness." *Urban Studies*, vol. 37(12): 2257-2285.
- Smith, David. 1984. *Urbanization in the World Economy: A Cross-National and Historical Structural Approach*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of North Carolina.
- _____. and Roger Nemeth. 1985. "The political economy of contrasting urban hierarchies in South Korea and the Philippines." *In M. Timberlake (ed.) Urbanization in the World-Economy pp. 183-206. Orlando: Academic Press.*
- _____. and Michael Timberlake. 1995 "Conceptualising and mapping the structure of the world-system's city system." *Urban Studies*, vol. 32 (2):287-304.
- _____. 2001. "World city networks and hierarchies 1977-1997: an empirical analysis of global air travel links." *American Behavioral Scientist* 44(10): 1656-1678.
- _____. 2002 "Hierarchies of dominance among world cities: a network approach." Chapter 4 in S. Sassen, ed., *Global Networks, Linked Cities*, pp. 117-141. New York: Routledge (and the United Nations University/Institute for Advanced Studies).
- Song, Frank and M. Timberlake. 1996 "Chinese urbanization, state policy, and the world-economy." *Journal of Urban Affairs* vol. 18 (3): 285-306.
- Taylor, Peter J. 1997. "Hierarchical tendencies amongst world cities: a global research proposal." *Cities* 14(6):323-332.
- _____. 2001. "Specification of the world city network." *Geographical Analysis* 33(2): 181-194.
- Timberlake, Michael. 1979. *Economic Dependence, Internal Urban and Labor Force Structure and Problems of Development: A Quantitative Cross-National Study*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Brown University.
- _____, ed. 1985 *Urbanization in the World-Economy*. Orlando: Academic Press.
- _____. and Jeffrey Kentor. 1983 "Economic dependence, overurbanization, and economic growth: a study of less developed countries." *The Sociological Quarterly*, 24 (Autumn): 489-507.

- _____, M. Sanderson, B. Derudder, X. Ma, F. Witlox, and J. Winitzky. 2012. "Testing a global city hypothesis: an assessment of polarization across U.S. cities." *City and Community* 11:1(March): 74-93.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. *The modern World-System, vol. I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York/London: Academic Press.
- Walters, Pamela. 1985. "Systems of cities and urban primacy: problems of definition and measurement." In M. Timberlake (ed.) *Urbanization in the World-Economy* pp. 63-85. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Walton, John. 1977. *Elites and Economic Development: Comparative Studies on the Political Economy of Latin American Cities*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Wilkinson, David. 1987. "Central Civilization." *Comparative Civilizations Review* 17: 31-59.