The latest books on globalization raise interesting issues which reflect upon the very complexity of the process we are facing. In *The Great Convergence: Information Technology and the New Globalization* Richard Baldwin proposes a history of globalization divided into two stages. As Baldwin argues, the process of globalization has to be divided into “old” and “new” age. The “old” globalization took place between 1820 and 1990. It was characterized by the “great divergence”, that is by the centralization of world income in today’s wealthy nations. However, since 1990 the sharing of world income has plummeted to where it was in 1900. According to Baldwin, this reversal of fortune is a symptom of a shift in the globalization process. The “new” globalization, driven by information technology, has combined high tech with low wages, and lead simultaneously to the industrialization of developing nations and deindustrialization of developed ones. This is the “great convergence”: in the “new” globalization rich and developing nations are alike and they face equal global challenges.

Nevertheless, regardless of its “new” or “old” shape, globalization has not defeated social and economic inequalities in the world. On the contrary, some scholars argue that they are still increasing, due to globalization. For instance, Roland Guillon asserts that globalization caused ruptures in the social relations (*Pour une autre globalisation. Essai de géopolitique des rapports sociaux*). Therefore, he aims for an alternative globalization focused on transnational cooperation projects rather than identity politics and competition between national economies. Similarly, Christian Cauvin argues that there exists only one way to succeed against global threats such as poverty, scarcity of natural resources, global warming and economic inequalities. That is an alternative globalization of peoples and cultures, as Cauvin affirms.
in his essay *Au-delà de la mondialisation. Costruire le monde de demain*.  

With regard to global threats, Fred Dallmayr’s *Against Apocalypse: Recovering Humanity’s Wholeness* offers a very interesting analysis and, perhaps, a possible solution. Humankind is facing a global war and nuclear destruction, Dallmayr argues, and the responsibilities for such a danger lie in the irresponsible recklessness of some geopolitical agendas. Thus, humankind has to wake up, stand up against this rush to destruction and quest for peace. Dallmayr’s essay is a call to a global public responsibility based on humanity’s acknowledgment of the world as a “whole”.

However, the global level by itself cannot fully explain neither our world nor the globalization process. On the contrary, the global sphere always relates to a local one. Victor Roudometof maintains that, despite its importance, the concept of “glocal” has never been examined carefully. Roudometof’s book *Glocalization: A Critical Introduction* specifically aims at fill this lack offering an unambiguous definition both theoretically and methodologically of the concepts of “global”, “local” and “glocal”. The concept of “glocal” will benefit from such clarification, for in the social sciences it will acquire the autonomous status it deserves.
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