

GLOBALISATION AND MONDIALISATION IN A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Elina Gugliuzzo
Online University Pegaso, Italy
elyna.gugliuzzo@gmail.com

Abstract:

The distinction between modernity and premodernity based on the opposition between territory and network is already present in Immanuel Wallerstein's work on world systems, which emphasizes a difference between world economies and world capitalist economies. According to Wallerstein, the former were limited by the territorial reach of political authorities (typically, imperial formations), while the latter are characterized by a tendency to break down or transcend the limits imposed by notions of territorial integrity. But recent studies, such as those written by Serge Gruzinski, have demonstrated that "mondialisation" is a larger and multidirectional phenomenon of diffusion of ideas, things, and people, larger than globalisation. In this sense, one can speak of an Islamic mondialisation before the beginning of the Iberian mondialisation in the fifteenth century, and one could even speak of an attempt of Chinese mondialisation. What characterizes the mechanisms of a mondialisation is the fact that it always provokes local reactions and métissages. On the contrary, globalisation is another form of mondialisation but it is "closed" or "finite" in the sense that it is without exchange, without métissage, without any possible local or indigenous reaction. Globalisation corresponds for him to the imposition on the entire planet, from the end of the fifteenth century, of Western models—even if sometimes these models come partially from or are filtered via Islam. Unlike the characteristic "openness" of mondialisation, which allows response, in globalisation, Western models remain impermeable to local conditions; they do not allow any reaction, so they do not provoke any métissage.

Keywords: globalisation, mondialisation, métissage, world economy