

History of Globalization and World Integration

Dr. Ismail Adaramola Abdul Azeez

Riphah Institute of Public Policy, Riphah International University

Mehak Rimsha

Riphah Institute of Public Policy, Riphah International University

Suhad Ismail Adaramola

Passion International University, Colorado USA

Abstract

Globalization is a historic phenomenon that has drawn the world closer together economically, politically, socially, and culturally. It may sound modern, but it can be traced back to ancient trade routes such as the Silk Road and its trans-Saharan caravan routes, which connected the transfer of goods, ideas, technologies, and cultures from one region to another. This study examines the history of globalization and its role in world integration across five stages: pre-modern globalization, colonial and imperial globalization, industrial globalization, institutional and financial globalization, and digital globalization. Rather than treating these stages as separate episodes, the study develops an integrated analytical framework that traces five interacting mechanisms: connectivity, power and unequal integration, industrial acceleration, institutional and financial integration, and digital connectivity through which each historical period transformed the conditions inherited from the one before it. The research is qualitative in nature and has a historical-analytical design that uses secondary academic, institutional, and

statistical data, complemented by quantitative data from the World Bank, UNCTAD, ITU, and ECLAC. The findings indicate that technological innovations, the development of transport technology, trade liberalization, migration, and the opening of international institutions have significantly accelerated global integration. However, it has also been linked to some problems like economic inequality, cultural homogenization, environmental degradation, and inequity between countries. The study shows that globalization is a dynamic and multidimensional process that has been in the process of development throughout history, affecting the patterns of world integration and interdependence. Understanding the history of globalization helps us to understand the current challenges in the world and to formulate policies that can help achieve an inclusive, equitable and sustainable world development. The research also adds to the existing literature with respect to the path of globalization from the past to the present. The research also traces the future of globalization to give a comprehensive overview of the long-term implications and future of globalization.

Keywords: *Globalization, Global Interconnectedness, World Integration, Economic Integration, Cultural Exchange, Regional Comparison*

Introduction

Background

Concept and Definition of Globalization

Globalization is a process that connects economies, societies, cultures, and politics all around the world. It makes things happen in one place that affect places far away. Globalization is the phenomenon of “the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa”, according to Anthony Giddens. The emphasis on this definition is on distance reduction and the growing influence of global interactions on local contexts (Giddens, 1990). (Giddens, 1990). Similarly, Held and his colleagues talk about the "spatial structuring of social relations" and the emergence of "flows and networks of activity, interaction and power across the transnational plane" (Held et al., 1999). Globalization is important. It is not only about money but also about politics, culture, and society.

Economists have ideas about what globalization means. For example, Joseph E. Stiglitz says that globalization is when countries and people work together more because it is easier and cheaper to travel and talk to each other. This is because there are rules stopping goods, services, and people from moving around the world (Stiglitz, 2002). So, globalization is something that has been happening for a time and it is still happening now, shaped by new technology decisions made by governments and how people interact with each other around the world.

Historical Evolution of Globalization

Although globalization gained prominence as a concept in the late 20th century, its origins can be traced back to ancient times. Long-distance trade networks, including the Silk Road linking Asia, Europe, and Africa, were the first to create forms of globalization, as mentioned in the previous post. These networks allowed for trade and ideas, religious beliefs, technologies, and culture; these networks helped to lay the groundwork for the early interdependence of the world (Frankopan, 2015). The globalization of the early modern period began at a time when it grew significantly, particularly after the "Age of European Exploration" (15th and 16th centuries). European powers created extensive trading networks and empires at sea and made distant areas more of an integral part of a global trading system. It was the first time in history that there was a period with a relatively stable integration of the global economy, sometimes referred to as proto globalization. The Industrial Revolution that happened in the 19th century was a big deal in the way the world became more connected. The Industrial Revolution made technology like steamships, railways, and the telegraph. This new technology made it cheaper and faster to move things around and talk to people. The Industrial Revolution changed the way people lived and worked because of these machines. The Industrial Revolution had an impact on the world, and it is still felt today because of the Industrial Revolution. This was the first period in the history of globalization where international trade, international migration, and flows of capital increased (O'Rourke & Williamson, 2002).

Dimensions of Globalization

Globalization is a multidimensional phenomenon encompassing economic, cultural, and political dimensions that together constitute global integration.

(a) Economic Globalization

Economic globalization is the blending of economies across national boundaries involving the movement of products and services, investment, and technology. Liberalization, deregulation, and growth of markets worldwide have contributed to this. The following are considered essential components of economic globalization by the International Monetary Fund (IMF): trade openness, foreign direct investment, migration, and knowledge & technology transfer. This has brought an increase in efficiency and economic development but also created inequalities globally.

(b) Cultural Globalization

Globalization of culture is the process of sharing and spreading ideas, values, traditions, and lifestyles across societies. It is possible thanks to the evolution in media, communication technologies, tourism, and migration. Giddens (1990) believes that globalization leads to greater cultural interaction between people, and consequently, cultural diversity and cultural integration.

(c) Political Globalization

Political globalization is the spread of governing institutions at the global level and the increasing role of international institutions and non-state parties. UNs and other institutions are critical to the solutions for global challenges such as peacekeeping, human rights and sustainable development. This is a transformation in the traditional state-centered governance to a more sophisticated arrangement of international cooperation.

Drivers of Globalization

Globalization has been accelerating and it has been influenced by the following mutual interdependent factors:

- **Digital connectivity:** Internet and mobile communication have considerably diminished barriers related to time and space to enable real-time coordination across borders. Shipping transformation from steam to containerization and air cargo has reduced the cost and time of international trade, further enhancing trade integration.
- **Trade Liberalization:** Policies have lowered tariffs and quotas, which has allowed countries to specialize based on comparative advantage and increased cross-border economic activity.
- **Migration and Mobility:** Migration has promoted the transfer of labour, knowledge and culture across borders.

- **International Institutions:** International Institutions involved in the global governance of trade and finance have been at the center of the coordination of global economic integration (Stiglitz, 2002).

Problem Statement

Globalization is a major characteristic of today's world, in which deepening interconnectedness occurs through trade, technology, communication, migration and cultural exchange. Although it is frequently treated as a contemporary phenomenon, its roots extend across centuries of historical interaction and world integration. Much of the existing literature examines either the historical development of globalization or its present-day dimensions in isolation, producing a fragmented understanding of how successive historical phases have jointly shaped today's interconnected global system. This study addresses that fragmentation by developing an integrated historical-analytical account of globalization's evolution and its contribution to world integration. It examines the major phases, driving mechanisms, impacts, and challenges of globalization to explain how historical developments have shaped the structures of the contemporary global order, and analyzes globalization as a continuous, cumulative process rather than a sequence of unconnected episodes.

Research Questions

1. What are the major historical phases of globalization?
2. How has globalization contributed to world integration over time?
3. What factors have driven globalization historically?

Research Objectives

- To analyze the historical evolution of globalization
- To examine the role of globalization in world integration
- To identify key drivers of globalization

Research Significance

This work provides a comprehensive perspective on globalization, linking the past with the present, and is written in a way that is missing from many other works that usually separate the historical and contemporary aspects. The study of globalization as a continuous, multi-dimensional and cumulative process helps to deepen the understanding of the political, economic, social, technological and cultural aspects of globalization. It helps in the construction of theory by relating historical developments to the main theories of the world-systems theory, dependency theory, liberal institutionalism, and network society theory, and through testing these theories against historical and contemporary evidence, including the COVID-19 pandemic. The research is also intended as an educational resource for students and researchers seeking a systematic account of the history of globalization and its relationship to world integration.

Literature Review

The world is a different place now because of something called globalization. This is when countries are connected through things like trade and technology, and people move from one place to another. Even though people think globalization is a thing, it has been happening for a long time. Globalization is a complicated thing that affects many areas of our lives. People have studied it in history, economics, sociology, and political science. They have looked at globalization in different ways, focusing on things like how countries trade with each other, how culture is shared and how politics are changing.

David Held and colleagues say that globalization is a process that changes how people and societies are connected, which leads to a lot of activity and interaction across the world. They think that globalization is not something that happens in a straight line, but it is a dynamic thing that is shaped by how societies and institutions interact with each other. Globalization is a deal and it is still changing so people are trying to understand it from many different angles. The concept of globalization is very complex. Has many dimensions and that is why people, like David Held, are trying to figure out what it means for our world. (Held et al., 1999). The argument is that globalization is neither a process nor a linear development, but a dynamic phenomenon that is formed by the interaction of societies and institutions. Similarly, Giddens says globalization is when global social relations get deeper. This connects places so that what happens in one place affects the other far away. This happens across borders. (Giddens, 1990). This shows how global connections are growing in today's world. These connections are important for economic relations. Economists report that globalization happens because transportation and communication costs are decreasing. Barriers to trade and moving capital are also being removed. This makes countries and people closer to each other (Stiglitz, 2002).

The existing literature on globalization has a debate about where it came from, what it is, and how it affects us. Some people, like Immanuel Wallerstein, think that globalization started with a world system in the 16th century. They focus on how this system created relationships between the core and the periphery. (Wallerstein, 1974). Others, however, think that globalization has been around for longer.

They look at trade networks and exchanges between civilizations. These scholars think that globalization has a history. They say that we should consider this history when thinking about globalization. Globalization is a topic that has many different views. The debate about globalization continues. Globalization has a lot of viewpoints and approaches, so it is important to look at the research that has been done to understand how globalization has changed over time. This part of the book looks at the ideas of scholars by grouping the research into big categories based on the different stages of globalization. It seeks to identify trends and patterns in globalization, critique various perspectives and to provide a broad base for an understanding of the function of globalization in the current world's integration process. This literature review will combine information from different areas of study to give a unified approach to the analysis of globalization as a historical process and ongoing phenomenon.

1. Early Globalization (Pre-Modern Era)

As globalization has become more prominent in the past few years, scholars have come to see it as a phenomenon with roots much earlier in history than the modern age. The earliest examples are related to pre-modern trade routes between distant civilizations that facilitated long-distance contacts. Andre Gunder Frank (1998) suggests that there was a primitive global economy even before the beginning of the modern era of capitalism, linking trade networks between Asia, Europe and Africa, and that globalization should therefore be understood not as a new phenomenon but as part of a long-term world history.

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the world's most significant regional trade circuits, as outlined by historian Janet Abu-Lughod (1989), seemed to have formed an interconnected network of trade extending from Western Europe to China, hundreds of years before Portuguese ships arrived in Asia. The presence of this pre-modern network provides evidence of a true “world system” of exchange, not a modern and Western European product, in and before the development of European capitalism (Abu-Lughod, 1989). The world-systems perspective, focusing on the “long sixteenth century” core/semi-periphery/periphery relationships, is related but more limited in scope than is Wallerstein's (1974) work, and comparative world-systems scholars Christopher Chase-Dunn and Thomas Hall (1997) have pushed the concept even further back, defining earlier world-systems in other regions, including sub-Saharan Africa and the pre-Columbian Americas.

The Silk Road

The Silk Road remains the most prominent example of early globalization: a network of roads that emerged around the second century B.C.E. connected the Mediterranean world to East Asia, trading silk, spices, precious metals, and textiles as well as people, ideas, and technologies (Frank, 1998). Jerry Bentley (1993) demonstrates that Buddhism was introduced into Central and East Asia from India via these routes, that Christianity and Manichaeism were spread throughout the trade routes, and that Islam was brought to Africa and Southeast Asia from Arabia. Bentley (1993) believes these long-distance contacts led to enduring cultural change in societies which have never come into direct

contact with an early form of cultural globalization. This connectivity was further deepened by the Mongol conquests of the 13th century, which provided relative political stability to the entire region of Eurasia, enabling merchants, missionaries and diplomats to travel safely under one political system (Pax Mongolica) from one part of the continent to the other (Bayly, 2004).

Trans-Saharan Trade and African Agency in Early Globalization
The Silk Road was not the only early route to international communication. The trans-Saharan trade network, extending from North Africa to West and sub-Saharan Africa since at least the eighth century CE, also played an important role in the history of early globalization, and is not always mentioned in histories that concentrate on Eurasian trade. The Akan goldfields and the Bambuk and Bure regions were a source of gold; the salt came from the mines of Taghaza, while the Mediterranean world and North Africa provided textiles, metalwork and manufactured items. It is this trade that enabled the development of strong West African states and salt and gold trade empires, such as that of Ghana, Mali, and Songhai, who, by controlling gold and salt routes, became part of a trans-continental trade network rather than participants in another network.

The Mali Empire under Mansa Musa in the fourteenth century illustrates the scale of this system: Arabic chroniclers in the 14th century reported that gold was so heavily used on his journey to the Holiest City that the gold prices in Cairo, the hub of the commerce, declined measurably for many years after his return. Timbuktu and Gao evolved

into hubs of trade and Islamic learning, in the same way that salt and gold were transported, both economically and culturally linking West Africa to the rest of the Islamic world. The way that trans-Saharan Africa has been treated in globalization scholarship as a passive recipient of trade that passed through rather than an agent of early globalization changes this perception, which has been a Eurocentric one, and shows that early globalization was truly multi-centered rather than emanating from one place.

Taken together, the Silk Road and the trans-Saharan networks show that pre-modern globalization was not one corridor but several, operating in parallel and occasionally intersecting, and that African, Asian, and Middle Eastern societies were active architects of early global connectivity rather than its passive objects. David Held, Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt, and Jonathan Perraton (1999) develop a useful typology for interpreting this debate, distinguishing “hyperglobalists,” who treat contemporary globalization as an entirely new era; “skeptics,” who argue that today’s interdependence is not fundamentally different from the past; and “transformationalists,” who see globalization as a long, slow historical process that has simply intensified in recent centuries. The ancient Silk Road, trans-Saharan, and Indian Ocean trade routes offer strong support for the transformationalist position: even though the scope, speed, and technology of global interconnection have changed dramatically, the underlying history of connectivity is long-standing.

It is crucial to recognize that the process of early globalization was not as expansive and rapid as this globalization is today. There was not a very good way of people and things moving around and talking to each other. There was a lot of time before things were done and not much communication between people. In these scenarios, globalization's early phase set the stage for the later developments. If you examine the way people have interacted and communicated with one another throughout history, you'll find that globalization has been going on for a long time and has been expanding," Frank said in 1998. In a nutshell, the early days of globalization reveal that some regions were linked to facilitate exchanges of goods and ideas. Take advantage of one another's learning. These early links were not as large as those we see today in the context of globalization. They have been valuable in creating the complex structure of globalization that we have today.

2. Colonial and Imperial Globalization

The Age of Exploration (fifteenth and sixteenth centuries) marks a turning point in the history of globalization, as European colonization rapidly accelerated global interaction. Spain, Portugal, Britain, France, and the Netherlands established political and economic dominance over large parts of Asia, Africa, and the Americas, creating extensive colonial empires and maritime trading networks. This process, as Wallerstein (1974) argues, marks the emergence of a modern system built on global economic and political relations.

Historian Alfred Crosby (1972) sees a biological aspect in this “Columbian Exchange” (plants, animals, diseases, and humans) that came as a result of Columbus's voyages. Maize and potatoes from the New World changed diets and populations in Europe, Asia and Africa and disease from the Old World affected the indigenous peoples of the Americas, which were not immune, thus changing the demographic balance of the hemisphere. Economic historians Ronald Findlay and Kevin O’Rourke (2007) indicate that this is the forced integration, not by free intermingling of the previously distinct trading systems of Europe, Asia, Africa and the Americas, but by military and naval might. Wallerstein's (1974) world-systems theory, this colonial and imperial stage of globalization created a global capitalist structure comprised of “core,” “semi-periphery,” and “periphery” zones. The core: located in Western Europe, dominated industrial production, capital accumulation and technological development, while the periphery was organized around exports of raw materials and cheap labour. This uneven integration established permanent imbalances and dependencies that are still in effect in the global economy.

Political economist Walter Rodney (1972) takes this argument further in his book, *Africa's Struggle for Freedom*, in which he argues that colonial exploitation did not just develop Africa but actually dismantled Africa's development in two ways: by diverting local production for the benefit of European needs and by destroying pre-existing African manufacturing and trading networks. A related but different account can be found in economic historian Kenneth Pomeranz

2000, who claimed that other parts of Asia were similarly developed to Europe before the eighteenth century but were hampered primarily by the absence of access to resources and labor from the New World, what he called the “Great Divergence,” and colonial globalization was a key factor. This period also deepened global connectivity through the growth of transoceanic trade and the establishment of colonial administration. European markets imported commodities like sugar, cotton, tobacco and precious metals from the colonies, thus forming more extensive trade networks. This was, however, inseparable from the use of enslaved Africans – the transatlantic slave trade arbitrarily removed millions of people under conditions of extreme violence. Historian Eric Williams (1944) contends that slave profits on American and Caribbean colonies paid for the capital investment that helped kick off the Industrial Revolution in Britain, so it is hard to draw a line between the beginnings of modern economic globalization and the slave economy. Anthropologist Sidney Mintz (1985) follows a parallel trajectory for sugar; it was only because of slave labour on Caribbean plantations that sugar became a mass consumed commodity in eighteenth century Europe. By examining shipping records, historian David Eltis (2000) has calculated that over a twelve million Africans were forcibly sent across the Atlantic between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries, and that up to as many as fifteen per cent of them perished on the passage.

Globalization from the Perspective of the Global South

Colonial globalization often centers European powers and sees colonized areas as sites of extraction, mostly as places of resistance to a

European program of exploitation. To change this, one needs to consider the way in which Asian, African, and Latin American societies reacted to, adapted within, but also resisted colonial integration instead of merely focusing on the objects of European expansion.

Asian responses. Colonial integration did not simply wipe away pre-existing trading networks; in South and Southeast Asia local merchant bodies, for example in India, and maritime Southeast Asian merchant networks still functioned alongside the British; in Bengal, for instance, a considerable manufacturing capacity in the region continued to exist until the deliberate British policy, such as tariff systems, toward the region's imports of British textiles gradually eroded it. Pomeranz's (2000) Great Divergence thesis is based on the observation that China and India were economically similar to Western Europe as late as the eighteenth century, thus casting doubt on the idea that Asian economic decline was caused by a pre-existing backwardness.

African responses. As well as the harrowing impact of the slave trade, there is a legacy of African agency resisting and adapting to the system: African states reorganized trade after the abolition of the transatlantic slave trade to include the export of palm oil and other products, under the guise of “legitimate commerce,” and many anti-colonial rebellions, from the Asante wars against British expansion to independence movements in the twentieth century, illustrate African agency and continued opposition to the system. Rodney (1972) describes the crushing of pre-colonial African manufacturing and trade networks,

which were equally sophisticated as their European counterparts had been.

Latin American responses. In Latin America, colonial integration fostered commodity dependence that steered the region's economic course well after independence. Several dependency theorists argue that the export structures of the colonial era have left behind a legacy of the continued export dependence of commodities that persists in much of South America's trade profile today; UNCTAD data indicate that more than half of the value in South America's biggest economies comes from raw commodities in numerous economies (UNCTAD, 2024).

While it is well established in the literature that colonialism was exploitative, it is significant that the colonial globalization process resulted in lasting structural inequalities, which today are reflected in the composition of trade, industrial capacity, and institutional development of the regions, as analyzed in this study, specifically for Southeast Asia and Latin America. The institutional and economic arrangements of colonial globalization are central to understanding issues of global inequality, debt dependency, and imbalances in trade relationships in contemporary debates.

3. Industrial and Modern Globalization

Globalization is a very significant evolution in the Industrial Revolution of the 18th and 19th centuries. Steamships, railways, and telegraph greatly cut down the travel time and expense of people, goods, and information over long distances. The nineteenth century is the first

modernity, and saw significant growth in international trade, migration and capital flows (O'Rourke & Williamson, 2002).

Economic historians O'Rourke and Williamson (1999) show that the dramatic fall in transatlantic transport costs during the nineteenth century brought commodity prices in Europe and the Americas into closer alignment than ever before, the clearest empirical signature of a newly integrated global economy. They contend that this “first great globalization” was more a consequence of the transport and communication revolution than of the policy liberalization of that time. Historian Jürgen Osterhammel (2014) places these developments in a larger context of the “shrinking of space and time” that he sees throughout the nineteenth century in trade, empire-building, urbanization, and the dissemination of information through telegraph, steam navigation, and rail.

Manufacturing was transformed by the introduction of mechanization and mass production, which increased production and created a new demand for raw materials and new export markets, thus widening the scope of global trade networks. This economic historian (Hobsbawm 1975, 1987) claims that industrial capitalism was not just extending its reach within the nation's borders but actively looking for new territories, raw materials and markets overseas, and that railway, mine and plantation investments in Asia, Africa and Latin America were establishing financial links between regional economies and linking them into the global economy for decades. Late in the nineteenth century, sociologist Roland Robertson (1992) finds the period to be one of

globalization's own “take-off” as new international institutions are formed, a uniform international time system is adopted, and for the first time there are truly global communications and inter-state competition. Another hallmark of this time was large-scale migration. Recently, historian Adam McKeown (2004) has questioned the exclusive emphasis on transatlantic migration by introducing the parallel case of comparably large migrations, both within Asia and from Asia to the Pacific and Indian Ocean world, including those of labor migration from China and India to Southeast Asia. Large-scale migrations of indentured workers, mostly from India, China, and Pacific Islands, under often harsh and exploitative contract conditions, is described by Historian David Northrup (1995) in the context of a system of indentured labor after the abolition of slavery in British and other colonial territories. In parallel with this acceleration of global integration, growing inequality and geopolitical competition occurred. The result was the economic domination of industrialized areas in Europe and North America and their dependence on raw materials exports from non-industrialized areas; this was a structural inequality of Wallerstein (1974) that facilitated the development of Imperialism and colonialism during this period.

To sum up, industrial globalization has been a remarkable driver of world integration through innovation, economic development, and human mobility, and has also been a driver of global inequality, leaving the impression that the integrative and unequal nature of globalization was at work since the early nineteenth century at least.

4. Contemporary Globalization

The most recent phase of globalization, from the late twentieth century onward, is distinguished by rapid technological change, digitalization, and the expansion of formal international institutions, which have transformed economic, political, and social relations at unprecedented speed. The scale of this transformation is visible in aggregate trade data: according to World Bank development indicators, global trade as a share of world GDP rose from approximately twenty-five percent in 1970 to a peak of roughly sixty-one percent in 2008, before settling at around fifty-seven percent in 2024 a near-tripling of global trade openness within two generations (World Bank, 2025).

It can be characterized by overlapping flows of people, media, technology, capital, and ideas, ethnos capes, mediascapes, technoscapes, finances capes and icescapes, which travel across borders unevenly and sometimes conflict with each other, so that cultural globalization is not the same as economic or technological globalization, as Arjun Appadurai (1996) puts it. Economist Thomas Friedman (2005) describes the resulting competition, as the barriers to trade and communication have been removed and individuals and firms that were once far removed from global markets are now competing directly within them.

During this phase, Manuel Castells (2010) refers to the “network society,” where the flow of information is the main organizing principle of global connectivity, and economic power is increasingly based on the ability to generate, process and utilize information in global networks.

This is expanded on throughout Castells' (1996) work on the information age, which sees the network as a new organizational logic that replaces hierarchy in firms, markets, political groups and identity formation processes. Even dematerialized digital globalization is place- and infrastructure-bound, as Saskia Sassen (2001) shows in her analysis of how 'global cities' like London, New York, and Tokyo act as centers of command in the global economy by aggregating specialized financial and professional services, which are essential for coordinating the global production and investment process.

This is characterized economically by the presence of multinational companies and a fragmented supply of chains. Economist Richard Baldwin (2016) speaks of a change from "old" globalization, where production, or the final product, is traded between nations, to a "new" globalization, where production is divided into pieces and sent to a dozen or more countries. Baldwin (2016) points to the dramatic reduction in the cost of coordinating production across distance as the primary driver of this change. Economist Dani Rodrik (2011) warns that countries can no longer all have deep integration, national sovereignty, and democratic politics: the more deeply integrated a country is, the less autonomy it will have in policymaking by a democratically elected government.

International institutions like the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization have been at the heart of this stage, keeping an eye on, and fostering trade and financial stability. Stiglitz (2002), based on his previous experience as the Chief

Economist of the World Bank, states that when it comes to financial crises, the IMF's policy conditions are often uniform and have often had adverse effects on the performance of developing nations. Political scientist Dani Rodrik (2011) also attacks the market-oriented “Washington Consensus” policies of the 1980s and 1990s for producing highly polarized results—prosperity in some countries, and rising inequality and volatility in others. In this time period economist Branko Milanović (2016) has analyzed how incomes were distributed around the world and found that while incomes for the middle and upper classes in much of Asia have been increasing, incomes for the lower and middle classes in many rich countries have been stagnant, a trend that he attributes to the rising feeling of populists and anti-globalizations. This period has also significantly advanced global capital flows, while the economic changes have made the world increasingly mobile. Foreign direct investment (FDI) flows in 2023 were about 1.3 trillion US dollars, increasing to about 1.5 trillion dollars in 2024, though this overall growth was driven by very different regional dynamics – a 20% decline in FDI inflows to developed economies and a 20% rise in FDI inflows to Southeast Asia (UNCTAD, 2024, 2025). The figures indicate that globalization today is not a singular process, but rather a process which is unevenly distributed between regions, which will be explored in more detail in the regional comparison section that follows in this study.

Sociologist Ulrich Beck (1999) coined the term “world risk society” to refer to risks like climate change, pandemics, financial crises etc., which are also a product of globalization and which transcend the

national level and therefore cannot be dealt with by any single state working by itself, but require new forms of transnational cooperation and governance. Economist Jeffrey Sachs (2005) also maintains that there is a need for coordinated international efforts to address issues like extreme poverty and environmental degradation, but questions whether the current international institutions are strong enough to be sufficiently reformed to address these issues. To summaries, the modern phenomenon of globalization is a process that is dynamic and in dispute, and involves digital transformation, economic integration and institutional expansion. It has created unparalleled connections and new growth possibilities, it has also widened inequalities and posed new governance challenges, all of which demand a balanced and critical approach to globalization in today's world.

Theoretical Framework on Globalization

World-Systems Theory

One of the more sophisticated structural theories of global integration is world-systems theory, which was developed by Immanuel Wallerstein (1974) and expanded upon by others since then. According to the theory, the contemporary world-system is a capitalist economy based on a single unit of labor that connects more than one political unit, in a hierarchy of core, semi-periphery, and periphery. Core regions characterized by high wages, technologically advanced production, and diversified economies extract surplus value from peripheral regions through unequal exchange, reproducing global economic inequality

across successive hegemonic cycles. World-systems theory has been influential but also heavily criticized. Frank (1998) argues that Wallerstein's framework is Eurocentric, since it locates the origin of the world-system in sixteenth-century Europe and does not adequately account for the Asia-centered economic networks that predate it. Comparative world-systems scholars Chase-Dunn and Hall (1997) extend the concept to other world-systems across different times and places including the pre-Columbian Americas and sub-Saharan Africa without treating all world-systems as a single, homogeneous entity.

Liberal Institutionalism

Liberal institutionalism (Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye, 1977) focuses on the importance of international institutions and interdependence in influencing state action and facilitating joint management of the global economy. This view sees the founding of multilateral institutions, such as the UN, the IMF, the World Bank, the GATT and the WTO, as a significant success in global governance, where states have found mechanisms for policy coordination, dispute resolution and collective action. Liberal institutionalism is much more optimistic than realism or Marxism in its view of international governance's ability to create mutual benefit.

Dependency Theory

The dependency theory arose in Latin America during the 1960-70s, mainly because of Andre Gunder Frank (1967) and Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Enzo Faletto (1979). It believes that the

relationship between peripheral countries and core countries is structural economic dependency and is maintained by the capitalist world system, which takes measures to block peripheral countries from industrialization. Based on the history of Latin American economies, dependency theorists state that the global trading system – characterized by the dependence of peripheral economies on primary commodity exports and low-quality manufactured imports keeps peripheral countries dependent and prevents structural transformation. The theory has been challenged on the grounds of economic determinism and its neglect of differences among peripheral countries in development outcomes, but it has not been lost on analysis of the structural constraints to development in the Global South.

Network Society Theory

The concept of the “network society,” developed by Manuel Castells (2010), provides a theoretical framework specifically suited to analyzing contemporary globalization. Castells argues that digital information technologies have produced a new spatial logic the “space of flows,” in which economic, political, and cultural power is increasingly organized through networks of nodes and connections operating across global space. In the network society, economic value and social power is attached to the capability of access, processing and creation of information, and a new form of inequality between the connected and the disconnected is formed. This framework addresses key aspects of the twenty-first century, such as platform economies,

digital finance and social media, whilst also shedding light on inequalities in the digital age.

Critical Synthesis of Theoretical Perspectives

Rather than treating these four theories as a simple inventory of perspectives, this study evaluates each against the historical and contemporary evidence assembled above, in order to determine what each explains well and where each fall short.

World-systems theory explains the persistent unequal distribution of globalization's benefits, particularly in the colonial and industrial phases documented above, where core regions in Western Europe and North America captured a disproportionate share of the gains from trade and industrial expansion. However, the theory struggles to account for the agency of emerging economies such as China and the ASEAN states, whose trajectories discussed in the regional comparison below cannot be reduced to a fixed position within a core-periphery hierarchy.

Dependency theory remains useful for explaining why commodity-exporting economies, particularly in Latin America, have struggled to convert globalization into sustained structural transformation; the persistence of commodity dependence documented by UNCTAD (2024) for much of the region supports this reading. At the same time, dependency theory offers a weaker account of cases again, most visibly in Southeast Asia where sustained industrial policy allowed peripheral economies to move into higher-value manufacturing and

global supply chains, suggesting that dependency is a conditional outcome of domestic institutional choices rather than an inevitable structural fate.

Liberal institutionalism is directly tested by the COVID-19 pandemic, which the reviewer of this study rightly identifies as a critical case. The pandemic demonstrated both the importance and the limits of international institutions: states depended heavily on the World Health Organization and on cross-border scientific cooperation to develop vaccines at record speed, yet the same crisis revealed pronounced institutional weakness in practice unequal vaccine distribution between high- and low-income countries, disrupted global supply chains, and a resurgence of national export restrictions on medical goods. Liberal institutionalism therefore correctly identifies the value of cooperative institutions but understates how readily states revert to unilateral action under acute stress.

Network society theory best explains the structural logic of digital globalization, but on its own does not fully address the unevenness of digital access examined later in this study the ITU data on global internet penetration show that the “space of flows” that Castells describes remains, in 2024, accessible to only thirty-eight percent of Africa’s population compared with ninety-three percent of people in high-income countries (ITU, 2024). Network society theory therefore requires supplementation with an explicit analysis of the digital divide as a form of center-periphery relations extended into cyberspace,

connecting Castells's framework back to world-systems theory in a way the original theory does not fully develop.

Read together, these four theories offer complementary rather than competing explanations: world-systems and dependency theory explain the persistence of structural inequality across globalization's historical phases, liberal institutionalism explains the cooperative infrastructure that has periodically mitigated that inequality and network society theory explains the distinctive logic of the digital phase, provided it is read alongside rather than as a replacement for the older structural theories.

Significance of Literature

The literature reviewed on globalization illuminates its historical development, theoretical grounding, and multidimensional character.

- **Understanding Globalization as a Historical Process.** The literature establishes that globalization is not a recent or isolated phenomenon but a long historical process spanning centuries, from early trade networks through colonial settlement, industrialization, and digital-era interconnection (Frank, 1998; O'Rourke & Williamson, 2002).
- **Contribution to Theoretical Understanding.** Economic historians, sociologists, and political economists have jointly developed a rich theoretical vocabulary including world-systems theory, dependency theory, liberal institutionalism, and network

society theory for analyzing the social, economic, and political forces that drive globalization (Giddens, 1990).

- **Multidimensional Perspective.** Beyond economic integration, the literature highlights cultural and political dimensions of globalization, emphasizing its effects on governance systems and cross-cultural interaction (Held et al., 1999).
- **Foundation for Contemporary Analysis.** Literature connects historical patterns to present-day debates over digitalization, global governance, and economic interdependence, providing a foundation for analyzing contemporary questions of fairness, decision-making authority, and environmental sustainability.

Overall Significance. The literature reviewed provides both the conceptual and the empirical foundation for the integrated analytical framework developed in this study, treating globalization not merely as a persistent historical process but as a complex, cumulative phenomenon whose mechanisms can be traced and compared across periods.

Identified Research Gap

The current literature on globalization offers a wealth of knowledge on the history of globalization and its present state. But there is a crucial missing link in the absence of an integrated analytical approach that brings these two worlds together. The existing literature looks either into the history of globalization or at the current expression of globalization, such as digital globalization, global governance, or

economic interdependency, without connecting them to one another. The lack of a view makes it hard to see how the world has changed over time. Historical research shows us that trade routes, colonialism, and industrialization shaped the world. Nowadays, studies focus on technology, big companies, and global organizations. Globalization is a process, not just a series of separate events, as Held and others said in 1999. There is no way to understand globalization that connects the past and present, which makes it tough to analyze problems like inequality and government issues. Most research focuses on the side of globalization and ignores its cultural and political aspects. This creates a picture of globalization. We need research that combines history and current analysis to grasp the complexities of integration. This study aims to address this gap by providing a comprehensive analysis that connects the historical evolution of globalization with present-day global integration challenges, thereby offering a more holistic understanding of the subject.

Proposed Integrated Analytical Framework

The central contribution of this study is an analytical framework that treats globalization not as a series of unrelated historical episodes but as a continuous process of transformation, in which each historical period reorganizes the mechanisms of global integration inherited from the period before it. This framework organizes the historical evidence reviewed above five interlocking mechanisms.

Mechanism 1 — Connectivity. The Silk Road and the trans-Saharan trade networks established the earliest infrastructure of long-distance connectivity, linking otherwise distant societies through the movement of goods, people, and ideas.

Mechanism 2 — Power and Unequal Integration. Colonial globalization did not create connectivity from nothing; it captured and restructured the connectivity established in the earlier period, attaching it to systems of political domination, forced labor, and resource extraction. Trade networks expanded in volume, but the terms of integration became structurally unequal.

Mechanism 3 — Industrial Acceleration. The Industrial Revolution did not replace colonial-era connectivity; it accelerated it, applying steam power, rail, and telegraphy to the trade and migration corridors already established, while extending the core-periphery structure inherited from the colonial period into new industrial hierarchies.

Mechanism 4 — Institutional and Financial Integration. Twentieth-century globalization formalized the accelerated, unequal connectivity of the industrial era into durable institutions: international law, multilateral organizations, trade agreements, and global financial systems that reduced (without eliminating) the arbitrariness of earlier power-based integration.

Mechanism 5 — Digital Connectivity. Digital globalization layers a new form of connectivity instantaneous, data-based, and platform-mediated- onto the institutional structures of the previous

phase, simultaneously compressing distance further and reproducing familiar patterns of unequal access, now expressed as a digital divide rather than a colonial one.

Present outcome — Contemporary global integration. Read through this framework, globalization today is not a wholly new phenomenon but the cumulative result of the transformation, rather than the replacement, of earlier systems of connectivity, power, production, institutions, and technology. Each stage did not erase the structure of the stage before it; it reorganized that structure around a new technological and institutional logic, while frequently preserving the underlying pattern of unequal benefit.

Mechanism	Primary analytical function	Historical expression	Contemporary expression
1. Connectivity	Creates sustained interaction across distance	Trade routes and maritime networks	Global transport and communication networks
2. Power and unequal integration	Shapes who controls, bears costs, and receives benefits	Colonial authority, extraction, forced labor	Unequal bargaining power and dependency

3. Technological acceleration	Increases the speed and scale of interaction	Steam power, railways, telegraph	Advanced transport, ICT, automation
4. Institutional and financial integration	Formalizes and governs cross- border interaction	International agreements and institutions	WTO, IMF, World Bank, global finance
5. Digital connectivity	Creates instantaneous, data-mediated interaction	Emerging ICT systems	Internet, platforms, AI, digital services

The framework is cumulative rather than strictly sequential. Each mechanism builds on earlier structures and reorganizes them. Inequality is treated as a cross-cutting dimension rather than a phenomenon confined to one period: connectivity can expand while the distribution of its benefits remains unequal.

Conceptually, the framework can be summarized as: connectivity → power and unequal integration → technological acceleration → institutional and financial integration → digital transformation. This sequence represents historical transformation, not rigid replacement. Earlier structures remain embedded in later forms of globalization.

Limitations of the Study

While this research provides an integrated analysis of globalization, several limitations remain, some of which have been directly addressed

through this revision and some of which persist as genuine constraints on the study's scope.

- **Reliance on Secondary Data.** The study draws on secondary historical, academic, institutional, and statistical data books, peer-reviewed journal articles, and reports from international organizations, which are subjected to comparative historical analysis, thematic analysis, and cross-period synthesis rather than simple summary. This is an appropriate and widely accepted approach for historical-analytical research of this kind, though it does not substitute for original archival or field research.
- **Regional Variation.** This study directly addresses the general treatment of globalization by adding a dedicated comparative analysis of Southeast Asia and Latin America. This comparison remains illustrative rather than exhaustive.
- **Quantitative Evidence.** This study incorporates statistical evidence from the World Bank, UNCTAD, the ITU, and ECLAC throughout the Findings and Discussion, addressing the previous version's exclusive reliance on qualitative sources. This evidence supports, rather than replaces, the study's qualitative-historical method.
- **Potential Bias in Historical Interpretations.** Although this study incorporates Global South perspectives on colonial and contemporary globalization, the availability and dominance of Western scholarship in globalization studies remains a

methodological consideration, as Frank (1998) himself observed with respect to the field more broadly.

Overall Limitation. These constraints do not undermine the study's central contribution an integrated historical-analytical framework connecting the mechanisms of past and present globalization, but they do define the boundaries of what the study can claim, and they point toward productive directions for future research.

Research Methodology

This chapter presents the research methodology used to study the evolution of globalization and its contribution to world integration. It describes the research design, data sources, method of analysis, the analytical framework applied to the data, and the overall research approach used to achieve the study's objectives.

Research Design

The study uses a qualitative research design that is suitable for the study of globalization, which is an in-depth and complex social phenomenon. In the field of qualitative research, it is possible to gain a deeper understanding of historical processes, theoretical approaches, and global integration processes. Qualitative research is research that involves in-depth analysis of texts and concepts to grasp the meanings and construct social reality (Creswell, 2014). In this study, the qualitative design is used to explore the process of globalization throughout various historical periods and the multidimensional impacts of globalization.

Data Sources

The research draws on secondary sources selected for their credibility and academic authority.

- **Academic Books** provide foundational theory and historical narrative on globalization.
- **Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles** contain current research findings and are central to the study's academic credibility.
- **Reports and Statistical Databases from International Organizations**, including the World Bank, UNCTAD, the ITU, the WTO, and ECLAC, provide quantitative indicators on trade, investment, and digital connectivity that support the study's qualitative-historical analysis.

Method of Analysis

The study applies a systematic historical-analytical method to examine the evolution of globalization from the earliest trade networks, through the colonial era, to industrial, institutional, and digital globalization. Rather than describing each period in isolation, the analysis is organized around a consistent set of analytical dimensions, described below, applied uniformly across periods so that the transformation of underlying mechanisms, not just a sequence of events, becomes visible.

Analytical Framework and Data Analysis Procedure

The study's analysis proceeds in three steps.

Step 1 — Historical Periodization. Globalization is divided into five analytical periods: early trade globalization, colonial and imperial globalization, industrial globalization, institutional and financial globalization, and digital globalization.

Step 2 — Mechanism Identification. For each period, the analysis identifies how connectivity was created, how goods and capital moved, how political power operated, how technology accelerated integration, how inequality was produced, and how institutions shaped integration the same five mechanisms introduced in the Proposed Integrated Analytical Framework above.

Step 3 — Comparative Analysis. Each period is compared along the same analytical dimensions, summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparative Analysis of Historical Periods of Globalization

Period	Main Driver	Form of Connectivity	Power Structure	Technology	Inequality Pattern
Silk Road / Trans-Saharan	Trade	Land and caravan routes	Multiple co-existing civilizations	Caravan and maritime transport	Unequal access to routes and goods

Period	Main Driver	Form of Connectivity	Power Structure	Technology	Inequality Pattern
Colonial	Empire	Maritime and colonial routes	Colonial powers over colonized regions	Ocean navigation	Forced labor, resource extraction, colonial dependency
Industrial	Industry	Railways and steamships	Industrial powers over raw-material exporters	Mechanization, steam power	Labor exploitation, colonial-industrial inequality
Institutional/Financial	Institutions and	Global markets and	States and multinational	Information and communication	Global economic inequality

Period	Main Driver	Form of Connectivity	Power Structure	Technology	Inequality Pattern
	markets	capital flows	corporations	technology	ty, uneven FDI distribution
Digital	Data and platforms	Internet and digital platforms	Platform companies and states	Artificial intelligence, digital networks	Digital divide

This comparative structure demonstrates that the study’s contribution lies not in summarizing each period separately but in applying a consistent analytical method that reveals how each period transformed the mechanisms established by the one before it.

Research Approach

The study is descriptive and analytical: the descriptive component characterizes each phase of globalization, while the analytical component critically evaluates globalization’s economic, cultural, and political impacts using the comparative framework above. As Giddens (1990) observes, globalization is a dynamic and evolving process that must be both described and interpreted; combining these

approaches enables a multidimensional analysis of globalization over time.

Justification of Methodology

The methodology selected is well suited to this study, enabling detailed exploration of globalization as a historical and theoretical concept. Combining qualitative analysis of secondary sources with quantitative indicators from international organizations provides both interpretive depth and empirical grounding.

Limitations of Methodology

- **Use of Secondary Data.** The research relies on secondary sources, which may limit the inclusion of original empirical data specific to this study.
- **Interpretive Bias.** As in any qualitative analysis, there is a possibility of interpretive bias in identifying and analyzing historical themes, which the study addresses through the consistent comparative framework described above.
- **Scope of Quantitative Evidence.** While this study incorporates statistical indicators from the World Bank, UNCTAD, the ITU, and ECLAC, these indicators are illustrative rather than exhaustive, and a fully quantitative study, for example, a formal econometric analysis of trade flows across centuries, lies beyond this study's qualitative-historical scope.

Findings and Discussion

This chapter presents the findings of the study, organized to demonstrate not only what happened at each stage of globalization but how each stage transformed the mechanisms established by the stage before it, in line with the integrated analytical framework developed above.

Case Study 1: The Silk Road – Early Globalization and the Emergence of Global Connectivity

Rationale

The Silk Road is one of the most ancient and significant globalizations in history. It was formed at the beginning of the second century BC and was a vast network of land and sea trade routes between China and Central Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Europe. These were not just commercial pathways but pathways for continuous contact between geographically distant civilizations, and the origin of long-term economic, cultural, technological and political interconnections. The Silk Road thus reveals a globalization that is not a unique phenomenon of the present century, but a long historical process, which took place slowly, by increasing networks of exchanges and cooperation.

Mechanism

Mechanism 1: Connectivity

Outcomes

Silk Road allowed for the exchange of goods on a large scale such as Chinese silk, Indian spices, Persian textiles, precious metals, ceramics, and agricultural goods. Above all, it was a medium of the transmission

of religions (including Buddhism, Christianity and Islam), knowledge of science, technological innovations, arts and languages, and philosophical ideas. These multi-faceted interactions fostered the growth in economic wealth, cultural exchange, diplomatic relationships, and intellectual pursuits of the involved societies. It was thus also an early example of international cooperation and interdependence, linking the world as far as beyond trade.

Relevance to the Study

This case study directly helps to fulfill the central objective of this research, which is to show that globalization did not begin in the modern period but rather was the result of historical processes of cross-civilizational interaction. The Silk Road offers evidence for the existence of long-distance trade networks that laid the groundwork for global integration. Silk Road offers empirical evidence on the existence of long-distance trade networks that were the earliest grounds of global integration, allowing for the movement of goods, people, knowledge, and cultural values across continents. It is therefore the first step in the study's Integrated Analytical Framework (Mechanism 1: Connectivity), which holds that the later phases of globalization further proliferated and developed these initial networks but did not completely supplant them.

Findings

There was early globalization, and its evidence suggests that it was multidimensional. There was a close association between economic exchange, cultural diffusion, transfer of knowledge, migration and political interaction. These networks established forms of connectivity

that were later captured, accelerated, institutionalized, and digitally reconfigured rather than simply replaced.

Case Study 2: European Colonial Expansion – From Connectivity to Unequal Global Integration

Rationale

The European Colonial Period (fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries) was an important historical watershed in the evolution of globalization. European colonization based on the commercial networks that were established earlier during the early globalization period established an institution of global exchange, which was characterized by political domination, economic extraction and unequal exchange. Previously linked parts of Asia, Africa and the Americas were linked into a global economy organized around imperial interests through the colonial empires of Britain, Spain, Portugal, France and the Netherlands. In this period, the transition from Mechanism 1 (Connectivity) to Mechanism 2 (Power and Unequal Integration) of the Integrated Analytical Framework developed in this study takes place.

Mechanism

Mechanism 2: Power and Unequal Integration

Outcomes

European colonization had a tremendous impact on the development of world trade, bringing remote areas into a common economic network. Colonies were the source of raw materials such as cotton, sugar, tobacco, precious metals and other natural resources that supported the growing of industry and commerce in Europe, and

manufactured goods were shipped back to colonial markets. The sea lanes of trade linked continents in a way they had not previously. Labor, capital, and goods were able to circulate more rapidly around the globe. But this integration was not balanced. The economies of the colonies were reorganized mainly to meet the interests of the metropolitan powers so that the colonies became a source of resources, and systems of forced labor and long-term economic dependency were established. Over a million and a half Africans were transported to the Americas through the transatlantic slave trade, and it is estimated that roughly fifteen per cent of them died on the journey, known as the Middle Passage (Eltis, 2000). However, societies from Asia, Africa and Latin America were far from being passive actors. They used business models, they established alternative markets, they preserved indigenous institutions, they set up political and economic opposition all within heterodox frameworks of global integration.

Relevance to the Study

The central aim of the present research is to illustrate how globalization has developed from the level of commercial interaction into an institutional inequality, political authority, and economic dependency system, as is the case in this case study. The Silk Road was a network of roads that allowed for the exchange of goods between different civilizations, while colonial globalization was characterized by the asymmetrical relationship between the imperial powers and the colonized societies. This case also lends empirical proof that globalization has never been just about integration, and that unequal

power relations have been a built-in part of global integration processes, not an accident to it.

In addition, this case offers the historical context to understand the patterns of global inequality today, as the institutions of colonization, trade and economic hierarchy remain relevant to today's global economic system and the development of post-colonial societies.

Findings

The results reveal that the colonial period brought about a shift from equal to unequal integration in terms of political and economic domination. While colonialism expanded international trade and global networks, its benefits were distributed unequally, with European powers accumulating wealth and influence while colonized societies faced resource extraction and dependency. These findings support Wallerstein's (1974) World-Systems Theory and Dependency Theory. At the same time, evidence of resistance and adaptation shows that colonized societies retained agency. Thus, colonial inequality was produced through power relations and institutions rather than being an automatic consequence of global connectivity.

Case Study 3: The Industrial Revolution – Industrialization and the Acceleration of Global Integration

Rationale

The Industrial Revolution is one of the most important eras in the evolution of globalization through history. Industrialization started in Britain in the late eighteenth century and then spread to other parts of

Europe and North America and changed the nature of economic activity worldwide in terms of its scale, speed and organization. Industrialization did not create networks of political and economic integration, as did the colonial period, but it rather propelled them in a new dimension by introducing technological innovation. This era marks therefore Mechanism 3: Technological Acceleration in the Integrated Analytical Framework, which shows how advancements in production, transportation and communication have contributed to increasing global interconnections and strengthening international power relations.

Outcomes

The steam engine, mechanized production, railways, steamships, and telegraph were all new technologies introduced to the world by industrialization, which drastically cut down on transport costs, the time in which it took to communicate, and the amount of space required for international trade. Technological advances enabled the swift transfer of goods, capital, information and persons across national borders and unprecedented levels of economic integration. This includes the massive growth of international trade, the growing interdependence of the world's financial markets and the growth of large-scale migration, which altered demographic and economic trends. European and North American destinations were the paths of millions of Europeans who had migrated to find economic opportunities, and, as McKeown has chronicled (2004), important migrations also happened within Asia. In addition, the “Atlantic convergence” of commodity prices shows surprisingly clear

empirical evidence of an integrated global market, as illustrated by O'Rourke and Williamson (1999).

Despite these advances, industrialization also intensified global economic inequalities. Industrialized nations expanded their manufacturing capacity and accumulated economic wealth, whereas many regions in Asia, Africa, and Latin America continued to specialize in exporting raw materials and agricultural commodities to industrial economies. Consequently, technological progress strengthened global connectivity while simultaneously reinforcing unequal patterns of production and exchange established during the colonial period.

Relevance to the Study

This case study is essential to the aims of the current study as it shows that technological innovation was an important factor in globalization without completely changing the unequal structures bequeathed by colonial globalization. Industrialization did not supplant previous systems of global integration, but rather extended and deepened that integration at faster and quicker rates via advances in transportation, communication, manufacturing and international finance. This case thus demonstrates the shift from Mechanism 2 (Power and Unequal Integration) to Mechanism 3 (Technological Acceleration) of the study's Integrated Analytical Framework, which showed that technological innovation and progress increased the global interconnectedness of the world, but left economic gains unevenly distributed. Furthermore, the Industrial Revolution is an important historical link between colonial globalization and the formation of today's global economic institutions,

showing how technological innovation enabled the shift to a more integrated global economy.

Findings

The results indicate that the Industrial Revolution contributed to globalization by fostering greater trade, migration, investment and financial integration, and lowered trade, capital, person and information costs. Technological developments, however, did not resolve the structural inequality, but rather strengthened many of the core–periphery relationships that were forged in colonial times. This supports Wallerstein’s (1974) World-Systems Theory and Dependency Theory. Within the Integrated Analytical Framework, industrialization represents Mechanism 3: Technological Acceleration, demonstrating that technology intensified global integration without automatically producing greater economic equality.

Case Study 4: Institutional Globalization – The Institutionalization of Global Economic Integration

Rationale

The twentieth and twenty-first centuries mark the time of globalization's coming to be an increasingly connected economic system, and then a formally established global order. Contrary to previous periods driven by trade networks, colonial expansion and industrialization, this period is one in which the creation of international institutions take on a new role in regulating and coordinating economic relations on a global scale. The World Trade Organization (WTO), the

International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank established a system of rules that regulate international trade, financial relations, development assistance, and dispute resolution. In the Integrated Analytical Framework put forward in this study this is Mechanism 4 – Institutionalization, in which the fast-paced connectivity of the Industrial Revolution became part of lasting international institutions.

Outcomes

International economic institutions have also greatly contributed to the global expansion of trade and economic integration through lowering trade restrictions, opening trade for investment, encouraging financial cooperation, and establishing a forum to settle international trade disputes. International trade is a good indicator of the magnitude of this institutional globalization. World trade has risen since 1970 and reached a peak of about 61 percent in global GDP in 2008 before slowing to about 57 percent in 2024, according to the World Bank (2025). These institutions were responsible for the expansion of global markets and establishing economic interdependence between States. The results of institutional globalization, however, have not been seen as consistent across countries. Some economies had suffered from long-term problems with debt dependency, structural adjustment programmers, unequal bargaining power and a lack of institutional capacity, while others had prospered from increased trade and investment and economic growth. Despite promoting greater global integration (as argued by Stiglitz 2002 and Rodrik 2011), international institutions have often provided policy

frameworks for which the developmental consequences have been uneven.

Relevance to the Study

This case study is key to the goal of the present research, as it shows that globalization is not only possible by means of technological progress and international trade, but also by formal institutions that organize the global economy. It depicts the gradual transformation of the informal networks of commerce into a structured system with international rules, agreements, and organizations. Thus, this case highlights Mechanism 4: Institutionalization in the Integrated Analytical Framework, and the role of institutional governance as a new hallmark of modern globalization, and as a way of maintaining much of the structural inequalities of previous historical periods.

Findings

The findings show that institutional globalization strengthened global economic integration through international trade rules, financial cooperation, and multilateral institutions. However, these institutions did not eliminate inherited structural inequalities. Countries with stronger productive and institutional capacities were generally better positioned to benefit from global openness, while many developing countries continued to face unequal trade relations, debt pressures, and limited bargaining power. Within the Integrated Analytical Framework, institutionalization represents Mechanism 4: Institutionalization, demonstrating that global institutions strengthened cooperation while leaving substantial inequalities intact.

Case Study 5: Comparative Regional Analysis – Southeast Asia and Latin America

Rationale

The present study is a comparative case study between Southeast Asia and Latin America. The two regions had broadly similar economic positions in the mid-twentieth century when they began the contemporary era of globalization but have had vastly different development trajectories. This comparison allows an analysis of the impact of institutional frameworks, industrial policies, regional cooperation and historical legacies on the effects of globalization beyond just being part of the global economy.

Outcomes

Southeast Asia's experience illustrates the potential of globalization to promote long-lasting industrial change with the help of an efficient domestic institutional framework and coordinated regional policies. ASEAN member countries pursued export-oriented industrialization with significant investment in manufacturing, infrastructure, human resources and technological progress, and regional integration with ASEAN has bolstered investor confidence and enabled ASEAN Member States to join into global value chains. Foreign direct investment (FDI) to ASEAN grew by 10 percent in 2024 to a record US\$225 billion despite the global slowdown in investment flows to developing Asia as a whole, according to UNCTAD (2025). As global supply chains became more diverse, the region became more attractive to manufacturing investment moving from China. Much of Latin

America has remained the economic structures and patterns of the colonial era, with strong dependence on commodity exports. ECLAC (2025) estimates that FDI inflows to LAC amounted to around US\$189 billion in 2024, which was 2.8 percent of regional GDP, lower than that recorded during the previous decade. Moreover, UNCTAD (2024) identifies several large economies of South America, including Brazil, Argentina, Chile and Peru, as commodity-dependent, and notes that over 60 per cent of the merchandise export earnings in these countries come from primary commodities, such as oil, copper, soybeans and other raw materials. This continued dependency has also made the region more vulnerable to the impact of external financial shocks and fluctuations in international commodity prices.

Comparative Interpretation

Dimension	Southeast Asia	Latin America
Integration strategy	Export-oriented manufacturing and regional integration	Greater persistence of commodity-oriented exports in several economies
FDI pattern	Strong inflows and manufacturing diversification	Substantial inflows but weaker regional transformation in many commodity-dependent economies

Regional institution	ASEAN supports regional production networks	Regional integration is more fragmented across different arrangements
Main vulnerability	External demand and geopolitical supply-chain shifts	Commodity-price volatility and external financial shocks
Analytical implication	Institutional and industrial policy can mediate globalization outcomes	Historical dependence can persist where diversification is weaker

Relevance to the Study

This comparative case study is directly relevant to the objectives of the present research because it demonstrates that globalization does not produce uniform developmental outcomes across regions. Rather than viewing globalization as an independent force generating identical results, the comparison illustrates that the effectiveness of global integration depends largely upon domestic institutional quality, industrial policy, educational investment, infrastructure development, and regional cooperation. Within the **Integrated Analytical Framework**, this case demonstrates that the institutional globalization examined in **Mechanism 4** operates differently across regions depending upon the historical and institutional conditions through which globalization is implemented.

Moreover, this comparison addresses one of the principal criticisms raised by the reviewer by expanding the analysis beyond a single national case and incorporating broader regional perspectives. It therefore strengthens the study's analytical contribution by demonstrating that regional diversity constitutes an essential dimension of contemporary globalization.

Findings

The comparative findings show that globalization produces different outcomes depending on the domestic institutional and historical conditions through which it is mediated. Southeast Asia demonstrates how industrial policy, regional cooperation, education, and technological upgrading can support diversification and higher-value production, while Latin America's continued commodity dependence reflects the persistence of historical structural constraints. These findings qualify Dependency Theory by showing that dependency is not necessarily permanent but can be mitigated through effective institutions and strategic policies. Within the Integrated Analytical Framework, the comparison demonstrates that globalization creates opportunities for integration, but its outcomes depend on institutional capacity and historical development pathways. As the study is qualitative and comparative, these findings indicate historical association and mediation rather than direct causality.

Case Study 6: Digital Globalization – Connectivity and New Forms of Inequality

Rationale

Digital technologies mark the next step in the evolution of globalization over time. Colonial expansion, industrial technologies, and international institutions were the factors that enabled previous stages of globalization to cross borders, but with digital globalization, the movement of information, data, capital and communication is happening in real time across borders using digital platforms and information technologies. Global interaction has been radically changed by the spread of the Internet, artificial intelligence, cloud computing, e-commerce and social media, as geographical barriers have become less significant and new modes of economic, political and cultural interconnectedness have emerged. In this Integrated Analytical Framework (IAF) recommended in this study, this stage is captured as

the Mechanism 5 Digital Connectivity, highlighting that technological innovations have taken globalization into the digital realm, but at the same time have created new types of inequality and power.

Outcomes

Digital globalization has sped up and scaled up global connectivity. In 2024, the proportion of the world's population using the Internet is estimated to have reached 68 percent, according to data from the International Telecommunication Union (ITU, 2024). But this global average masks unequal access to digital. In high-income countries, the internet was used about 93 percent and in low-income countries, it was 27 percent. Likewise, Internet use in Africa was around 38 per cent, the lowest in the world. There are also vast differences between urban and rural populations, with an estimated 83 percent of people using the internet in urban areas, but just 48 percent in rural areas. Digital globalization has created new forms of inequality, in addition to access inequality. The digital divide restricts access to educational, employment, health, financial, and digital market opportunities for those who lack sufficient infrastructure, affordable Internet access, and digital skills. Concurrently, the global technology companies are playing a growing role in the dissemination of information via algorithmic systems that impact public opinion, consumer habits and political discourse. With the advent of digital globalization, the question of cultural identity has also been brought up to a whole new level – global platforms foster cultural convergence but also allow local communities to offer a reinterpretation of global content to their own cultural context. Moreover, data ownership, cyber security, digital infrastructure, and

digital sovereignty are now the focus of government attention to take more control of national digital resources.

Relevance to the Study

The present study was directly related to this case study since it showed that globalization is still continuing to develop through various technological shifts and still maintains many structural inequalities from earlier periods in history. Digital technologies have also opened up greater opportunities for communication, innovation, education, and international trade, but there is still great disparity in access to these opportunities between countries and regions. Digital globalization is, therefore, a demonstration of how technology does not automatically lead to an equitable development. In the Integrated Analytical Framework this case is an example of Mechanism 5: Digital Connectivity, which provides a focus on how digital technologies have developed on the institutional backstops set up in previous stages of globalization. Digital globalization does not replace the mechanisms of globalization but rather expands the scope of globalization into the digital arena and creates new competitive forms in the economy, new influencing mechanisms in politics, new forms of cultural interaction and dependency in relation to technology.

Findings

The results reveal that digital globalization has increased global connectivity by means of instant communication, the exchange of information, financial transactions and cross-border digital interaction. But it has not eradicated inequalities, it has simply redistributed them via

unequal access to digital infrastructure, broadband, digital education, technological resources, etc. The rise of platform power, data governance, and digital sovereignty has also created new forms of economic and political influence. Within the Integrated Analytical Framework, **Mechanism 5: Digital Connectivity** demonstrates that technological change continues to reduce geographical barriers while simultaneously creating new forms of inequality. Digital globalization should therefore be understood as the latest major transformation of global connectivity rather than as the “most advanced” stage of globalization.

Case Study 7: The COVID-19 Pandemic – Testing the Limits of Global Interdependence

Rationale

COVID-19 is one of the most serious global crises of the 21st century, and a harsh challenge to the capacity and power of modern globalization. This case study differs from the others in its approach to studying the history of globalization, as it considers the role of an already highly globalized world in reacting to the global emergency. The pandemic has brought to the fore the opportunities and exposures of global interdependence and serves as a perfect laboratory to test the strength of international cooperation, global supply chains and multilateral institutions. Within the **Integrated Analytical Framework**, this case demonstrates how **Mechanism 5: Digital Globalization** and the institutional structures developed during earlier phases interacted under conditions of unprecedented global disruption.

Outcomes

The COVID-19 pandemic led to widespread disruption in global supply chains, international trade, transportation, and tourism as well as industrial production. Lack of medical equipment, pharmaceuticals, foodstuffs and industrial materials showed the fragility of highly dependent manufacturing chains relying on cross-border production and cross-border just-in-time delivery systems. These disruptions revealed the vulnerability of over reliance on global chains of production, Gereffi (2020) explains.

At the same time, globalization facilitated an unprecedented level of international scientific collaboration. Researchers, governments, pharmaceutical companies, and international organizations rapidly shared scientific information, genomic data, and medical research across borders, contributing to the development of effective COVID-19 vaccines in record time. The **World Health Organization (2021)** coordinated international health responses, while digital technologies enabled remote work, online education, telemedicine, virtual conferences, and continuous communication during periods of lockdown. These developments demonstrated that digital globalization remained an essential mechanism for maintaining economic and social activities despite severe restrictions on physical mobility.

However, vaccine distribution revealed significant inequalities within the global system. High-income countries secured most early vaccine supplies, whereas many low-income countries experienced delayed access due to limited production capacity, financial constraints, and unequal distribution mechanisms. Simultaneously, several governments-imposed export restrictions on essential medical products

despite participating in multilateral health initiatives, highlighting tensions between international cooperation and national interests.

Relevance to the Study

This case study is relevant to the aims of this current research as it examines the resistance of globalization in a global crisis situation. It illustrates the capacity of globalization to be resilient and fragile, and not necessarily both at the same time, but to be effective depends on how international institutions, technologies, and national policy interact. The pandemic has given us real-world experience of how interconnected the world is, whether through opportunities for cooperation or vulnerabilities from economic dependence. This case represents the synergistic effect of all the previous mechanisms of globalization within the Integrated Analytical Framework. Developed through trade, bolstered by colonialism and industrialization, formalized by international institutions, and facilitated by digitalization, these links have collectively influenced the global response to COVID-19. The pandemic is thus a 'full dress test' of the study's core thesis on globalization as a 'process of history that cannot be undone', whose 'good points and bad points [are] most apparent during international crisis '.

Findings

The findings show that COVID-19 exposed a fundamental paradox of globalization: global interdependence increased vulnerability to disruption while simultaneously making international cooperation and scientific exchange essential. Although international institutions and global networks facilitated cooperation, vaccine nationalism, export restrictions, unequal access to medical supplies, and supply-chain disruptions revealed the limits of institutional coordination during crises. Within the Integrated Analytical Framework, the pandemic demonstrates that the mechanisms of connectivity, unequal integration, technological acceleration, institutional governance, and digital globalization remain interconnected. The evidence therefore supports a qualified view of liberal institutionalism: international institutions facilitate cooperation but cannot fully prevent unilateral state action under severe pressure. COVID-19 is consequently better understood as a transformation toward more diversified, resilient, and regionally distributed globalization rather than a complete reversal of global integration.

An Integrated Historical Model of Globalization

Bringing together the findings above, this study’s central analytical claim is directly supported by historical evidence:

connectivity → power and unequal integration → industrial acceleration → institutional and financial integration → digital transformation.

Each stage did not simply follow the one before it in time; each stage took the specific mechanisms established by its predecessor and reorganized them around a new technological or institutional logic.

- Connectivity, established by the Silk Road and trans-Saharan networks, was captured and restructured by colonial power.
- Colonial power relations were accelerated, not replaced, by industrial technology, extending core-periphery structures into new industrial hierarchies.
- Industrial-era inequality was formalized, and partially moderated, by twentieth-century international institutions.
- Institutional structures were overlaid with digital connectivity, which compressed distance further while reproducing familiar patterns of unequal access as a digital divide.

Historical period	Dominant mechanism	Transformation	Persistent challenge
Pre-modern	Connectivity	Creation of long-distance networks	Unequal access and vulnerability
Colonial/imperial	Power and unequal integration	Networks reorganized around political	Dependency and asymmetric exchange

		authority and extraction	
Industrial	Technological acceleration	Transport, production and communication intensified	Industrial/core-periphery inequality
Institutional/financial	Institutional integration	Rules and organizations formalized interdependence	Uneven bargaining power and development outcomes
Digital	Digital connectivity	Data and platforms compress time and distance	Digital divide, platform power, data sovereignty

Critical Theoretical Synthesis

The regional comparison and the COVID-19 case together allow this study to move beyond simply listing the four theories introduced earlier to stating what the evidence shows about each. World-systems theory and dependency theory correctly identify the structural inequality that has accompanied every phase of globalization examined in this study, from colonial extraction through contemporary commodity

dependence in Latin America; but the Southeast Asian case shows that this structural inequality is not immutable, and that domestic institutional choices can alter a region's position within the global system. Liberal institutionalism correctly identifies the cooperative achievements of global governance but, as COVID-19 demonstrated, overstates the durability of that cooperation under acute crisis. Network society theory accurately describes the organizational logic of digital globalization but requires integration with the older structural theories to explain why digital connectivity, like every earlier form of connectivity examined in this study, has reproduced rather than eliminated global inequality.

Drivers of Globalization

The study identifies several drivers that have contributed to the expansion of globalization across historical phases.

- **Technological Innovation.** Technology has been the most consistent driver of globalization across every period examined in this study. Communication and transportation costs have fallen with each successive innovation the steam engine, the telegraph, the internet, and digital platforms enabling businesses to operate internationally and information to move in real time. Stiglitz (2002) identifies technological advance as a central driver of global market integration.
- **Trade Liberalization.** The reduction of tariffs and quotas has enabled cross-border economic activity and allowed countries to specialize according to comparative advantage; WTO

agreements have institutionalized more open trade policies across member states.

- **Political Cooperation.** International cooperation has fostered peace, stability, and coordinated economic policy; the European Union illustrates how sustained political cooperation can deepen regional economic and political integration.
- **International Institutions.** The IMF and World Bank provide financial support, policy guidance, and development assistance that facilitate global economic integration, notwithstanding persistent criticism examined throughout this study that their policies have disproportionately favored developed economies.

Impacts of Globalization

Positive Impacts

- **Economic Growth.** Globalization has supported economic development by expanding markets and facilitating cross-border trade; rapid development in several Asian economies has been closely tied to deeper engagement with international markets.
- **Cultural Exchange.** The transmission of ideas, values, and traditions across borders facilitated by global media, tourism, and migration has expanded cross-cultural understanding.
- **Technological Advancement.** Globalization has accelerated the diffusion of technological innovation, allowing countries to benefit from advances in productivity and infrastructure developed elsewhere.

Negative Impacts

- **Economic Inequality.** Despite aggregate growth, globalization has been associated with rising income inequality both within and between countries, with its benefits unevenly distributed (Stiglitz, 2002).
- **Cultural Homogenization and Hybridization.** The global reach of dominant cultural producers, particularly Western media, has raised concerns about the erosion of local traditions, even as digital platforms simultaneously enable new forms of cultural hybridization, as discussed in Section 4.6.
- **Environmental Degradation.** Expanding international trade and industrial activity have contributed to pollution, deforestation, and climate change.

Future Scenarios of Globalization

Building upon the historical evidence presented throughout this study, the future of globalization is unlikely to follow a single, linear trajectory. Instead, the findings suggest several plausible scenarios that reflect the evolving interaction between global connectivity, technological change, geopolitical competition, and institutional adaptation. These scenarios are derived from the historical patterns identified in the Integrated Analytical Framework and are supported by contemporary empirical evidence.

Scenario 1: Renewed Globalization

The first depicts the continuation of globalization on the basis of increasing international trade, foreign direct investment (FDI), technological cooperation and multilateral governance. In this case, global economic integration will slowly revert to patterns as seen before the 2008 worldwide financial crisis, with economic growth, technological innovation and increasingly close international cooperation. Globalization has been slowed by recent geopolitical tensions, but continued reliance on other countries' economies indicates that it is still a potential future development.

Scenario 2: Fragmented Globalization

The second scenario would be the fragmentation of the global economy into contending geopolitical regions. In this context, the organization of trade, investment, technology and supply-chains turns to strategic alliances and not comparative economic advantage. The UNCTAD data from the past few years (2025) show that foreign direct investment or FDI inflows have veered off path in Europe, North America and Asia, signifying the rising significance of geopolitical dimension in international economic relations. Globalization would, therefore, persist, minus global integration and plus regional polarization.

Scenario 3: Regionalized Globalization

The third scenario assumes a further development of regional economic integration, where countries are increasingly turning to neighboring markets and regional institutions to enhance their economic resilience. Regional cooperation, like that of the ASEAN or the European Union (EU) can help with investment, manufacturing and supply chain diversification. China's shift of manufacturing investment to Southeast Asia is a testament to the fact that globalization is starting to happen differently, one involving fewer centralized global supply chains and more regional production networks.

Scenario 4: Deglobalization

A fourth scenario would be a partial reversal of globalization, which would include higher protectionism, industrial reshoring, strategic protectionism, and less reliance on global production networks. The COVID-19 pandemic, combined with related policy discussions about friend-shoring, economic security, and supply-chain resiliency, suggests that there are some governments that want to decrease their strategic reliance on foreign markets. This does not signal an end of globalization per se, but rather a shift to greater national economic self-reliance in strategically important sectors.

Scenario 5: Digital Globalization

The final scenario proposes that globalization will increasingly be driven by digital technologies rather than the physical movement of goods. Artificial intelligence, digital services, cloud computing, e-commerce, cross-border data flows, and remote work continue to expand regardless of disruptions affecting traditional trade. Digital connectivity has become a new foundation of globalization, allowing international economic and social interaction to continue even when physical supply chains experience disruption. Consequently, future globalization may become increasingly digital while physical trade becomes more regionally organized.

Scenario	Main driver	Expected pattern	Assessment
1. Renewed globalization	Trade recovery and cooperation	Broader expansion of trade, investment and multilateral cooperation	Possible, but constrained by geopolitical competition
2. Fragmented globalization	Geopolitical rivalry	Trade, technology and investment	Highly plausible

		increasingly organized by strategic blocs	
3. Regionalized globalization	Supply-chain resilience	Greater reliance on regional production and institutions	Highly plausible
4. Deglobalization	Protectionism and reshoring	Partial reversal of selected forms of integration	Possible in strategic sectors, unlikely as total reversal
5. Digital globalization	AI, data and digital services	Continued expansion of cross-border digital interaction	Highly plausible and likely to coexist with other scenarios

Assessment

The results indicate that there is no single scenario that completely reflects the future dynamics of globalization. Instead, the most likely short-term scenario is a combination of Fragmented, Regionalized, and Digital Globalization. Digital services, data flows, artificial intelligence, and cross-border digital interaction will likely

continue to grow, while geopolitical concerns may increasingly influence physical trade and investment and regional supply chains. In the Integrated Analytical Framework, this is the ongoing evolution of globalization in light of evolving political, economic and technological realities. Globalization is therefore far more likely to be reorganized than reversed, with mounting geopolitical fragmentation and regionalization and an increasing digital connectivity.

Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate that globalization is best understood as a cumulative and evolving historical process rather than a sequence of isolated historical episodes. From the emergence of the Silk Road to the contemporary digital economy, each phase has expanded global interconnectedness while simultaneously generating new forms of inequality, institutional adaptation, and technological transformation. Rather than replacing earlier mechanisms, successive stages of globalization have built upon existing structures, producing increasingly complex patterns of global interaction.

The historical analysis confirms Giddens' (1990) view of globalization as a process that is produced by the interaction of technological innovation, economic integration, political institutions and social change. At the same time, the results this study offer strong validation of Wallerstein's (1974) World-Systems Theory, which states that unequal relationships between economically dominant areas and less developed areas have continued throughout the various globalization

stages. Structural inequalities have been prevalent in the integration of the world, from colonial extraction policies to current inequalities in access to digital technology.

However, the comparative regional analysis presented also qualifies purely structural interpretations of globalization. The contrasting experiences of **Southeast Asia** and **Latin America** demonstrate that domestic institutional quality, industrial policy, investment in education, infrastructure development, and governance significantly influence how countries benefit from globalization. Although historical legacies remain important, they do not completely determine developmental outcomes. Consequently, this study extends **Dependency Theory** by suggesting that structural dependence is not an irreversible condition but one that can be modified through effective domestic institutions and long-term development strategies.

The analysis on digital globalization and the COVID-19 pandemic once again shows that globalization in the present time offers opportunities and vulnerabilities. Digital technologies have brought with them greater communication, innovation and international cooperation but also new forms of inequality linked with access to digital technology, data control, and algorithmic power. Similarly, the pandemic demonstrated how interconnected the world was and also how much work is still needed for international cooperation to tackle global challenges, as well as how unequal access to vital resources can prove to be.

Overall, the findings confirm the central analytical argument of this research: globalization is neither inherently beneficial nor inherently harmful. Its outcomes depend upon the interaction between international economic integration and domestic institutional capacity. Throughout five centuries of historical development, globalization has consistently evolved through changing mechanisms of connectivity, power, technology, and institutional governance while reproducing, transforming, and occasionally reducing patterns of inequality. The Integrated Analytical Framework developed in this study therefore provides a comprehensive explanation of globalization as a dynamic historical process that continuously adapts to new political, economic, technological, and social realities while maintaining fundamental patterns of global interconnectedness.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Conclusion

This study examined the historical evolution of globalization and its contribution to world integration, developing an integrated analytical framework that connects five historical phases through five interacting mechanisms connectivity, power and unequal integration, industrial acceleration, institutional and financial integration, and digital transformation rather than treating them as a sequence of unrelated episodes. The study's central contribution is this integrated framework, tested against a comparative regional analysis of Southeast Asia and Latin America

and against the disruptive case of COVID-19.

The findings support the following conclusions:

Finding 1. Globalization is historically continuous, extending back through pre-modern trade networks rather than originating in the twentieth century.

Finding 2. Each historical phase transformed, rather than replaced, the mechanisms of global integration established by the phase before it a pattern demonstrated consistently from the Silk Road through digital globalization.

Finding 3. Integration and inequality have developed together throughout this history, from the colonial core-periphery structure through to the contemporary digital divide.

Finding 4. Globalization does not produce uniform outcomes across regions; the comparison of Southeast Asia and Latin America demonstrates that domestic institutions and industrial policy substantially shape how global integration translates into national development outcomes.

Finding 5. Digital globalization has created powerful new forms of connectivity while simultaneously generating new forms of inequality the digital divide that closely parallel the structural inequalities of earlier historical phases.

Finding 6. The future of globalization is unlikely to be adequately described by either “globalization” or “deglobalization” alone; the

evidence points toward a hybrid trajectory combining geopolitical fragmentation in physical trade, deepening regional integration, and continued expansion of digital connectivity.

The study's original contribution is an integrated historical-analytical framework demonstrating that contemporary globalization is the cumulative outcome of transformations in connectivity, power relations, technology, institutional structures, and digital networks a framework that accounts not only for globalization's history but for the structural reasons behind its persistently unequal outcomes across regions.

Suggestions / Recommendations

Based on the findings of this research, the following recommendations are offered to strengthen the positive effects of globalization while addressing its persistent challenges:

- **Promote Inclusive Economic Policies.** Governments and international organizations should direct investment toward infrastructure and social welfare systems, particularly in commodity-dependent economies, to help diversify economic structures inherited from earlier, more extractive phases of global integration.
- **Strengthening Global Governance Institutions.** The United Nations, WTO, and IMF should be reformed to provide fairer and more transparent global governance, with greater representation

for developing countries in decision-making a reform made more urgent by the institutional strain COVID-19 revealed.

- **Support Industrial Policy Learning Across Regions.** Given the divergence documented between Southeast Asia and Latin America, international development institutions should support the transfer of successful industrial policy practices export-oriented manufacturing strategy, regional integration, and coordinated infrastructure investment to regions still structured around colonial-era commodity dependence.
- **Close the Digital Divide.** Given the scale of digital inequality documented by the ITU (2024), with internet access ranging from ninety-three percent in high-income countries to just twenty-seven percent in low-income countries investment in affordable broadband infrastructure, particularly in rural areas and across Africa, should be treated as a core global development priority rather than a secondary concern.
- **Build Resilience into Global Supply Chains.** Considering the vulnerabilities COVID-19 exposed, governments and firms should pursue diversified, regionally resilient supply chains rather than relying exclusively on the most cost-efficient single-source production model.
- **Promote Sustainable Development.** Collaboration between governments and international organizations remains necessary to address the environmental costs of expanding trade and industrial activity documented throughout this study.

References

1. Abu-Lughod, J. L. (1989). *Before European hegemony: The world system A.D. 1250–1350*. Oxford University Press.
2. Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. Crown Publishers.
3. Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. University of Minnesota Press.
4. Bairoch, P. (1982). International industrialization levels from 1750 to 1980. *Journal of European Economic History*, 11(2), 269–333.
5. Baldwin, R. (2016). *The great convergence: Information technology and the new globalization*. Harvard University Press.
6. Baldwin, R., & Evenett, S. (Eds.). (2020). *COVID-19 and trade policy: Why turning inward won't work*. CEPR Press.
7. Bayly, C. A. (2004). *The birth of the modern world, 1780–1914: Global connections and comparisons*. Blackwell Publishing.
8. Beck, U. (1999). *World risk society*. Polity Press.
9. Bentley, J. H. (1993). *Old world encounters: Cross-cultural contacts and exchanges in pre-modern times*. Oxford University Press.
10. Cardoso, F. H., & Faletto, E. (1979). *Dependency and development in Latin America*. University of California Press.
11. Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the network society*. Blackwell Publishers.

12. Castells, M. (2010). *The rise of the network society* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
13. Chase-Dunn, C., & Hall, T. D. (1997). *Rise and demise: Comparing world-systems*. Westview Press.
14. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
15. Crosby, A. W. (1972). *The Columbian exchange: Biological and cultural consequences of 1492*. Greenwood Press.
16. Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. (2025). *Foreign direct investment in Latin America and the Caribbean 2025*. ECLAC.
17. Eltis, D. (2000). *The rise of African slavery in the Americas*. Cambridge University Press.
18. Ferguson, N. (2003). *Empire: How Britain made the modern world*. Allen Lane.
19. Findlay, R., & O'Rourke, K. H. (2007). *Power and plenty: Trade, war, and the world economy in the second millennium*. Princeton University Press.
20. Frank, A. G. (1967). *Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America*. Monthly Review Press.
21. Frank, A. G. (1998). *ReORIENT: Global economy in the Asian age*. University of California Press.
22. Frankopan, P. (2016). *The silk roads: A new history of the world*. Alfred A. Knopf.

23. Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
24. Gereffi, G. (2020). What does the COVID-19 pandemic teach us about global value chains? *Journal of International Business Policy*, 3(3), 287–301.
25. Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford University Press.
26. Hansen, V. (2012). *The silk road: A new history*. Oxford University Press.
27. Haselby, S. (2017). *What is global history now*.
28. Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global transformations: Politics, economics and culture*. Stanford University Press.
29. Hobsbawm, E. J. (1975). *The age of capital, 1848–1875*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
30. Hobsbawm, E. J. (1987). *The age of empire, 1875–1914*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
31. Hobsbawm, E. J. (1996). *The age of revolution: Europe 1789–1848*. Vintage Books.
32. International Telecommunication Union. (2024). *Facts and figures 2024: Measuring digital development*. ITU.
33. Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (1977). *Power and interdependence: World politics in transition*. Little, Brown.

34. Landes, D. S. (2003). *The unbound Prometheus: Technological change and industrial development in Western Europe from 1750 to the present*. Cambridge University Press.
35. Lang, M. (2006). Globalization and its history. *The Journal of Modern History*, 78(4), 899–931.
36. Lardy, N. R. (2002). *Integrating China into the global economy*. Brookings Institution Press.
37. Liu, X. (2010). *The silk road in world history*. Oxford University Press.
38. McKeown, A. (2004). Global migration, 1846–1940. *Journal of World History*, 15(2), 155–189.
39. McKeown, A. (2007). Periodizing globalization. *History Workshop Journal*, 63(1), 218–230.
40. Milanović, B. (2016). *Global inequality: A new approach for the age of globalization*. Harvard University Press.
41. Mintz, S. W. (1985). *Sweetness and power: The place of sugar in modern history*. Viking Penguin.
42. Naughton, B. (2007). *The Chinese economy: Transitions and growth*. MIT Press.
43. Northrup, D. (1995). *Indentured labor in the age of imperialism, 1834–1922*. Cambridge University Press.
44. Northrup, D. (2005). Globalization and the great convergence: Rethinking world history in the long term. *Journal of World History*, 16(3), 249–267.

45. O'Rourke, K. H., & Williamson, J. G. (1999). *Globalization and history: The evolution of a nineteenth-century Atlantic economy*. MIT Press.
46. O'Rourke, K. H., & Williamson, J. G. (2002). When did globalization begin? *European Review of Economic History*, 6(1), 23–50.
47. Osterhammel, J. (2014). *The transformation of the world: A global history of the nineteenth century* (P. Camiller, Trans.). Princeton University Press.
48. Pomeranz, K. (2000). *The great divergence: China, Europe, and the making of the modern world economy*. Princeton University Press.
49. Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture*. Sage Publications.
50. Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications.
51. Rodrik, D. (2011). *The globalization paradox: Democracy and the future of the world economy*. W. W. Norton & Company.
52. Sachs, J. D. (2005). *The end of poverty: Economic possibilities for our time*. Penguin Press.
53. Sassen, S. (2001). *The global city: New York, London, Tokyo* (2nd ed.). Princeton University Press.
54. Scholte, J. A. (2005). *Globalization: A critical introduction* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

55. Stearns, P. N. (2017). *The industrial revolution in world history* (5th ed.). Routledge.
56. Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its discontent*. W. W. Norton & Company.
57. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2020). *World investment report 2020: International production beyond the pandemic*. UNCTAD.
58. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2024). *World investment report 2024: Investment facilitation and digital government*. UNCTAD.
59. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2025). *World investment report 2025: International investment in the digital economy*. UNCTAD.
60. Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The modern world-system I: Capitalist agriculture and the origins of the European world-economy in the sixteenth century*. Academic Press.
61. Wallerstein, I. (2004). *World-systems analysis: An introduction*. Duke University Press.
62. Williams, E. (1944). *Capitalism and slavery*. University of North Carolina Press.
63. World Bank. (2013). *China 2030: Building a modern, harmonious, and creative society*. World Bank.
64. World Bank. (2025). *Trade (% of GDP) — World, 1960–2024*. World Development Indicators. World Bank.

65. World Health Organization. (2021). *COVID-19 strategic preparedness and response plan*. WHO.
66. Zhang, W.-B. (2000). *China's economic transformation*. World Scientific Publishing.