An Analysis of the World Society Conceptualization in the English School

İngiliz Okulunda Dünya Toplumu Kavramının Bir İncelemesi

Ali Onur TEPECİKLİOĞLU[1]

ABSTRACT

This study aims at analyzing the English School perspective on the non-state actors of international relations. In this regard, the study represents an overview of the world society conceptualization of the English School and highlights strengths and limitations of the existing accounts of the concept. The existing literature on the subject mainly concentrates on modern, value-based and global forms of non-state actors in international relations. This study offers an alternative view by emphasizing the importance of including non-global, interest-based and pre-modern non-state actors into the analysis in order to widen the scope of the English School theory. It is argued that the revised version of the world society conceptualization would also contribute to the understanding of modern non-state elements by achieving theoretical generalizations about the non-state dimension of the international relations.

Keywords: The English School, World Society, Non-state Actors

ÖZET:

Bu çalışma İngiliz Okulunun devlet dışı aktörlere bakış açısını incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu bağlamda çalışma, İngiliz Okulunun dünya toplumu kavramının bir genel değerlendirmesini yapmakta ve kavrama bugüne kadar getirilmiş yaklaşımların güçlü ve zayıf yönlerinin altını çizmektedir. Kavram üzerine yazılmış literatür, temelde modern, değer temelli ve küresel devlet dışı uluslararası ilişkiler aktörlerine yoğunlaşmaktadır. Bu çalışma küresel olmayan, çıkar temelli ve tarihsel devlet dışı aktörlerin incelemelere dahil edilmesinin önemini vurgulayarak, İngiliz Okulu teorisinin kapsamını genişletmek adına bir alternatif bakış açısı önermektedir. Bu çalışmada uluslararası ilişkilerin devlet dışı boyutu hakkında teorik genellemelere vararak, gözden geçirilmiş dünya toplumu kavramının modern devlet dışı aktörleri anlamaya katkıda bulunacağı iddia edilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler : İngiliz Okulu, Dünya Toplumu, Devlet Dışı Aktörler

1. Introduction

This study aims to analyze how the world society conceptualization is conceived within the theoretical framework drawn by the English School of International Relations. Main inquiry of the paper focuses on a question; in which areas can the world society concept of the English School be developed in a way to address further analysis of non-state dimension of international relations? Particularly as a result of neo-realism's shortcomings in the analysis of the post-Cold War era, the English School studies have gained remarkable attention for their comprehensive explanations of the international politics in the last two decades within the broad field of International Relations (hereafter will be abbreviated as IR). In

addition to their holistic approach, the English School also offers new concepts including international society, and new analytical tools such as institutional perspective. One of the main shortcomings of neorealism was its marginalization of non-state actors in explaining the new dynamics of the post-Cold War era. The new era started after the demise of the Soviet Union required much work on the functions of these actors and their likely influence on international system. The English School already had a concept, namely world society, for analyzing such actors. Moreover, the world society was more than just a concept in the English School theory; it was seen as one of the three essential dimensions of international politics. Nonetheless, compared to the other two dimensions –international system

and international society– of international politics, world society continues to be the less developed and analytically unclarified conceptualization of the English School. Thus, there is still a need for an update in the world society conceptualization in order to use it as an analytical tool in the future studies.

In order to provide such a basis for prospective studies, the literature of the English School's conception of world society will be critically analyzed. In this regard, three points will be focused on within this inquiry. Firstly, the study will concentrate on the way that the existing literature on the world society concept conceives the relationship between the world society and the other elements of international reality, namely international system and international society. Rather than providing a newly innovated notion of world society, the study aims to underline the importance of returning to the core arguments of the English School, which seem to be overlooked in most of the contemporary analysis of the world society conceptualization. Secondly, geographical extent of the existing world society conceptualizations will be analyzed. This study argues that the concept of world society does not necessarily penetrate into the whole world. Contrary to the existing accounts of the world society conceptualization that mostly relate the concept to the globalism, it is suggested that the concept can also define sub-globally shared values and interest among non-state actors (or individuals) that has the capacity to interact with the state system and society of states. This sub-globally or regionally shared interests and values can also provide basis for the establishment of non-state institutions. Lastly, the kind of commonality (values, interests or both) among non-state actors that the existing studies on the subject depict will be examined. It is argued in this work that accounts of the English School's world society conceptualization mainly discuss cosmopolitan conception of humanity, or human rights in general, as the potentially shared value among non-state actors that can provide a basis for the world society can be built on as a form of political organization in the international relations. The existing accounts of the concept are criticized in that sense, mostly because of neglecting the importance of the shared interests among non-state actors and ignoring their potential of influencing the functioning of international relations.

The English School can be defined as a group of IR scholars largely educated in Britain. They introduced an alternative view of world politics against to the dominant American IR perspective in 1960s. These scholars are often associated with their concept of international society. Their contribution is usually regarded as "via media" in international relations theory between the two extreme positions occupied by realism and the so-called idealism (Little, 2000). Despite the fact that international society is the key concept for understanding the English School's way of conceiving international relations, focusing merely on this concept brings along the neglect of the holistic approach of the school. Indeed, the English School's basic tenet is pluralism (Little, 2000). Here, pluralism implies that the international reality is composed of international system, international society and world society. International reality, in this sense, cannot be reduced merely to one of these elements that constitute it. Rather, none of these elements should be neglected in the analysis since the interplay between these three elements constitutes the international realm.

Whereas international system refers to a unsocial/mechanical condition which states are in contact with each other without sharing common values, norms, rules or institutions; international society implies a situation that states having common interests and values, are in continuous contact with each other by volitionally accepting to be bounded by common rules and share the work of common institutions (Bull, 1985: 13-14). According to their norms, there are at least two types of international society defined by Bull (1971), according to their norms. A pluralist international society in this sense prescribes a thin version of international society where international order is built upon the separateness of states which have ultimate authority over their people and territory. According to pluralists, any attempt to intervene in the domestic affairs of a state would harm the international order. In order to prevent disorder, intervention should be avoided in all cases including crimes against humanity. A solidarist international society, on the other hand, defines a thick version of international society which humanitarian intervention is a norm. According to a leading argument among solidarists, a state loses its legitimacy if it harms its people and violates their rights. Legitimacy in this sense is a principal feature for staying within the domain of international society. Thus, if a state loses its legitimacy other members of the international society should intervene and

reestablish justice in the international politics. Indeed, the tension between establishing order among states and securing the justice for individuals is one of the key debates within the English School.

World society, in this context, refers to a specific dimension of international relations ordered by a set of rules and institutions established by non-state actors. These rules and institutions of world society are founded upon the common values and interests of non-state actors instead of states'. Therefore, this dimension of international relations defined by the world society concept transcends the state system. At any point of history, all these three elements (international system, international society and world society) are present in international relations, nonetheless, one of them may predominate others (Bull, 1985: 41, 51).

In analyzing international relations, the English School adopts a methodological starting point, instead of an ontological one. Little (1995: 15) clarifies this method of the English School by stressing the importance of the English School scholars' separation of the key elements that characterize the international relations for methodological convenience. For Wight (1987: 221; 1991), there are three different elements both in international thought and in the practice of international relations. These are international anarchy (international system), habitual intercourse (international society) and moral solidarity (world society). What constitutes the discipline of IR is, then, "the interaction and cross-fertilization among those elements" (Wight, 1991: 7, 260). As Little (1995: 15) asserts, international relations is a complex phenomenon and in order to examine it, one must adopt different perspectives. On the grounds of treating different traditions of thought as diverse yet interrelated parts of a single philosophical inquiry, the English School suggests three different levels for the analysis of that single complex reality. One may adopt one of these levels in his/her analysis but he/she can never ignore the others. In order to comprehend the reality of international relations, all three levels of inquiry should be considered in the analysis. It should also be noted that these levels are not just analytical categories in the world of ideas but they are also concrete realities (Wight, 1991) as Bull (1985), Watson (2002), Wight (1977) and many others demonstrated by historical examples.

World society concept, therefore, enables us to analyze a substantial part of the international reality. This study, in this context, will principally intensify its analysis on the concept and the reality of world society, instead of representing a broader analysis of the English School theory, which is mainly defined with the concept of international society. But, of course, the relationship between the concept of the world society and the notions of the international system/international society as well as the interaction among them as separate yet interrelated entities (or forms of political organization in international relations) cannot be totally neglected. Thus, the study will analyze the gaps in the existing literature on the issue of the relationship among three different dimensions of international reality and IR theory. Based on its inquiry, the study suggests that world society conceptualization still represents a good starting point for developing the non-state dimension of international relations theory although it is underdeveloped and largely marginalized in the classical English School writings.

It is also claimed that an updated version of the world society conceptualization, within the broader context that English School provides for examining international relations, can allow us to better understand how "world of states" and "world of individuals" interact in international politics. In order to represent a significant analysis of at which points the existing world society conceptualization can be updated in a way to provide different perspectives on how the world of states and world of individuals interact, the study will first briefly introduce how the world society has been conceptualized within the English School theory, then, it will concentrate on the common points in the existing works and their limitations. Lastly, it will question in which areas the world society concept needs an update.

2. World Society within the English School Theory

The term world society is neither invented by the English School, nor merely used by them. It has been studied by different international relations traditions such as Stanford School, and it is utilized to define professional associations as well, e.g. World Society of Cardio-Thoracic Surgeons. Nonetheless, it is the English School scholars who first put forth the idea that world society is a dimension of international relations together with international system and

international society (Wight, 1991; Bull, 1985; Little, 2000; Buzan, 2001). Both international system and international society are analytically clarified (Bull, 1985) and historically studied (Bull and Watson, 1984; Wight, 1977; Watson, 2002; Buzan and Little, 2000) in the classical writings of the English School; however, world society is largely marginalized and neglected. As Buzan (2004: 21) accurately puts, the concept played the role of an "intellectual dustbin". However, it is also equally true that the contemporary English School literature still takes the concept very seriously, especially after the period called "reconvening."[1] Today, the concept continues to occupy a significant place for the analysis of non-state actors in the English School research agenda (Pella, 2013: 67).

Manning defined the world society concept for the first time within the English School. "The nascent society of mankind", for him, is the underlying element of society of states (Manning, 1962: 177). Likewise, Wight (1977: 33) treats cultural unity as a precondition for a state system to come into being. He usually conceives the world society concept within the boundaries of Kantian tradition, and this eventually leads his analysis to the context of a world state (Wight, 1991, 1987). He, nonetheless, does not limit his conceptualization of world society with world state. For him, *civitas maxima,* the single society of all mankind, can be achieved via spread of a single great power throughout the world (doctrinal imperialism) or, via the acceptance of the same doctrine by separate states (doctrinal uniformity) (Wight, 1991: 41-45). Bull's approach to the world society concept is not different than other classical figures. He generally uses the term within the context of cosmopolitan conception of humanity (Bull, 1985: 279) and forges a direct link between human rights and world society (Bull, 2002: 222). For him, cosmopolitan justice is equal to world society and given the fact that these justice demands do not have enough support in world politics, it is far from being realized (Bull, 1971: 276).

Vincent was interested in the analysis of the universal justice claims in the international relations much more than any other classical figure of the English School. Based on his desire to find a solution to the tension between the absolute sovereignty of states and justice, or in other words, in order to transcend the debate between the order and justice in the modern international society, Vincent uses the world society concept as a complementary element of the international society. For him, by assuring the human rights and accepting it as an international issue of the society of states, states dissolve international society into a world society (Vincent, 1995: 93). In general, his aim is to find a common ground between international society and universal justice claims. He defines his area of interest as "in the domain outside the diplomacy and international relations", and "beyond international society to world society" (Vincent, 1978: 20). World society, in his words, described as "the framework of morality that encompasses groups of this kind whose claims, not being accommodated by the society of states, are voiced in a tone which is hostile to it" (Vincent, 1978, 28).

He acknowledges the contradiction between norms that enable international society to operate such as non-intervention, and norms that world society stands on such as respect to human rights. In order to resolve the tension between "order" and "justice", Vincent adopts the basic rights approach of Henry Shue. According to this approach, intervention in international society can only be justified if a state violates the basic rights of its citizens, which are defined as right to live and right to subsistence. For Vincent, "it is the attraction of the idea of basic rights as the minimal modification of the morality of states: it seeks to put a floor under the societies of the world and not a ceiling over them" (Vincent, 1995: 126).

Quite similar to Vincent's approach, Neumann also treats the world society as a system of values, which can provide the basis for the humanitarian intervention in the international society (Neumann, 2001: 505). Further, he sees no difference between the world society and the international society dimensions of international relations. For him, world society is something attached to the international society and it represents the basics of individuals' justice claims in the world of states. In fact, he tries to open the standards that states should apply in the

---

international society to question. According to him these standards are provided by the world society, and have the capability to change the international society (Neumann, 2001: 506).

Andrew Linklater's approach to the world society concept can also be regarded in line with that of Vincent's. His study essentially focuses on the vulnerability of individual in international relations, and it takes the so-called border between solidarist international society and world society as a starting point for analysis. In an earlier study, he reformulates pluralism-solidarism debate around the contradictory nature of being a man and citizen. For him tension between these two types of morality has been the central issue of international relations (Linklater, 1981: 25). According to him, society of states should adopt a cosmopolitan conception of humanity in order to deal with different types of harm that individuals suffer from (Linklater, 2002: 327).

As it can be inferred from Vincent's and Linklater's approach to the subject, the normative ground for intervention in the international society, namely solidarism, is usually seen as the starting point for further analysis of world society both as a concept and as a political entity. However, John Williams's study of the world society concept diverges sharply from others since he builds his theory upon the pluralist version of international society. Williams (2005: 20) defines the notion of world society as a shift in the focus of political activity from states to individuals, and as a universal normative progress. For him, the world society as a form of political organization would emerge via separateness of states, and, furthermore, this is a potentially ethically desirable way (Williams, 2005: 19). Williams (2005: 27) stresses the importance of institutions of international society that generate "new organizations, practices and normative propositions." He further supports this argument with the examples of World Trade Organization and International Criminal Court. For him these organizations transcend the interstate and reach inter-human domain of international relations. He indicates that these organizations are founded by states and interstate order is a must for them to function properly. Thus, pluralistic international society is the basis for world society to emerge (Williams, 2005: 27). However, elsewhere (Williams, 2014: 139) he admits that world society as a form of political organization do not exist.

Clark, on the other hand, takes a non-theoretical standpoint, and tries to discover how world society relates to international society within the context of some historical examples (Clark, 2007). He basically stresses the importance of world society level in providing legitimacy for international society (Clark, 2007: 6, 18). Nevertheless, he admits that world society is an analytical category and can never be found in its absolute form (as a concrete reality, as a form of political organization) in the international relations (Clark, 2007: 22). For him, "world society is the realm of the individual, of the non-official group or movement, and of the transnational network of nongovernmental agents" (Clark, 2007: 6). Although his definition seems promising in the initial phase, particularly in terms of containing all types of non-state elements (value and interest based), his empirical studies indicate the opposite. In order to examine the relationship between international society and world society, he takes the historical development of values that had and continue to have major effects on the state system such as abolishment of slave trade, human rights, racial equality and democracy (Clark, 2007). For this reason, it would not be erroneous to assess his study of world society within the cosmopolitan tradition, as Pella (2013: 67) asserts.

In his recent work, Ralph treats Rome Statue of the International Criminal Court as constitutional element of world society. The International Criminal Court established by this statute is able to respond crimes against humanity (or universal values in his terms) when society of states is reluctant or incapable of to do so (Ralph, 2007: 21). For him, the English School propounds two different conceptualizations of world society in order to achieve "cosmopolitan consciousness", the basic value held in common in world society. These two conceptualizations are defined as revolutionary, where states no longer exists as agents of human affairs, and as Kantian version, where states remain to play a complementary role in the work of supranational institutions (Ralph, 2007: 18). Moreover, he draws a line between the Kantian conception of world society and solidarist version of international society. Ralph argues that intervention that is carried out by states as a political tool to restore the values of world society continues to exist in the solidarist international society where it disappears completely in the Kantian world society. Because in the latter, supranational institutions play the role

of principal agents in implementing "cosmopolitan consciousness" (Ralph, 2007: 19). He further claims that humanity is the fundamental value of a Kantian conception of world society because it is the only principle that can be universalized. In his analysis, it is therefore not possible to have geographically limited, or regionally defined world societies, since the world society and its basic value are inherently global (Ralph, 2007: 91). Ralph's account of world society undoubtedly falls into cosmopolitan category, not just because analyzing the concept within the framework of how international society/world society responds to crimes against humanity but also because excluding all non-state activities from his analysis unless they are somehow related to idea of humanity, or human rights in general.

Among the contemporary English School members, Buzan can be regarded as one of the most productive scholars without doubt. In addition to many contributions to the field, he devoted a full volume on the world society concept, entitled "*From International to World Society?*". This volume, indeed, does not simply focus on world society, but it aims at redefining and widening the scope of the English School theory. In line with this purpose, international society purports the international realm as a whole which consists of three levels of social interaction within it. Buzan defines these social interactions in three different categories. The first category, interstate society, is simply equal to the classical definition of an international society or a society of states. The second one, transnational society, refers to the dimension of non-state organizations. Inter-human society, lastly, means the social structures among individuals (Buzan, 2004: 120-127). Non-state dimension of international relations, then, is composed of inter-human and transnational levels, and Buzan names them together as world society (Buzan, 2004: 90-138, 2009: 26).

The distinction between inter-human and transnational dimensions is profound in Buzan's approach. Drawing insights upon the sociological distinction between community and society, he examines the nature of cohesion in transnational and inter-human levels. For him, individual (inter-human) level largely concentrates on the questions of identity and community, while the transnational level limited to society. Community, in this sense, signifies the feeling of we-ness and shared identity, society, on the other hand, means "agreed arrangement

concerning expected behavior" (Buzan, 2004: 111). In this redefined context, it may seem possible for the English School theory to widen its non-state dimension to all kinds of activities of individuals and non-state actors. This provides the theoretical basis for accepting non-global world societies as well. Buzan (2004: 18) asserts that the meaning of "world" and "international" are not limited to global, but they can also mean regional phenomenon. The sense of community, in particular, is most likely to be found between individuals who live in defined geographical areas/regions (Buzan, 2004: 124).

In many aspects, Buzan's analysis of world society may be regarded as a path-breaking effort in the English School theory, especially for accepting non-global world societies and extending the scope of world society beyond the cosmopolitan understanding of humanity. However, Buzan's typology of world society still has some shortcomings. As Pella (2013) clearly shows with the mini-case study of the slave trade in Africa in the early fifteenth century, the ontological distinction between individual (inter-human) and non-state organizations (transnational) disappears quite easily when it is applied to different cases. Since individual activity and transnational companies almost at interplay and had similar influence over the slave trade, Buzan's distinction between inter-human and transnational dimension does not help much in the analysis (Pella, 2013: 72). Moreover, the world society analysis should not merely focus on "how non-state actors (individuals and non-state actors in Buzan's terminology) come together" but their main concern should be "why and what for non-state actors come together". Therefore, the world society leg of the English School should be widened in a way to include interests as well as values.

3. General Overview of the English School's World Society Conceptualization

Existing scholarly work on world society within the English School can be classified under two broad categories (Pella, 2013); the classical interpretation which mainly treats the world society as shared values among individuals (particularly cosmopolitan conception of humanity) with an influence over international society and a Buzanian version which approaches world society as distinct interacting non-state units. The first category can also be divided into two sub-categories (Ralph, 2007); a revolutionary version of world society where states disappear,

and a Kantian version where states remain to play a complementary role in supranational institutions. In addition to these common points, the literature review made so far indicates that Buzan's and other scholars work diverge widely on the existence of non-global world societies. Moreover, almost all world society conceptualizations accept a direct link between modernity and emergence of world society, either implicitly or explicitly.

The main issue within the classical interpretation of world society is whether the world society and international society are complementary or contradictory. Williams (2014: 140) defines this issue as a debate about whether the world society as a concept includes international society or a distinct form of activity composed of non-state actors. The literature review made so far shed light on that Manning, Wight and Bull view world society as the exact opposite of the international society. This simply means that establishment of a world society as a political form of international relations would inevitably bring the international society to an end. Bull, for example, generally regarded world society and cosmopolitan justice ideals as destructive factors of international society. In his works, particularly until his late studies, order has priority over justice. He regarded world society in terms of cosmopolitan conception of humanity, and accordingly, as a threat for the existence of international society (Bull, 1979, 1985). He (Bull, 1971) argues that realization of world society necessarily brings international society to an end. Wight also treats world society within revolutionalist tradition with a main aim of abolishing the society of states. The main concern of scholars like Vincent and Linklater is also to discover the potential grounds that cosmopolitan character of human rights can comply with the pluralistic nature of international society. Furthermore, Wight's (1977), Buzan's (2004), and Ralph's (2007) studies demonstrate that shared values among humanity, especially in the form of common values, can also be basis for state systems to come into being. Therefore, it would not be erroneous to state that world society, as it stands, takes complementary, opposite or supportive forms in its interaction with international society in the English School literature. Apart from the concept's relationship with the two other central concepts of international system and international society, the existing literature on the subject principally has three common points. They all agree that the world society

concept defines globally shared common values in the modern international society.

3.1. Global or Geographically Limited World Society

Except Buzan's (2004), a great majority of the existing works define the geographical extent of world society as the whole globe, largely because of considering the concept equal with the cosmopolitan conception of humanity. In addition to this evident reason, two other factors can be propounded for global understanding of world society; the word "world" and holistic approach of the English School. The term "world" basically refers to the totality of individuals on the face of earth without doubt. However, one should also bear in mind that world is not something geographically fixed. Before 1492 world was not global, instead, it was only composed of Europe, Middle East, North Africa and parts of Far East, barely forty percent of today's world. Phrases like Christian world, Muslim world, Arab world, world of sports, old world, new world do not necessarily refer to a particular territory, albeit sometimes overlap with it, they also correspond to shared identity, values, interest or to a profession.

Farther, it is true that the English School studies traditionally incline to comprehend totality of any entity. Modern international society which is inherently global was their main area of interest. Thus, they were referring to the totality of humanity with the world society concept. However, the English School is not totally stranger to sub-global phenomena. Especially regional international societies are studied extensively by scholars including Hurrell (2007), Buzan (2009), Quayle (2013), Schouenborg (2013) and Pella (2015). There are no theoretical or empirical constraints for sub-global analysis of the world society elements in the English School theory. Since ultimate unity among mankind is absent, and almost impossible to achieve, emergence of a global world society is unlikely. Besides, the written history of mankind does not inscribe any point that all individuals in the world, being aware each other's existence, united around a single idea, value, interest or polity. Thus, accepting geographically limited world societies would allow us to define and analyze non-state activity that occurs in a remote part of the world as well as implementing the English School's theoretical framework to pre-modern international relations when the world was not global.

3.2. Modernity and World Society

The other aspect that existing scholarly works on the world society have in common is their assumption of a coherent link between modernity and world society. The first reason for such a connection is the linear understanding of the relationship between international system, international society and world society. The original argument of the English School theory is international system, international society and world society co-exist. As it is discussed previously, none of these elements of international relations is given ontological priority by the English School. However, the interplay between these three is often misinterpreted and overlooked in world society studies. The world society is conceptualized in the framework of a historical stage that can be achieved after the completion of international system and international society. For example, it can be easily observed in Vincent's study (1995) that world society is/can be established only after the acceptance of human rights as the basic norm of the international society. Williams (2005) takes the fragmental nature of international relations as his starting point as well, and argues that world society can be achieved via norms emerged within the pluralistic international society. Linklater (1981) also defines international relations around the contradictory nature of being a man and being a citizen, and stresses the importance of adaptation of moral priority of being a man over being a citizen as the normative position in state system in order to protect individuals. Similarly, Ralph (2007) sees the emergence of world society as a consequence of the acceptance of "cosmopolitan consciousness" in the society of states. The linear understanding of the triad can also be seen in the analysis of relationship between international system and international society. Bull (1985) and Buzan (1993) treat the international system as a historical stage before the emergence of international society (Little, 2000). In sum, the triad of the English school, as it is portrayed in those works, is reformulated in a way to represent progressivism. However, the English School theory, or international relations in general, is inherently non-progressivist. For Wight, one of the two reasons for the absence of international theory is "belief in progress" (Wight, 1966). Hence, it would be misleading to adopt a progressivist understanding to inherently non-progressivist theory.

There is also no de facto reason for moral priority of international society over international system. This is also valid for the relationship between world society and international society. In fact, in the twentieth century humanity suffered most from the devastating effects of wars, wars between sovereign states, when international society was in its heyday. One can argue that pros and cons of modern period of history are almost equal. Massive developments in the science and technology prolonged human life span and provided safety and comfort to the mankind. These can hardly be refuted; however, it is also true that humanity witnessed peace and prosperity in the times of Pax-Romana, Pax-Ottomana, Pax-Britannica as well as modernity. In a nutshell, application of a progressivist understanding of history to the English School theory does not give any analytical leverage to the analysis of the world society. On the contrary, it limits the concept's analytical capacity with the analysis of the values that have the capacity to be shared globally. However, the world society concept can also be used to define non-state activity in the pre-modern international relations, if the alleged link between the modernity and the concept can be overcome.

Second reason for this link is the two way relationship between modernity and existing accounts of world society. On the one hand, world society, as it stands, is defined merely within the limits of shared values among individuals which have/or will have particular effects on the functioning mechanisms of international society. The existing world society conceptualization also requires maximum interaction among individuals all around the world since it is conceived as a global phenomenon. On the other hand, modernity provides "globally" shared values in the form of human rights as well as the maximum interaction among individuals as a result of massive developments in communication. World society in the existing literature requires something global in its extent and individualistic in its content, and modernity has what word society approach needs. It is not striking to see the human rights as the starting point in the existing accounts of world society. World society is always seen as something attached to international society (Jackson, 1995: 111) and therefore, the pure form of it can only be human rights or justice claims within international society. There can be no entity of world society beyond an ideal, if it is limited to shared values among mankind (Jackson, 2000). Nevertheless, even on the issue of human rights, consensus cannot be found

among more than seven billion people on earth. For instance, Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Article 18) lists changing religion as one of the basic human rights, however, Abrahamic religions do not allow one to leave his/her original religion and adopt another one. Atheism is forbidden as well. This simply represents a challenge to religious people's faith in human rights. Human rights are naturally universal; however, they are not universally accepted. There is a compromise, rather than consensus over the issue of human rights.

3.3. The Common Ground for Non-State Actors

In the scholarly works analyzed, there is no palpable distinction between the values and interest that provide a basis for a world society to emerge. Nonetheless, Buzan's and Williams' studies draw near to a distinction between interest-based and value-based world societies. The analytical distinction offered by Buzan between transnational and interhuman levels can get close to a differentiation between interests and values that enable world societies to emerge. In Buzan's study, while interhuman level is restricted to the value-based world society, transnational level can be regarded as a platform for non-state elements to get together and establish institutions and rules on the basis of interests. Similarly Williams, takes international organizations such as World Trade Organization as world society elements operating on the grounds of pluralistic structure of international society. Although World Trade Organization cannot be regarded as a true non-state element of international relations, it is still possible to state that Williams takes international acts based on interests such as trade as examples of world society.

Except these two examples, nevertheless, almost all existing studies focuses on the common values that are/can be shared between human beings. However, if world society is defined as a form of human relationship which interacts with the international society and international system in the international realm, then, common interests shared between non-state actors should also be accepted as a basis for a world society to emerge. Ignoring the interests that are shared among non-state actors hinders the opportunity to employ the world society concept in a way to analyze how interest-based non-state actors influence the functioning of international society. For instance, none-state actors such as FIFA, International

Chamber of Commerce, the Hanseatic League, Organisation Internationale des Constructeurs d'Automobiles (International Car Manufacturers Association), International Olympic Committee etc. are interacting with the society of states and influencing the functioning of its institutions without representing any challenge to its basic norms. The existing world society conceptualizations do not include such non-state actors and this inevitably narrows the English School's analytical framework. Accepting interests as a base for non-state actors may also contribute to the non-global version of world society. Since there is no need for a cosmopolitan ground for individuals or non-state actors that come together to seek interest within a particular area of the international society, their influence over the state system could be analyzed in sub-global scale. Moreover, including interest seeking non-state actors into the analysis can also alter the widely accepted argument that international society and world society are incompatible. Unlike value-based world society elements which aim at reshaping the norms and institutions of society of states, these interest seeking actors seek to control a specific a sphere of society of states such as trade, sports etc.

4. Conclusion

This study aimed at analyzing how world society has been studied within the English School literature. The English School already has an inbuilt mechanism for understanding, analyzing and explaining the relationship between the world of states and world of individuals. Particularly for theorizing international relations from a holistic perspective, the English School theory still have substantial potential for explaining the dynamics of non-state action. However, the world society leg of the English School still needs to be developed. There are three areas that the world society conceptualization should be updated. First, the world society concept should be redefined in a way to include the role of non-global non-state action in international politics. This would widen the scope of the world society conceptualization and allow it to analyze non-global phenomena that affect the main functioning mechanisms of international relations. Moreover, non-global conceptualization of the term would provide a basis for the analysis of historical world society elements. One of the main concerns of the classical members of the English School was to compare and contrast past and present forms of

international conduct and reach generalizations about how the institutions and rules that constitute the international relations emerge (Watson, 1990, 2002). Therefore, widening the scope of the world society conceptualization in a way to enable the analysis of historical forms of world society would contribute to this purpose.

Second, the fictional link between modernity and world society should be abandoned. This would also widen the scope of the world society conceptualization in a way to include historical forms of non-state action. By this revision, world society conceptualization can be employed to explain historical events such as crusades or slave trade as well as organizations including merchant guilds, the Hanseatic League and historical transnational companies. Moreover, world society conceptualization is inevitably limited to the human rights issues if it is only conceived as an element peculiar to the modernity. However, the conceptualization can be the starting point for the English School to include all kinds of non-state activities within its theory. Related to this, the world society concept as it stands needs an update on a third issue which can be described as accepting different grounds for commonality among the members of the world society. A distinction should be made between interests and values that enable non-state actors to come together and have a likely influence on the state system. It is because, there is a fundamental difference between the aims of these interest-based or value-based world society elements. While the interest-based world society elements have the objective of controlling a specific sphere of international realm by keeping states and state related institutions out, value-based world society elements seek to reshape the norms of international society according to their basic values. For example, whereas International Chamber of Commerce as an interest-based world society element try to control the international trade by keeping states out, Islamic State of Syria and Iraq (ISIS) as a value-based non-state actor aims at reshaping the international society according to its basic value, Sharia.

The existing world society conceptualization within the English School theory is promising. Nevertheless, these three updates can widen the scope of the theory to understand and explain both historical and modern versions of non-state actors and their influence on state system. Future studies particularly can concentrate on the historical development of the non-state actors, in order to understand the influence of the modern ones. Furthermore, developing a comprehensive approach for explaining the non-state action in international politics could shed light on the contemporary non-state threats to modern international system.

References

Bull, H. (1971) "Order vs. Justice in International Society", *Political Studies*, 19(3): 269-283.

Bull, H. (1979), "The State's Positive Role in World Affairs", *Daedalus,* 108(4): 111-123.

Bull, H. (1985) *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in International Politics*, Hong Kong, Macmillan.

Bull, H. (2002) "Justice in International Relations: The 1983 Hagey Lectures", Alderson et. al. (eds.), *Hedley Bull on International Society*, London, Macmillan.

Bull, H. and Watson A. (1984) *The Expansion of International Society*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Buzan, B. (1993) "From International System to International Society: Structural Realism and the Regime Theory Meet the English School", *International Organization*, 47(3): 327-352.

Buzan, B. (2001) "The English School: An Underexploited Resource in IR", *Review of International Studies*, 27(3): 471-488.

Buzan, B. (2004) *From International to World Society? English School Theory and the Social Structure of Globalisation*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Buzan, B. (2009) "The Middle East Through English School Theory", Buzan et. al. (eds.), *International Society and the Middle East English School Theory at the Regional Level*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.

Buzan, B. and Little R. (2000) *International Systems in World History: Remaking the Study of International Relations*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Clark, I. (2007) *Legitimacy and World Society*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Hurrell, A. (2007) "One world? Many worlds? The Place of Regions in the Study of International Society", *International Affairs*, 83(1): 127-146.

Jackson, R. (1995) "The Political Theory of International Society", Booth et. al. (eds.), *International Relations Theory Today*, New York, Polity Press.

Jackson, R. (2000) *The Global Covenant Human Conduct in a World of States*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Linklater, A. (1981) "Men and Citizens in International Relations", *Review of International Studies*, 7(1): 23-38.

Linklater, A. (2002) "The Problem of Harm in World Politics: Implications for the Sociology of States-Systems", *International Affairs*, 78(2): 319-338.

Little, R. (1995) "Neorealism and the English School: A Methodological, Ontological and Theoretical Reassessment", *European Journal of International Relations*, 1(1): 9-34.

Little, R. (2000) "The English School's Contribution to the Study of International Relations", *European Journal of International Relations*, 6 (3): 395-422.

Manning, C.A.W. (1962) *The Nature of International Society*, London, Macmillan.

Neumann, I. B. (2001) "The English School and the Practices of World Society", *Review of International Studies*, 27: 503–507.

Pella, J. A. (2013) "Thinking Outside International Society: A Discussion of the Possibilities for English School Conceptions of World Society", *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, 42(1): 65-77.

Pella, J. A. (2015) *Africa and the Expansion of International Society Surrendering the Savannah*, London, Routledge.

Quayle, L. (2013) *Southeast Asia and the English School of International Relations: A Region-Theory Dialogue*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.

Ralph, J. (2007) *Defending the Society of States Why America Opposes the International Criminal Court and its Vision of World Society*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Schouenborg, L. (2013) *The Scandinavian International Society: Primary Institutions and Binding Forces, 1815-2010*, London: Routledge.

Vincent, R. J. (1978) "Western Conceptions of a Universal Moral Order", *British Journal of International Studies*, 4(1): 20-46.

Vincent, R. J. (1995) *Human Rights and International Relations*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Watson, A. (1990) "Systems of States", *Review of International Studies,* 16(2): 99-109.

Watson, A. (2002) *The Evolution of International Society*, London, Routledge.

Wight, M. (1966) "Why is There no International Theory?", Butterfield et. al. (eds.) *Diplomatic Investigations: Essays in the Theory of International Politics*, London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Wight, M. (1977) *Systems of States*, Leicester, Leicester University Press.

Wight, M. (1987) "An Anatomy of International Thought", *Review of International Studies*, 13(3): 221-227.

Wight, M. (1991) *International Theory: The Three Traditions*, Leicester, Leicester University Press.

Williams, J. (2005) "Pluralism, Solidarism and the Emergence of World Society in the English School Theory", *International Relations*, 19(1): 19-38.

Williams, J. (2014) "The International Society–World Society Distinction", Navari et. al. (eds.), *Guide To The English School In International Studies*, 127-142.