

# Preface: The World Society Foundation: History and Practice

Christian Suter  
Patrick Ziltener  
Hans-Peter Meier-Dallach

**Como citar:** SUTER, Christian; ZILTENER, Patrick; MEIER-DALLACH, Hans-Peter. Preface: The World Society Foundation: History and Practice. *In*: DUCROS, Hélène *et al.* (org.). **Decentering European studies: perspectives on Europe from its beyond.** Marília: University Workshop; São Paulo: Academic Culture, 2025. p. 7-17. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36311/2025.978-65-5954-652-7.p7-17>



All the contents of this work, except where otherwise noted, is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).

Todo o conteúdo deste trabalho, exceto quando houver ressalva, é publicado sob a licença Creative Commons Atribuição-NãoComercial-SemDerivações 4.0 (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).

Todo el contenido de esta obra, excepto donde se indique lo contrario, está bajo licencia de la licencia Creative Commons Reconocimiento-No comercial-Sin derivados 4.0 (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).

# Preface

## The World Society Foundation History and Practice

*Christian SUTER<sup>1</sup>, Patrick ZILTENER<sup>2</sup>, and  
Hans-Peter MEIER-DALLACH<sup>3</sup>*

The aim of this preface is twofold. First, we trace the historical roots of the concept of “world society,” as it pertains to the funding behind this book and the motivation of the World Society Foundation (WSF) to bring together researchers from various parts of the globe to write about Europe from their respective regional perspectives. Because Peter Heintz, the founder of the WSF, was especially influential in shaping the Foundation’s approach to the making of a global society through research funding, we focus on his work. Second, we delve into the Foundation’s funding activities over the last forty years. In this respect, the present volume is well inscribed in the Foundation’s historical mission. Through its first “Writing Lab for Global South Scholars,” of which this book is a result, the World Society Foundation has developed a new funding tool guided by the conviction that such a novel sponsoring pursuit will provide researchers from the Global South (and the Global East) better access not only to resources within the Foundation but also beyond. In support of its core purpose of strengthening research on and from a world society while also promoting a diversity of voices in scholarship, the World Society Foundation brought these different perspectives into a dialogue, in particular through the regular activities of the writing lab. This preface, therefore, serves to situate this edited volume within the historical context of the Foundation’s philosophy and past research funding activity. In line with these past practices, the Foundation has gathered here researchers from different parts of the world and diverse cultural, historical, and academic contexts, who emanate from an array of disciplines and rely on a variety of theoretical and methodological bases to address topics relevant to an understanding of contemporary Europe.

### From “International System” to “World Society”

Long before the notion of “globalization” went viral in the 1990s, scholars used different analytical approaches to demonstrate that binding the notion of “society” to the concept of nations based on states and placing the nation at the center of sociological

---

<sup>1</sup> Christian Suter, University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland, christian.suter@unine.ch.

<sup>2</sup> Patrick Ziltener, University of Zurich, Switzerland, ziltener@soziologie.uzh.ch

<sup>3</sup> Hans-Peter Meier-Dallach, World Society Foundation, Zurich, Switzerland, hp@culturprospectiv.ch

analysis was untenable and even misleading. Certainly, the conceptualization of the world as an “international system” has had a long tradition in academic disciplines such as political science, international relations, and international law. However, the dominant perspectives have approached the international system as a simple consequence of the incidental interaction of its independent units, echoing the concept of the market in mainstream economics. Thus, the concept of “world society,” which emerged in sociology in the 1960s and early 1970s, has gone beyond the “global interaction system of national societies/nation-states” (GISN) model.

Before the 1970s, only a few social theorists had developed a “beyond the GISN” perspective on the world. The idea of a “world society” was first mentioned by an expert in international law, George Schwarzenberger, in his book *Power Politics*. Schwarzenberger, who had earned his PhD at the London School of Economics with a thesis on *The League of Nations and World Order*, held a position at the London Institute of World Affairs. Addressing the rule of law of peace (and war), i.e., the creation, functioning, and transformation of international rules, Schwarzenberger adopted a sociological perspective on international law to uncover the power politics that operated behind international rules. While the first edition of *Power Politics* (1941) was subtitled “An introduction to the study of international relations and post-war planning” and, therefore, still reflected a traditional international relations perspective, this subtitle was changed in the second (1951) and third (1963) editions to “A study of international society” and “A study of world society,” respectively. Drawing on Ferdinand Tönnies’s distinction between “society” and “community,” Schwarzenberger argued that the international system had to be conceptualized as a society, rather than as a community:

[...] modern international society is a reality for the reason that in groups co-exist within it which are both interdependent and independent of each other [...] The bond that holds world society together is not a vague community of spiritual interests. It is power. (Schwarzenberger 1951, 251).

It is no coincidence that Scharzenberger, a German emigrant whose Jewish family had been forced to leave Germany for political reasons, conceptualized world society by turning to a pronounced interdisciplinary approach that combined international law and international relations with sociology.

A second impetus for global thinking in the 1960s-1970s goes back to Wilbert E. Moore, former president of the American Sociological Association (ASA). In his presidential address at the 1965 ASA convention, Moore (1966, 475) called upon to develop “global sociology,” a “sociology of the globe, of mankind,” in the face of the “growing ubiquity of similar problems and similar solutions in the world of events.” He traced global thinking back to a “grand tradition” that included thinkers such as Polybius and Ibn Khaldun and assumed the unity of humankind. Since Antiquity, the metaphor of humankind as one “body” had been used frequently, e.g., in Seneca’s “membra sumus corporis magni” (“we are members of a large body,” cf. Motto 1955). As a student of Talcott Parsons, Moore believed that “we must rediscover super-systems” (Moore 1966, 482).

A third decisive development of the 1960s and early 1970s was the rise of various “world models” in the context of increasing global ecological risks and the boundaries placed on the planet by a dominant resource-intensive, growth-based development path, which had been pursued by most countries but in particular by those of the Global North. In his introduction to a special issue of the UNESCO *International Social Science Journal* focused on world society, Peter Heintz (1982a, 11) noted an increased interest within the scientific community for the topic of “world society,” which he explained as resulting from the construction of world models, in particular economic, resource-oriented, and international relations models. The two most important world models, the first Club of Rome publication on “Limits to Growth” (Meadows et al. 1972) and the “Latin American” counter model published by the Argentine Bariloche Foundation (Herrera et al. 1976) received considerable public attention across the globe. Based on computer simulations and focused on the interactions among selected global problems (such as population density, waste, environmental deterioration, famine, poverty, and criminality), the Club of Rome’s publications presented a fundamental critique of (resource-intensive) economic growth and pointed to the risks of a general collapse of the international system in the absence of a move to a more sustainable development model.

This global catastrophe scenario was criticized as neo-Malthusian by the proponents of the Bariloche model who emphasized in their social sciences-based counter-model the importance and impact of socio-structural factors such as global disparities, inequality, and over-consumption (in the Global North). Heintz, who had established the social sciences department at the Bariloche Foundation in the 1960s, maintained close contacts and research collaborations with researchers there, including with the creators of the “Latin American” world model. Although Heintz was not part of this group, his structural-theoretical, developmental-sociological approach, with its focus on global stratification, institutionalized power, and prestige, was closely related to the Bariloche model perspective.

As they interrogated world society, these three early initiatives had quite different impacts on research agendas in the social sciences and on the public debate about global issues. Schwarzenberger remained an “outsider,” as his interdisciplinary approach was neither adopted nor further developed in international law, while the world models’ perspectives have had a profound influence and contributed to linking development, global inequalities, and the environment more explicitly. In effect, it can be said that supporters of these models initiated, some 50 years ago, an eco-developmental agenda for global sustainability that is still robustly shaping today’s public debate.

## **Peter Heintz’s World Society Concept: Global Stratification, Development, and Tensions**

Peter Heintz started using the concept of “world society” in the early 1970s. By 1966, he had been appointed as a full professor of sociology at the University of Zurich, where he had established the Sociological Institute, which became, under his guidance, one of

the most important centers of empirical social research in Switzerland. Heintz had studied economics and social sciences in Zurich, Paris, and Cologne, and spent years in South America from 1956 to 1965 after receiving his habilitation under the leadership of René König at the University of Cologne. As an expert for UNESCO, he had contributed to the institutional development of sociological research and teaching in several South American countries, notably at the Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) in Santiago de Chile and at the Bariloche Foundation in Argentina. This experience in the Global South strongly influenced his work once he returned to Europe, as can be seen not only in his macro-sociological, developmentalist (structural-theoretical) approach and his emphasis on intercultural and comparative analyses but also in his interest in sociological teaching and public sociology (see Heintz 1960).

Heintz formally introduced the concept of “world society” in 1972 through two contributions targeted at the general public; indeed, he was interested in reaching beyond the limited scholarly audience of sociologists and academics. The first article, entitled “The world society and its citizens,” was published (in German) in the weekend edition of the liberal, center-left Basel-based newspaper *National-Zeitung am Wochenende* (Heintz 1972c). Two years later, he wrote a similar article, “The structural transformation of world society from the perspective of sociology,” for the broader public of the University of Zurich magazine (Heintz 1974). Hence, he had already been using the term for a few years when he published in 1977 his first scientific publication explicitly addressing the topic of world society (Heintz and Obrecht 1977).

Until then, Heintz had still used terms such as “international system” or “international system of development stratification” in his scientific writings, for instance in his 1972 analysis of “Switzerland’s position in the structure of the international system: A sociological analysis,” (Heintz 1972a) or in the volumes “A macrosociological theory of societal systems: With special reference to the international system” (Heintz 1972b) and “The future of development” (Heintz and Heintz 1973), which constituted two of his most important scientific publications in that period. He then also started developing a global approach that went beyond the international systems perspective, emphasizing instead the structural and institutional foundations of the international system and its impact on the national and local levels. His assumption was that

The notion of structure, i.e. institutionalized power and prestige, implies a differential distribution of chances, or even a distribution governed by different laws for different regions, as for instance, for the region of the developing countries and for that of the highly developed nations. The structure of the international system is thus conceived of as representing the distribution of nations’ chances to realize the values of development (Heintz 1972a, 81).

Heintz also increasingly examined the topic of world society in his teaching, for example through university seminars he conducted from 1976 onwards, as well as a lecture series “On the sociology of world society.” He also disseminated the concept

through international conferences in Zurich, e.g., at the Report on World Society and Educational Code symposium in January of 1976. Four years later, in November 1980, he organized an international seminar on Diversity and Change of World Society Images at the University of Zurich; several papers presented at that conference were published in 1982 in a special issue of UNESCO's *International Social Science Journal* (no. 34/1, 1982) under the title "Images of world society. Emerging global understanding and praxis." His research program at that time was quite ambitious, as he aimed to develop "a sociological code for the description of world society and its change."

At the center of Heintz's world society concept lies the notion of global stratification, more precisely an "international system of development stratification," which is characterized by a multi-dimensional and multi-level structure (of local, subnational, national, regional, and global levels) embedding individuals, organizations and institutions, and states into a comprehensive social reality (Suter 2005). Heintz conceptualized world society as a hierarchically structured international development system shaped by the unequal positions of individual nations on interrelated stratification dimensions such as income, education, urbanization, industrialization, and tertiarization. Heintz's structural-theoretical, developmentalist conceptualization of world society considerably differs from other world society or global society approaches developed in the 1970s, such as Niklas Luhmann's systems model (Luhmann 1982; Stichweh 2000), Ulrich Beck's (2009) world at risk approach, John W. Meyer's neo-institutionalist world polity approach (Meyer 1980; Meyer et al. 1997), or Immanuel Wallerstein's (1974) world systems theory. While the world systems theory relies primarily on global economic interactions and the world polity approach is based on political and institutional factors, Heintz emphasized the diffusion of global cultural values, norms, and societal institutions as the principal integrating forces of world society (for a more detailed discussion of the various world society approaches, see Bornschier and Lengyel 1990, Wobbe 2000, Bornschier 2002, Greve and Heintz 2005, Bauer 2014, Wittmann 2014, Suter and Ziltener 2024).

Heintz considered that the primary factors of integration and stability in world society are a consensus on the value of social and economic development and the existence of mobility channels permitting and regulating access to hierarchical positions within the multidimensional stratification system. Structural and anomic tensions constitute crucial aspects of this approach, as they are caused by incomplete status configurations or imbalances in the positions held by social actors, whether the latter are individuals or nation states. According to Heintz, structural and anomic tensions occur across different system levels within world society, that is, across global, national, regional, organizational, and individual levels. In the 1960s and early 1970s, he predicted that increasing contradictions and tensions within world society would result in a general deficit of legitimacy and in increasing tendencies toward disintegration.

In his late work, before his untimely death in 1983, Heintz focused on codes and images to describe world society and the structure and evolution of political regimes at the periphery (Heintz 1982b). Although he did not produce a specific "Zurich school" out of his research, Heintz inspired students, collaborators, and colleagues to further develop the concept of world society in the twenty-first century. *World Society and Social*

*Structure*, containing 38 contributions, is an example of this follow-up work (cf. Hirschier et al. 1980). The most prominent of Heintz's students has been Volker Bornschier, who served as president of the World Society Foundation in the 1980s and 1990s. Bornschier analyzed the (negative) impact of foreign investment dependence on economic growth and development at the periphery of the world economy (see Bornschier and Chase-Dunn, 1985); he also focused on state-building processes, processes of convergence and divergence in institutional orders, and societal models at the core of world society (Bornschier 1996). Other themes included the role of socio-cultural factors such as generalized trust and social capital for political and economic development (Bornschier 2004). Many other works by scholars who were students and collaborators of Peter Heintz are worth mentioning, in particular Georg P. Müller's (1988) world data handbook, Christian Suter's (1992, 1999, 2012) analysis of global sovereign debt cycles and regime change in Latin America, and Hans-Peter Meier-Dallach's research on post-socialist transformation in Eastern Europe (Meier-Dallach and Juchler 2001).

## Pros and Cons of a “World Society” Approach

In a short, but remarkable text in Johan Galtung's *Festschrift* in 1980, Heintz critically reflected on the pros and cons of studying world society and developed four main arguments in favor of such endeavor. First, he argued that studying world society entails a concern with the “only truly global society,” whereas national societies are, in structural terms, not global, even when they might be socially defined as such. Second, for Heintz, studying world society means to address a topic common to all social scientists, regardless of the region or culture to which they belong. This commonality is rooted in the idea that everyone can consider herself/himself to be a member of a (loose) worldwide community of social scientists. Third, Heintz advanced that studying world society is innovative, even at a time when the scale of study was modest, since this topic had been “highly neglected” by social scientists at that point. Fourth, studying world society entails understanding a “very particular type of society,” which promises to be highly productive for further theory building. This particular type of society was characterized by Heintz (1980, 97) as a stateless, highly complex society without identity, i.e., a society that is not perceived as such by most of its members.

Among the reasons *not* to approach the world as a world society, Heintz mentioned the following four arguments. First, he noted that there had been little to no demand for knowledge on world society; he added, that there seemed to be no social problem related to world society that required sociological knowledge and analysis. Second, Heintz mentioned that only a small, globalized elite (made up of foreign policymakers and managers of multinational corporations) might be interested in research findings on world society; moreover, research results might strengthen the power of these elites, which would hardly be in the interest of sociology. Third, for Heintz, studying world society would be to pretend to be able to overcome the structural limitations of one's own perspective, which is always influenced by the specific place and position someone



occupies in society. Fourth, Heintz (1980) argued that data on world society were lacking; moreover, these data, like governmental statistics or media news, might be quite biased.

In conclusion, Heintz (1982a, 20) called for an exploration of the “possibilities of shaping world society on the basis of solid knowledge shared by different groups,” in spite of “strong social and cultural forces” preventing such an exploration. For him, “a meaningful world society could only result from a commonly shared knowledge revealing action spaces and making people true participants in this society; without, of course, by any means denying the continued existence of antagonistic interests.” It is striking that several arguments advanced by Heintz fifty years ago are still valid, such as his characterization of world society as a stateless, highly complex society without an identity. Other aspects discussed by Heintz have fundamentally changed, for instance, his observation that no social problem seems to be related to world society. Already the wave of rapidly increasing economic globalization that characterized the world between the 1980s and the early 2000s was related to the emergence of several severe global social problems (such as increasing global inequalities and social stratification, or increasing global migration). The subsequent multiple global crises—financial, economic, political, military, sanitary, social, environmental, etc.—that have marked the years since 2008 and contributed to a considerable fragmentation challenging today’s world demonstrates the persistence and relevance of global social problems and the ongoing necessity of applying a world society approach.

## **Forty Years of Research Funding by the World Society Foundation**

A review of the Foundation’s forty years of research funding reveals an extensive thematic, theoretical, and methodological approach, as well as a wide disciplinary and regional diversity in the research supported, echoing the emerging structural transformations and changing images of world society over the past decades. When Heintz established the World Society Foundation in 1982, it was an important step toward strengthening and institutionalizing research on world society. The Foundation, now in its forty-third year of activity as a “world observatory” on global change has supported social sciences scholars and scientific research all over the world to reinforce the investigation into the various processes of global integration, disintegration, (re)structuring, and (re)configuration. In doing so, the Foundation has supported approximately 700 researchers from nearly 50 countries worldwide through various instruments, but in particular through the sponsorship of research projects and international conferences. Over the last few years, the Foundation has mainly promoted international conference sponsoring. Through this reorientation, the Foundation’s board has intended to give better access to marginalized researchers (from the Global South and peripheral regions of Europe), who have been markedly underrepresented in the distribution of project grants. Within the framework of its conference sponsoring activity, the WSF has placed a special focus on topics of particular interest for countries of the Global South, such as the emergence of a rapidly growing middle class there (see Suter et al. 2020) or the increasing relationships among



non-core Global South countries (see Ziltener and Suter 2022), which traditionally have been neglected in the scholarship produced in core countries.

The Foundation also established the World Society Foundation Research Paper Award and, in collaboration with Nicole Shea, founded the WSF Writing Lab for Global South scholars; it has also supported (open access) publications on various world society topics, in particular for Global South scholars. The output of this funding has been substantial, as can be seen in the numerous conference presentations, journal articles, books, edited volumes, and special issues published by the supported researchers. The Foundation has also established its own book series in “World Society Studies,” in which results of outstanding research projects and conference papers have been featured. Detailed information on the Foundation’s past and current activities, as well as access to electronic versions of papers, chapters, and books of supported research, are available on the Foundation’s website at [www.worldsociety.ch](http://www.worldsociety.ch).

## **World Society as a Code Guiding the Foundation**

Within the context of increasing globalization—in particular in the fields of economic relations, communication, and global risks—research in the social sciences and public debates on global issues have considerably intensified over the past decades. Various concepts describing a so-called world society and different perspectives have developed since the 1960s and contributed to improving our understanding of global transformations. Heintz insisted on the importance of world society as the most comprehensive unit of analysis and a fundamental concept in social science. However, his approach, unlike Luhmann’s systems theory and Wallerstein’s world-systems approach, is not a closed and coherent theory but rather a general (sociological) code that can be used to better describe and understand events, structures, and processes occurring at the global level of world society. Heintz also indicated that every individual member of world society adopts a code or an image of this society to get oriented. The socialization process thus emphasizes immediate neighborhoods and loyalties to the family, the local community, and the nation. However, most individuals have, according to Heintz (1982a, 12), a “rather vague, unstructured, poor and inconsistent image of world society” and mostly behave with regard to the wider world “as members of national or subnational societies.”

The World Society Foundation has carried on Heintz’s heritage by funding research activities to reach a better understanding of global structures and transformations. Four basic principles have guided the practices and research funding of the Foundation: First, its global and transnational mission regarding research funding has led it to support research all over the world, most of the funding allocated having gone to researchers outside Switzerland and Europe. Second, the Foundation has been guided by a multi- and cross-disciplinary perspective in its support of all the disciplines, in particular in the social sciences and humanities, that address world society issues. Third, the Foundation has relied on a broad theoretical and methodological orientation in its choices for grant recipients. Fourth, the Foundation has focused on encouraging and supporting

researchers from the Global South (or peripheral regions in the Global North) in order to hear the voices of those who generally have had limited access to research funding and publication opportunities in academic journals. These guiding principles are reflected in the present book. Here, looking in from the Global South and the margins of Europe through different angles, scholars from diverse cultural backgrounds and theoretical and methodological orientations analyze ideas, images, and visions of Europe, as well as European institutions, structures, dynamics, policies, and integration and disintegration processes.

**Note:** A longer version of this chapter appears in Suter, Christian, Patrick Ziltener, and Hans-Peter Meier-Dallach. 2024. “Fifty Years of Research on World Society: The Zurich ‘World Observatory’.” In *After Globalization: The Future of World Society*, edited by Christian Suter and Patrick Ziltener. Lit. <https://lit-verlag.de/isbn/978-3-643-80409-9/>

## References

- Babones, Salvatore. 2018. “Sovereignty in the Millennial World System.” In *The Return of Geopolitics* (World Society Studies 2018), edited by Albert J. Bergesen and Christian Suter. Lit.
- Bauer, Julian. 2014. “From Organisms to World Society: Steps toward a Conceptual History of Systems Theory, 1880–1980.” *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 9 (2): 51–72.
- Beck, Ulrich. 2009. *World at Risk*. Polity Press.
- Bornschier, Volker. 1996. *Western Society in Transition*. Transaction.
- Bornschier, Volker. 2002. *Weltgesellschaft: Grundlegende soziale Wandlungen*. Loreto.
- Bornschier, Volker. 2004. *Culture and Politics in Economic Development*. Loreto.
- Bornschier, Volker, and Christopher Chase-Dunn. 1985. *Transnational Corporations and Underdevelopment*. Praeger.
- Bornschier, Volker, and Peter Lengyel. 1990. “Introduction: Notions of World Society.” In *World Society Studies Vol. 1*, edited by Volker Bornschier and Peter Lengyel. Campus.
- Greve, Jens, and Bettina Heintz. 2005. “Die ‘Entdeckung’ der Weltgesellschaft: Entstehung und Grenzen der Weltgesellschaftstheorie”. In *Weltgesellschaft: Theoretische Zugänge und empirische Problemlagen* (Zeitschrift für Soziologie, Sonderheft Weltgesellschaft), edited by Bettina Heintz, Richard Münch and Hartmann Tyrell. Lucius & Lucius.
- Heintz, Peter. 1960. *Cursos de Sociologia*. Andrés Bello.
- Heintz, Peter. 1972a. *Switzerland’s Position in the Structure of the International System: A Sociological Analysis*. Bulletin of the Sociological Institute of the University Zurich. Sociological Institute of the University Zurich.
- Heintz, Peter. 1972b. *A Macrosociological Theory of Societal Systems: With Special Reference to the International System*. Vol. I and II. Huber.
- Heintz, Peter. 1972c. “Die Weltgesellschaft und ihre Bürger.” *National-Zeitung am Wochenende*, July 8.

- Heintz, Peter. 1974. "Der heutige Strukturwandel der Weltgesellschaft in der Sicht der Soziologie." *Universitas* 29 (5).
- Heintz, Peter. 1980. "The Study of World Society: Some Reasons Pro and Contra." In *Social Science—For What? Festschrift for Johan Galtung*, edited by Hans-Henrik Holm and Erik Rudeng. Universitetsforlaget.
- Heintz, Peter. 1982a. "A Sociological Code for the Description of World Society and its Change." *International Social Science Journal* 34 (1): 11–21.
- Heintz, Peter. 1982b. *Die Weltgesellschaft im Spiegel von Ereignissen*. Rügger.
- Heintz, Peter, and Suzanne Heintz. 1973. *The Future of Development*. Huber.
- Heintz, Peter, and Werner Obrecht. 1977. "Structure and Structural Change of World Society." *International Review of Community Development* 37 (18): 1–18.
- Herrera, Amílcar O., Hugo D. Scolnick, Graciela Chichilnisky, Gilberto C. Gallopin, and Jorge E. Hardoy. 1976. *Catastrophe or New Society? A Latin American World Model*. IDRC.
- Hischier, Guido, René Levy, and Werner Obrecht, eds. 1980. *Weltgesellschaft und Sozialstruktur: Festschrift zum 60: Geburtstag von Peter Heintz*. Rügger.
- Luhmann, Niklas. 1982. "The World Society as a Social System." *International Journal of General Systems* 8 (3): 131–38.
- Meadows, Donella, Denis Meadows, Jorgen Randers, and William W. Behrens III. 1972. *Limits to Growth: A Report of the Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind*. Universe Books.
- Meier-Dallach, Hans-Peter, and Jakob Juchler, eds. 2001. *Postsocialist Transformation and Civil Society in a Globalising World*. Nova Science Publishers.
- Meyer, John W. 1980. "The World Polity and the Authority of the Nation-State." In *Studies of the Modern World-System*, edited by Alfred Bergesen. Academic Press.
- Meyer, John W., John Boli, George M. Thomas, and Francisco O. Ramirez. 1997. "World Society and the Nation-state." *American Journal of Sociology* 103:144–81.
- Moore, Wilbert E. 1966. "Global Sociology: The World as Singular System." *American Journal of Sociology* 71 (8): 475–82.
- Motto, Anna Lydia. 1955. "Seneca, Exponent of Humanitarianism." *The Classical Journal* 50 (7): 315–18.
- Müller, Georg P., and Volker Bornschier. 1988. *Comparative World Data: A Statistical Handbook for Social Science*. Campus/Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Schwarzenberger, Georg. 1951. *Power Politics: A Study of International Society*. 2nd ed. London Institute of World Affairs.
- Stichweh, Rudolf. 2000. *Die Weltgesellschaft: Soziologische Analysen*. Suhrkamp.
- Suter, Christian. 1992. *Debt-Cycles in the World-Economy: Foreign Loans, Financial Crises, and Debt Settlements, 1820–1990*. Westview.
- Suter, Christian. 1999. *Gute und schlechte Regimes: Staat und Politik Lateinamerikas zwischen globaler Oekonomie und nationaler Gesellschaft*. Vervuert.
- Suter, Christian. 2005. "Research on World Society and the Zurich School." In *The Future of World Society*, edited by M. Herkenrath, C. König, H. Scholtz, and T. Volken. Intelligent book production.

- Suter, Christian. 2012. "Debt Crises in the Modern World-System." In *Routledge Handbook of World-Systems Analysis*, edited by Salvatore J. Babones and Christopher Chase-Dunn. Routledge.
- Suter, Christian, Hanspeter Stamm, and Ulrich Pfister. 1990. "External Debt of the Periphery: A Recurrent Problem of World Society." In *World Society Studies*. Vol. 1, edited by Volker Bornschier and Peter Lengyel. Campus.
- Suter, Christian, Subramaniam Madheswaran, and B.P. Vani. 2020. *The Middle Class in World Society: Negotiations, Diversities and Lived Experiences*. Routledge.
- Suter, Christian, and Patrick Ziltener, eds. 2024. *After Globalization: The Future of World Society* (World Society Studies). Lit.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. *The Modern World System I*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wittmann, Veronika. 2014. *Weltgesellschaft: Rekonstruktion eines wissenschaftlichen Diskurses*. Nomos.
- Wobbe, Theresa. 2000. *Weltgesellschaft*. Transcript Verlag.
- Ziltener, Patrick, and Christian Suter, eds. 2022. *African-Asian Relations: Past, Present, Future* (World Society Studies). Lit.