

Course ID Number: DCC 5070
Course Title: War and Diplomacy

No. of Credits: 2

Graduate School of International Relations
International University of Japan

Term: Fall 2011

Instructor: Harald Kleinschmidt

Course Introduction

This course shall provide a historical and comparative analysis of the structural features of diplomacy and war in the European arena. It will integrate the conduct of diplomacy and war into the period-specific socio-cultural contexts. In doing so, it will link diplomacy and war to changing broader patterns of actions and perceptions of the world. Specifically, it will juxtapose the mechanistic patterns prevailing during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries against the biologicistic patterns dominant during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Lecture course:

War and Diplomacy. A Comparative Survey of Patterns of Action in International Relations

Harald Kleinschmidt

Overview

This course shall provide a historical and comparative analysis of the structural features of diplomacy and war in the European arena. It will integrate the conduct of diplomacy and war into the period-specific socio-cultural contexts. In doing so, it will link diplomacy and war to changing broader patterns of actions and perceptions of the world. Specifically, it will juxtapose the mechanistic patterns prevailing during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries against the biologicistic patterns dominant during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Schedule

Part I: Normativity versus the Use of Force

Reading material: Michael Mann, *The Sources of Social Power*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. 1-33; Robert Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Order", in *Millennium* 10 (1981), pp. 126-155; reprinted in Cox, *Approaches to World Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 85-123 (Cambridge Studies in International Relations. 40.)

Part II: The Quest for Stability (Status quo) in Early Modern Europe as a Heuristical Problem and as a Research Controversy

Reading material: Geoffrey Parker, *The Military Revolution* (1988).

Part III: Description: Cases of Diplomatic Practice

Reading material: Jeremy Martin Black, *A Military Revolution?* (1991).

Part IV: Description: Cases of the Conduct of War

Reading material: Albrecht Altdorfer (ca 1480 – 1538), Battle of Alexander 1529.

Part V: Analysis: Diplomatic Organisation and Perceptions of International Relations

Reading material: Donald W. Hanson, "Thomas Hobbes's 'Highway to Peace'", in *International Organization* 38 (1984), pp. 329-354. David Runciman, "What Kind of Person is Hobbes' State?", in *Journal of Political Philosophy* 8 (2000), pp. 268-278.

Part VI: Analysis: Theories of International Relations

Reading Material: Harald Kleinschmidt, *The Nemesis of Power* (2000).

Part VII: Analysis: Military Organisation and the Perception of War

Reading material: John A. Lynn, *Giant of the Grand Siècle. The French Army 1610 – 1715* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 67-106.

Part VII: Analysis: Military Organisation and the Perception of War

Reading material: Jaap A. De Moor, "Experience and Experiment. Some Reflections upon the Military Developments in 16th and 17th Century Europe", in *Exercise of Arms. Warfare in the Netherlands. 1568 – 1648*, edited by Marco van der Hoeven (Leiden, New York und Köln: Brill, 1997), pp. 17-32 (History of Warfare.1.)

Part VIII: Analysis: Theories of War

Reading material: Edward Luttwak, *Strategy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987).

Part IX: Patterns of Action: Ethics of Self-Constraint and Theories of Peace

Reading material: Justus Lipsius, *Six Bookes about Politicks* (1589).

Part X: Patterns of Action: The Theory of Just War

Reading material: Richard Tuck, *The Rights of War and Peace. Political Thought and International Order from Grotius to Kant* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999) [the chapter on Grotius].

General Survey:

According to Ian Clark, *International Legitimacy and World Society*, 2007, the notion of “International Society”, a core term of the so-called English School in International Relations, comprises aspects of great power politics, balance of power politics, international law, diplomacy and the conduct of war. Clark thus categorises diplomacy and war as cross-cultural, if not global aspects of international relations.

Is this view tenable? Or are diplomacy and the conduct of war culturally specific?

Nicholas Greenwood Onuf, *World of Our Making*, 1989, pp. 248-9, has this to say about diplomats and soldiers:

„Among people trained in soldierly and diplomatic skills, military officers harmonize their professional and organizational voices especially well. Their very description as ‘officers’ and the importance they attribute to rank and chain of command contribute to this harmony. So does their training. Military officers are socialized uniformly in academies and typically schooled in engineering, the practice of which has been much affected by the discoveries of science and analytical methods. Military personnel work with machines and think of the military as a machine. Even the forced inactivity of military life – actual fighting is an infrequent experience for most officers – leaves a good deal of time for midcareer instruction in modern managerial, planning and analytic techniques.

By contrast, diplomats are notoriously unwilling to enhance their skills by learning these same techniques. They insist on the personal and informal nature of their skills, and they tend to display a premodern sense of community through their highly ritualized interactions. It must also be remarked that diplomats are no longer solely or even chiefly responsible for relations among governments. Indeed their share of responsibility has declined in inverse relation to the growth of the bureaucratic apparatus within, among, and beyond states. In other words, diplomats have retained their premodern integrity at the expense of relevance.”

Is this perception of the relationship between diplomacy and warfare tenable? Are the historical statement concerning the lack of “modernity” of diplomats and the theoretical statement about the failure for technology of military people in accordance with facts?

José Calvet de Magalhães, *The Pure Concept of Diplomacy* (New York, 1988), p. 9, defines: „While the most typical peaceful instrument of foreign policy is diplomacy, its most typical violent instrument is war.

Does this definition hold? Is the distinction between diplomacy and war that clearly cut?

References:

- Adair, Edward Robert: *The Exterritoriality of Ambassadors in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London: Longman, Green & Co, 1929).
- Anderson, Matthew Smith: *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy. 1450 – 1919* (London and New York: Longman, 1993).
- Barnett, Robert W.: *Beyond War. Japan's Concept of Comprehensive Security* (Washington: Pergamon-Brassey, 1984).
- Behrens, Betty: 'The office of English Ambassador', in: *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*. Fourth Series, vol. 16 (1933), pp. 161-195.
- Berridge, Geoff R.: *Diplomacy. Theory and Practice*, fourth edn (Basingstoke: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2010).
- Black, Jeremy: *War and the World. Military Power and the Fate of Continents. 1450 - 2000*, paperback edn (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000).
- Black, Jeremy: *A Short History of Diplomacy* (London: Reaktion Books, 2010).
- Ferguson, Yale H., and Richard W. Mansbach: *Remapping World Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 227-271: 'War in a post-international world'.
- Gat, Azar: *A History of Military Thought. From the Enlightenment to the Cold War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- Gat, Azar, *War in Human Civilization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006) (paperback edn of 2008 also available).
- Grabar, Vladimir Emmanuilovich: *De legatorum jure tractatum catalogus completus ab anno MDCXXV usque ad annum MCC* (Dorpat: s .n., 1918).
- Handel, Michael I.: *Masters of War. Classical Strategic Thought*, third edn (London & New York: Routledge, 2000).
- Holsti, Kalevi Jaako: *Taming the Sovereigns. Institutional Change in Institutional* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 26-71: 'States and Statehood'; pp. 275-299: 'War'.
- The Dynamics of Military Revolutions*, edited by MacGregor Knox and Williamson Murray (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- Ilardi, Vincent: 'Fifteenth-Century Diplomatic Documents in Western European Archives and Libraries. 1450 – 1494', in: *Studies in the Renaissance* 9 (1969), pp. 64-112.
- Luttwak, Edward: *Strategy. The Logic of War and Peace* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).
- Magalhaes, Jose Calvet de: *The Pure Concept of Diplomacy* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1988).
- Mattingly, Garrett: *Renaissance Diplomacy* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1965).
- Queller, Donald Edward: *Early Venetian Legislation on Ambassadors* (Geneva: Anmilly-Annemasse, 1966).
- Queller, Donald Edward: *The Office of Ambassador in the Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967).

Sawyer, Ralph D.: *The Art of the Warrior. Leadership and Strategy from the Chinese Military Classics* (Boston & London: Shambala, 1996).

Sharp, Paul: 'Who Needs Diplomats? The Problem of Diplomatic Representation', in: *International Journal* 52 (1997), pp. 609-634.

Sharp, Paul: 'For Diplomacy. Representation and the Study of International Relations', in: *International Studies Review* 1 (1999), pp. 33-57.

White, Brian: 'Diplomacy', in: *The Globalization of World Politics*, edited by John Baylis and Steve Smith, third edn (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 387-403.

Section A: Generalities

Part I:

History, the Social Sciences and International Relations

1. The complexity of international relations

1.1. Factors of international relations are societal, political, economic and cultural.

1.1.1. These factors are long-term.

1.1.2. These factors relate to actions in a macro-perspective (group actions, action in groups).

1.1.3. These factors involve institutions and large population segments.

1.2. The definition of international relations is broad, namely: relations among groups whose members mutually consider each other as outsiders

1.2.1. This definition invokes the distinction between inside and outside.

1.2.2 This definition necessitates the inclusion of borders.

1.3. Societal factors of international relations

1.3.1. International relations are relation involving social actions.

1.3.1.1. Max[imilian] Weber (1864 – 1920)'s concept of social action: action within groups wherein observers can pass judgments about the accomplishment of set and recognizable goals to be attained by the actor.

1.3.1.2. Max Weber's definition of social action as 'end-rational action' within a societal context.

1.3.1.3. The eighteenth-century sensualist tradition of Max Weber's concept of social action (thinking and determination of goals are prior to and conditional for acting; Anthony Ashley Cooper, 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury, 1671 – 1713; Francis Hutcheson, 1694 – 1746).

1.3.2. Focus of international relations on groups, not individuals (cf 1.1.2.)

1.3.3. Distinctions between inside and outside are definitional properties of international relations (cf. 1.2.1.)

1.4. Political factors of international relations (including legal and military factors)

1.4.1. A hidden political agenda: Defining actorship and other key concepts in International Relations as a field of study is a political process in itself.

1.4.2. Various definitions of the political:

1.4.2.1. Carl Schmitt (1888 – 1985; *Der Begriff des Politischen*, 1932; English version, 1976): politics is the struggle between opponents for power.

1.4.2.2. David Easton (1917- ; *A Framework for Political Analysis*, 1956/1965): politics is the authoritative allocation of values for society.

1.4.2.3. David Held (1951- ; *Models of Democracy*, 1987; *Democratic Government and Politics*, 1991; *Political Theory Today*, 1991): politics is grassroots bottom-up facilitation

about agreement about basic norms and values, involving commonality of interests.

1.4.3. Commonality of interests emerges from rule-free debates within groups (Jürgen Habermas, 1929- ; *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*, 1981; English version, 1984).

1.4.4. Politics may position international relations either within a normative context or within the context of struggles for power.

1.4.5. Politics either may position international relations within a conflict of interests across groups or may contextualize international relations within processes of negotiations among diversity of group interests.

1.5. Economic factors of international relations

1.5.1. Economics position international relations in the context of value and utility (*homo economicus* theory as the background).

1.5.2. Economics assume that international relations are about the allocation of access to scarce resources.

1.5.3. Economics focus on transactions linking actors together.

1.6. Cultural factors of international relations

1.6.1. Various definitions of culture:

1.6.1.1. Culture as a system of norms, goods and practices.

1.6.1.2. Culture as a system of perceptions.

1.6.1.3. Culture as a specific type of actions (e.g. theatre, literature, art, music).

1.6.2. Culture can be the matter international relations are conducted about (e.g. cultural exchange and foreign cultural policy).

1.6.3. Culture can refer to the thought patterns embedding international relations (e.g. perceptions of the world).

1.6.4. Culture can contain perceptions of the 'other' (i.e. the 'constructedness' of international relations).

1.6.5. Culture can provide the norms and rules underlying international relations (i.e. international relations as the 'property' of a specific culture).

2. Perspectives on international relations

2.1. An problematic abridged definition of international relations: international relations as relations among states.

2.1.1. What are states?

2.1.1.1. Various approaches to the state:

2.1.1.1.1. the state as a set of institutions.

2.1.1.1.2. the state as a (legal) person.

2.1.1.2. Changing definitions of the state (as a set of institutions):

2.1.1.2.1. the state as a triad of unities (Georg Jellinek, 1851 – 1911; *Allgemeine Staatslehre*, 1900).

2.1.1.2.2. the state as an institution equipped with the monopoly of the use of force (Max

Weber, c. 1920, specifying Jellinek's definition).

2.1.1.3. The transfer of concepts relating to the state: the theory of sovereignty.

2.1.1.3.1. sovereignty in the sense of Jean Bodin (1530 – 1596; *Six livres de la République*, 1576).

2.1.1.3.2. sovereignty in the understanding of twentieth-century Western political thought

2.1.1.3.3. sovereignty in the understanding of international law (the state as a legal person, cf. 2.1.1.1.2.)

2.1.1.3.4. the significance of social, political and cultural history for the allocation of sovereignty.

2.1.1.3.5. sovereignty in East Asia.

2.1.1.3.6. the history of the word state in the various European languages and in Japanese (classical Latin *stare* as a root, relating to standing, stability, constancy; Japanese 国家).

2.1.2. What are nations?

2.1.2.2. the cultural perspectivity of the distinction between nations and other types of groups (e.g. the so-called 'ethnic groups'): nations as constructs.

2.1.2.2.1. the lack of general definability of a nation: collective identity not a given.

2.1.2.2.2. the problem of the interconnectedness or lack of interconnectedness between states and nations (little less than 200 states exist in the world, but between 7000 and 8000 nationality projects exist, most of which have remained unsuccessful: Ernest Gellner, 1925 – 1995; *Nations and Nationalism*, 1983; Philip G. Roeder, *Where Nation-States Come From*, 2007).

2.1.2.2.3. the problem of size in correlation with the nation.

2.1.2.3. the history of the word nation in the various European languages and in Japanese (classical Latin *nascere*, being born, versus Japanese 国民、国体 国対、民族、民俗).

2.1.2.3.1. identity as a condition of nation-building.

2.1.2.3.2. greed as a condition of nation-building.

2.1.2.3.3. grievances as a condition of nation-building.

2.1.2.3.4. mobilization as a condition of nation-building.

2.1.2.3.5. recognition as a condition of nation-building.

2.1.3. Actorship as a problem underlying the definability of states and nations.

2.1.3.1. Persons as actors in states and nations.

2.1.3.2. Institutions as actors in states and nations.

2.1.3.3. the history of the word international in the various European languages and in Japanese (inter = in between、versus 国際).

2.2. Universality versus globality

2.2.1. Universality:

2.2.1.1. a world without borders.

2.2.1.2. the perception of all humankind as one.

2.2.1.3. the subjection of all humankind to the control of only one government.

2.2.2. Globality:

2.2.2.1. changing world pictures and the history of globalization.

2.2.2.2. the evolution of the concept of border from zone to line.

- 2.2.2.3. a world of states: sovereignty as a definitional element of the global international system.
- 2.2.3. the contested notion of universality in international relations.
 - 2.2.3.1. one ruler or many: universalism versus particularism.
 - 2.2.3.2. contested hierarchies: tributary international systems versus systems based on the equality of sovereign rulers or states.
 - 2.2.3.3. contested borders: the difficulty of defining inside versus outside.
 - 2.2.3.4. various notions of the system
 - 2.2.3.4.1. mechanicism: the system as a hierarchical complete ordering instrument (the total sum of the elements is identical with the system).
 - 2.2.3.4.2. biologism: the system as an assemblage of units (the system is larger than the total sum of units).
 - 2.2.3.5. various extensions of the systems in connection with international relations:
 - 2.2.3.5.1. global.
 - 2.2.3.5.2. regional.
 - 2.2.3.5.3. national.
 - 2.2.3.5.4. local (sub-national).
 - 2.2.3.5.5. macro- versus microsystems.

2.3. Various notions of the international:

- 2.3.1. international as global.
- 2.3.2. international as transnational (the superstructure).
- 2.3.3. international as cross-national.
- 2.3.4. international as multilateral
- 2.3.5. international as bilateral.
- 2.3.6. aspects of the international:
 - 2.3.6.1. consisting of various types of relations (2.3.1. – 2.3.5.)
 - 2.3.6.2. consisting of comparisons across units.
 - 2.3.6.3. consisting of global, transnational or cross-national generalities.

3. Cultural factors in the pursuit of International Relations as a field of study

3.1. the claim for universality underlying social sciences versus their dependency upon culture: the impact of the constructivist revolt.

- 3.1.1. Social sciences as a Western concept.
 - 3.1.1.1. 'politics' and 'economics': their conceptual history.
 - 3.1.1.2. cameralism, physiocracy and the quest for betterment.
 - 3.1.1.3. Auguste Comte (1798 – 1857)'s scientism: positivism, generalization and prediction as constitutive feature of the social sciences (Max Weber taking up positions from Comte).
 - 3.1.1.4. Thomas Kuhn (1922 – 1996)'s concept of the paradigm and his positioning of the social sciences in the 'pre-paradigmatic' field.
 - 3.1.1.5. social sciences between sciences and humanities.

3.2. Some methodological limitations informing International relations as a social science

3.2.1. The absence of laboratories.

3.2.2. The absence of large-scale, comprehensive statistical data: International Relations usually deals with small data sets.

3.2.3. The problem of the cross-cultural and cross-temporal comparability of international relations data.

3.2.4. History serving as an empirical proxy base for International Relations (despite the limited cross-temporal comparability of the data).

3.2.5. Change and International Relations: the self-destruction of the empirical base through research in International Relations.

Part II: Objectivity versus Subjectivity: the Problematique of Scientism

1. Hallmarks of scientism

1.1. Objectivity as a hallmark of scientism.

1.2. Predictivism as a hallmark of scientism.

1.3. Generalizability as a hallmark of scientism.

1.4. A tale of meanings

1.4.1. The concepts of objectivity and of the object.

1.4.1.1. etymology of the words.

1.4.1.2. nineteenth-century philosophy of science on objectivity.

1.4.1.2.1. Heinrich Rickert (1863 – 1936).

1.4.1.2.2. Wilhelm Windelband (1848 – 1915).

1.4.1.3. methodology: research as the process of objectifying reality (the 'box' argument).

1.4.1.4. ethics: objectivity as neutrality or impartiality (individual researchers contending for objectivity of their research standards).

1.4.1.5. academic organization: objectivity as neutrality or impartiality (schools contending for objectivity of their research standards).

1.4.2. The concepts of subjectivity and of the subject.

1.4.2.1. etymology.

1.4.2.2. philosophical approaches to the subject and subjectivity: Michel Foucault (1926 – 1984) and his theory of the alleged destruction of the subject (the 'self').

1.4.2.3. ethics: the quest for the avoidance of subjectivity (as bias) in research.

1.4.2.4. politics: the existence of political values and goals in research and the demand to disclose these values and goals.

1.4.2.5. academic organization: schools accusing others as being subjective.

1.4.3. From ontology to epistemology.

1.4.3.1. Buddhism (Vasubandhu, fourth century?) and the construction of the object.

1.4.3.2. Scientism (August Comte, Max Weber) and taking the object for granted (the bias of Western scientific method for the object).

1.5. Objectification as social science methodology (the legacy of scientism)

1.5.1. Objectivity and the notion of truth: the methodology of Karl Raimund Popper (1902 – 1994).

1.5.2. Induction versus deduction.

1.5.3. Truth as related to objectifiable referents (within the broader concept of social action).

1.5.4. Theory-testing and the goals of scientific research.

1.5.5. Quantification.

- 1.5.6. Prediction.
- 1.5.7. Universalization and generalization.
- 1.5.8. Social science fieldwork: objectifying society into a target of observation (from the methods of social anthropology, Edward Evan Evans Pritchard (1902 – 1973), to participant observation).
- 1.5.9. Social science schools and the objectivity issue:
 - 1.5.9.1. Marxism, its roots in the nineteenth-century philosophy of science.
 - 1.5.9.2. Realism, its roots in the nineteenth-century philosophy of science.
 - 1.5.9.3. Constructivism, its revolt against the nineteenth-century philosophy of science.
 - 1.5.9.4. Max Weber's notion of society (action-oriented concept, objectivist).
 - 1.5.9.5. Charles Ragin (*The Comparative Method*, 1987)'s critique of objectivism: societies cannot be identified.

1.6. 'Paradigm shifts' in the social sciences

- 1.6.1. The conflictual notion of 'paradigm shift': Thomas Kuhn versus social science practice.
- 1.6.2. Culture and the impact of subjectivity: limiting the general applicability of social science research results.
- 1.6.3. Politics and the limits of objectivity: political bias as an impediment of social science research (the *problematique* of political correctness in social science research).
- 1.6.4. Ethics and the limits of objectivity: the 'dialectics-of-the-Enlightenment' problem.
- 1.6.5. History and the limits of objectivity: the time factor reducing the range of validity of research results (the embedding of research within culture).
- 1.6.5. The tide of 'turns': Linguistic Turn, Performative Turn, Constructive Turn, Visual Turn) and its impact of objectivity.
- 1.6.6. The 'End of the Cold War' syndrome and the predicament of predictivism.
- 1.6.7. Ideology and method: the refutation of Modernization Theory as the ideology of the Kennedy Era.
- 1.6.8. Postmodernism and the breaking-down of disciplinary walls: problems of measuring objectivity across disciplines.

1.7. Implications for method I: approximations to objectivity

- 1.7.1. The practical inevitability of objectivity in Western style social sciences.
- 1.7.2. The 'veto' of the sources: hypotheses, expectations, intuition and the 'facts'.
- 1.7.3. Data as evidence (the ultimate object).
- 1.7.4. Transparency of the research process as the basis for objectivity (problems of the organization of fieldwork as a transparent process).
- 1.7.5. The demand of honesty for the researcher's self.
- 1.7.6. Various disciplinary codes and objectivity:
 - 1.7.6.1. rules of evidence: the problem of classified sources.
 - 1.7.6.2. the practical difficulty of making and enforcing trans-disciplinary rules of evidence.
 - 1.7.6.3. the practical difficulty of facilitating dialogue about objectivity across disciplines.

1.8. Implications for method II: the theoretical inevitability of subjectivity

- 1.8.1. Subjective motivations for research.
- 1.8.2. Intuition as a cognitive instrument.
- 1.8.3. Implications of constructivism for social science methodology.
- 1.8.4. The politics of data generation: the state, statistics and the reliability of quantitative data.
- 1.8.5. The dangers of the political instrumentalization of social science research and the subjectivation of objectivity.

2. Buddhism versus objectivism, 'Being-in-the World' versus Scientism

2.1. Martin Heidegger, Edmund Husserl, the problem of 'being-in-the world' and scientism.

- 2.1.1. The problem of Heidegger's reception of Buddhism.
- 2.1.2. Heidegger (1889 – 1976) responding to the Viennese school: Ludwig Wittgenstein (1890 – 1951)'s positivism in his *Tractatus logico-philosophicus* (1921).
- 2.1.3. Wittgenstein's reformulation of his positions in his Cambridge lectures.
- 2.1.4. Heidegger responding to Max Weber's methodology (Weber's quest for 'de-magification' as the goal of social science research).
- 2.1.5. Karl Raimund Ropper responding to Heidegger.

2.2. Heidegger's concept of 'being-in-the-world'

- 2.2.1. Heidegger's rejection of the model of the 'box' representing the world.
- 2.2.2. Heidegger's notion of 'in-the-world' as the non-locus.
- 2.2.3. The lack of distinguishability between subject and object 'in-the-world'.

2.3. Husserl's rejection of objectivism (as positivism).

- 2.3.1. Edmund Husserl (1859 – 1938)'s rejection of René Descartes (1596 – 1650)'s objectivism.
- 2.3.2. Husserl's claim that Descartes's methodology represented the origin of objectivism in Europe.
- 2.3.3. Husserl's replacement of objectivism through phenomenology.

2.4. Methodology and Politics

- 2.4.1. The necessary distinction between irrationality and the negation of positivism (as subjectivity).
- 2.4.2. Heidegger and Nazism.
- 2.4.3. Interactionism, intersubjectivity versus irrationality.
- 2.4.4. Scientism (positivism) as an ideology of political determinism.
- 2.4.5. Interactionism and the consensus theory of truth.
- 2.4.6. Subjectivity, constructivism and the international system

Part III: Theory and Methods

1. The vicissitudes of words:

1.1. *theoria*.

1.2. *pragma*.

2. Theory and practice

2.1. Cognition and interest: Jürgen Habermas's denial of the necessity of objectivism for the social sciences.

2.2. Practice as the research-guiding interest of the social sciences

2.2.1. Application to and transformation of society as research goals in the social sciences.

2.2.2. The tasks of theory in relation to practice:

2.2.2.1. explanatory theory.

2.2.2.2. predictive theory.

2.2.2.3. definition as the task of theory.

2.2.2.4. descriptive theory.

2.2.2.5. normative theory.

2.2.3. The impact of practice on theory.

2.2.3.1. practice and the empirical.

2.2.3.2. the empirical base of theory.

2.2.3.3. social scientists as observing (objectifying) theorists.

2.2.3.4. induction (David Hume, 1711 – 1776; Franz Boas, 1858 – 1942).

2.2.3.5. deduction (René Descartes, Karl Raimund Popper).

2.3. The logic of theory

2.3.1. The movement from observation to abstraction.

2.3.2. The abstract and generalizing language of theory.

2.3.3. Max Weber's 'pure types' and theory.

2.3.4. The procedure of explanation.

2.3.5. The procedure of prediction.

2.3.6. The procedure of definition.

2.3.7. Theory takes priority over practice: the predicament of the quest for the falsifiability of scientific theory (Karl Raimund Popper).

2.3.8. The rationality of science: the quest for planning research.

2.3.9. Method and the practice of research.

2.3.9.1. the meaning of method.

2.3.9.2. the appropriateness of method in relation to the goal.

- 2.3.9.3. methodology: goal-setting and the choice of method.
- 2.3.10. Determining the 'object':
 - 2.3.10.1. setting the task: stating the 'objective'.
 - 2.3.10.2. avoiding bias: controlling assumptions.
 - 2.3.10.3. assessing relevance: defining purpose for 'practice'.
 - 2.3.10.4. remaining accountable: approaching the 'object'.
 - 2.3.10.5. referencing: research in context.

3. The logic of concepts

3.1. The semantic triangle

3.2. Concepts as intellectual tools

3.3. Comparison as a method of making concepts.

- 3.3.1. The notion of the *tertia comparationis*
- 3.3.2. Determining comparability
- 3.3.3. Generalizing and individualizing comparisons.
- 3.4. Concepts as cultural givens
- 3.5. 'Travelling concepts'.

4. The logic of categories

4.1. The difference between categories and concepts

4.2. Categories as labels

4.3. Comparison as a method of categorization

5. Principles and problems of social science method

5.1. Hypotheses

- 5.1.1. Knowledge assumptions and the research goal.
- 5.1.2. The presentism of the social sciences.
- 5.1.3. Formulating a hypothesis: aspects of the grammar of hypothesizing.
- 5.1.4. Testing hypotheses as an act of theory-testing.
- 5.1.5. The mutual interdependence of data collecting and hypothesizing.
- 5.1.6. Hypothesizing: a self-fulfilling prophecy?

5.2. Research questions

- 5.2.1. The grammar of the research question.
- 5.2.2. Correlations between hypotheses and research questions.

5.2.3. Research questions without hypotheses: history versus the presentism of the social sciences.

5.3. Models

5.3.1. The logic of models: models versus metaphors.

5.3.2. Analytical models versus synthetic models.

5.3.3. Simple versus complex models.

5.4. Approaches

5.4.1. Taking a position on good reason.

5.4.2. Choosing an appropriate method or set of methods.

5.4.3. Approaches and the logic of paradigms.

5.5. Some problems of methodology.

5.5.1. The problem of tacit assumptions.

5.5.2. The problem of determining 'progress' of research:

5.5.2.1. Max Weber and the necessity for scientific research work to become outdated (through subsequent research).

5.5.2.2. Jürgen Habermas's premise about changes of practice as recognition-guiding interest.

5.5.3. The questionable rationality of the 'progress' of research.

5.5.3.1. Max Weber's argument of the fall of ideas (when they please to fall).

5.5.3.2. Karl Raimund Popper's demand that research should be conducted rationally.

5.5.4. The problem of unbiased research and the issue of religion: Max Weber's 'de-magification' and the questionable rationality of Max Weber's views on magic (specifically in relation to his views on Asia).

5.5.5. The *problematique* of fieldwork

5.5.5.1. practical limitations of avoiding endogeneity.

5.5.5.2. the false claim of objectifying society: who observes whom?

5.5.5.3. the hermeneutic circle, cultural bias and the false claim for the 'objectivity' of fieldwork.

5.5.6. The problem of the use of intuition in a rationally constructed research process.

5.5.7. The problem of statistics:

5.5.7.1. the origin of statistical data, their distortedness and dependence on politics.

5.5.7.2. population data as a case.

5.5.7.3. data framing the 'object'.

5.5.8. The problem of 'paradigm shifts' and the devalidation of social science research results through changing approaches.

5.5.9. The onslaught of the past: historicizing the social sciences:

5.5.9.1. Extending the time frame for social science research.

5.5.9.2. Reducing presentism.

5.5.9.3. Challenging social science method.

5.5.10. The onslaught of constructivism: the politics of the 'world of our making' (Nicholas Greenwood Onuf, *World of Our Making*, 1989).

Part IV: Explanation versus Understanding: The Problem of Causality

1. The theory of explanation

1.1. Various concepts of causality

- 1.1.1. The sciences: causality as energy flow.
- 1.1.2. The humanities: describing links across time
- 1.1.3. The social sciences: ascertaining reasons.

1.2. Nomothetic versus ideographic sciences and the concept of hermeneutics

- 1.2.1. Grouping scientific inquiries through the philosophy of science.
- 1.2.2. Natural versus social sciences.
- 1.2.3. Natural sciences versus the humanities.
- 1.2.4. Sciences as non-hermeneutic types of inquiry: Thomas Kuhn.
- 1.2.5. Social sciences and humanities as hermeneutic types of inquiry
 - 1.2.5.1. Max Weber's notion of the *Verstehende Soziologie* (1913): ascertaining 'qualitative evidence' for a 'form of behaviour' against identifying 'reason' for that behavior (= explanation)
 - 1.2.5.2. the hermeneutic and culturalist onslaught on the social sciences: John Comaroff (1945- ;) and Jean Comaroff (1946-), *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination*, 1992, Michael Mann (1942- ; *The Sources of Social Power*, vol.1, 1986, Immanuel Wallerstein (1930- ; *The Modern Capitalist World System*, vol. 1, 1974).
 - 1.2.5.3. critical doubts about the value of statistical data 'as ultimate facts'
 - 1.2.5.4. critique of predictivism.
 - 1.2.5.5. hermeneutics and constructivism.
 - 1.2.5.6. hermeneutics and culturalism.
 - 1.2.5.7. the hermeneutic circle.

1.3. Philosophy-of-science approaches to causality

- 1.3.1. The postulates of the generality and of the rationality of the notion of science.
- 1.3.2. Positivism:
 - 1.3.2.1. the Karl Raimund Popper / Carl Gustav Hempel (1905 – 1997)'s theory of explanation
 - 1.3.2.2. general laws.
 - 1.3.2.3. *explanans* versus *explanandum*
 - 1.3.2.4. general laws as hypotheses.
 - 1.3.2.5. reason as the link between cause and effect.
- 1.3.3. Narrativism:
 - 1.3.3.1. Arthur Coleman Danto (1924- ; *Analytical Philosophy of History*, 1965)'s theory of explanation.
 - 1.3.3.2. the logic of the story.
 - 1.3.3.3. narration as causality.

2. *Verstehen* (understanding) versus explanation

2.1. The logic of empiricism

2.1.1. Some empiricists (e.g. Ernst Bernheim, 1850 – 1942): *verstehen* is explanation:

2.1.1.1. establishing links across time.

2.1.1.2. identifying 'greatness'.

2.1.1.3. ascertaining 'historical impact'.

2.1.2. The conceptual history of hermeneutics

2.1.2.1. the classical period (up to c. 1800): the art of reading and interpreting texts in

2.1.2.1.1. theology.

2.1.2.1.2. law.

2.1.2.2. the modern period (since c. 1800): the philosophical (methodological) inquiry into *verstehen* (Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher, 1768 – 1834; Hans-Georg Gadamer, 1900 – 2002).

2.1.3. *Verstehen* as a science: the evolution of history as an academic field of inquiry in the nineteenth century: Johann Gustav Droysen (1808 – 1884).

2.1.3.1. collecting sources.

2.1.3.2. critically editing sources.

2.1.3.3. critically evaluating sources.

2.1.4. *Verstehen* and the social sciences: Max Weber.

2.1.5. Norm and deviation

2.1.5.1. Emile Durkheim (1858 – 1917)'s definition of the pathological

2.1.5.2. the objectivist legacy and Durkheim.

2.2. From interpretation to explanation

2.2.1. Description: collecting data, the researcher as the observer.

2.2.2. Interpretation: arranging data, the researcher being the choreographer.

2.2.3. Explanation: synthesizing data, the researcher being the director.

3. Two types of research questions

3.1. Why-questions: seeking to ascertain reasons.

3.2. How-come-questions: seeking to ascertain links across time.

3.3. The methodologies of answering both types of questions

3.3.1. Controlling the hermeneutic circle:

3.3.1.1. establishing the context for questions.

3.3.1.2. stating the research purpose.

3.3.2. selecting research tools.

3.3.3. collecting data.

3.3.4. interpreting data.

3.3.5. explaining data.

3.3.6. the lack of compatibility between why-questions and how-come-answers.

3.4. Linking research questions to hypotheses

3.5. Explanation and ideology: ‘*quod-erat-demonstrandum*’ as the fallacy of the self-fulfilling prophecy.

Section B: Descriptions and Analyses

Part I:

Normativity versus the Use of Force

1. A short survey of the history of international relations theories

1.1. Functionalism: acceptance of norms and preference given to law

1.1.1. Classical functionalism

1.1.2. Neofunctionalism

1.1.3. Neoliberal institutionalism

1.2. Realism: toleration of norms and preference given to power

1.2.1. Classical realism

1.2.2. Neorealism

1.2.3. Realist responses to constructivism

1.3. Constructivism and culturalism: making of norms as policy and preference given to specific patterns of behaviour

1.3.1. Hermeneutics and constructivism

1.3.2. Postmodernism and constructivism

1.3.3. Construction or deconstruction

1.3.4. Culturalism in anthropology

1.3.5. Culturalism and the social sciences

2. The concept of the international system

2.1. The history of the concept of the international system

2.1.1. Mechanicism and the definition of the system

2.1.2. Biologism and the definition of the system

2.1.3. From biology to politics: the making of the concept of the global international system in nineteenth century Europe

2.1.4. Institutions as definitional elements of the global international system

2.1.5. Norms as the definitional element of the global international system

2.2. The locus of the international system

2.2.1. The international system of an objective reality (assumption enshrined in realism and functionalism)

2.2.2. The international system as being-in-the-world (assumption enshrined in constructivism)

3. The theory of norms (in contradistinction to normative theory)

3.1. The theory of norms (in contradistinction to normative theory)

3.1.1. Norms as patterns of behaviour

3.1.1.1. The concept of patterns of behaviour

3.1.1.1.1. norms as factors restricting the possibilities of choice between various patterns of behaviour

3.1.1.1.2. how and why do we adopt patterns of behavior?

3.1.1.1.2.1. by force

3.1.1.1.2.2. voluntarily

3.1.1.1.3. types of norms

3.1.1.1.3.1. legal norms

3.1.1.1.3.2. ethical norms

3.1.1.1.4. Categories of norms:

3.1.1.1.4.1. laws

3.1.1.1.4.2. rules

3.1.2. The origins of norms

3.1.2.1. norms as givens (natural law, human rights)

3.1.2.2. statutory norms

3.1.2.3. norms following from free agreement

3.1.2.4. customary norms

3.1.3. norms as institutions (for example marriage, succession, rules of diplomacy, *ius in bello*)

3.1.4. norms and institutions

3.1.4.1. institutions that create norms

3.1.4.2. institutions that impose norms

3.1.4.3. norms required for the establishment of institutions

3.1.5. the perception of differences between norms related to domestic institutions and norms related to international institutions (as well as to international relations beyond the activities of public institutions)

3.1.3. Change of norms

3.1.3.1. change of patterns of behaviour preceding change of norms

3.1.3.2. change of social contexts leading to change of norms

3.1.3.3. endogeneity versus exogeneity: the identification of factors of change within and beyond groups

3.1.3.4. law against politics: the choice of procedures to implement change

3.1.3.4.1. the logic of due process

3.1.3.4.2. the logic of the use of force

3.1.3.4.3. the logic of revolution

3.1.3.5. intention as ex-ante rationalisation of norm change: *de lege ferenda*

3.1.3.6. causality as ex-post rationalisation of norm change: *de lege lata*

3.1.4. Norms versus regimes: types of the limitation of the choice of patterns of

behaviour

- 3.1.4.1. Non-normative factors of the limitation of the choice of patterns of behaviour
 - 3.1.4.1.1. customs and habits (traditions)
 - 3.1.4.1.2. expectations (status)
 - 3.1.4.1.3. age, health (stability and its perception)
 - 3.1.4.1.4. income (wealth and its perception)
 - 3.1.4.1.5. access to resources (power and its perception)
- 3.1.4.2. the significance of non-normative factors limiting the choice of patterns of behavior in international relations
- 3.1.5. norms in international relations
 - 3.1.5.1. the significance of legal norms in international relations
 - 3.1.5.2. the significance of ethical norms in international relations
- 3.1.6. regimes again
 - 3.1.6.1. the definition of regimes according to Stephen D. Krasner (*Sovereignty, Organized Hypocrisy*, 1999), p. 7: „a set of explicit or implicit principles, norms, rules and decision-making procedures around which actor expectations converge in a given issue area“)
 - 3.1.6.2. regimes and deviation (Robert O. Keohane (*After Hegemony*, 1984): regimes articulate rules for deviation)

3.2. The enforceability of norms in international relations

- 3.2.1. enforceability in the legal sense
 - 3.2.1.1. lack of institutionality of international relations
 - 3.2.1.2. voluntariness of the acceptance of legal arbitration
 - 3.2.1.3. voluntariness of the conclusion of treaties
 - 3.2.1.4. the debate about the „basic norm“ *Pacta sunt servanda*
 - 3.2.1.5. the *Clausula de rebus sic stantibus* and the enforceability of norms
- 3.2.2. Political and military enforceability
 - 3.2.2.1. states as institutions for the enforceability of norms through
 - 3.2.2.1.1. diplomacy
 - 3.2.2.1.2. war
 - 3.2.2.2. the United Nations Organization and the enforceability of norms through
 - 3.2.2.2.1. PKO
 - 3.2.2.2.2. PEO
- 3.2.3. moral enforceability
 - 3.2.3.1. economic sanctions
 - 3.2.3.2. the rogue state syndrome

3.3. Constructivism and norms in international relations

- 3.3.1. Survey of the history of constructivism

- 3.3.1.1. Justus Lipsius (1547 – 1606)
- 3.3.1.2. Hans Joachim Morgenthau (1904 – 1980)
- 3.3.1.3. Nicholas Greenwood Onuf (*World of Our Making*, 1989)
- 3.3.1.4. regimes as social constructs?
- 3.3.2. The politics of normification
 - 3.3.2.1. The setting of agenda at international conferences
 - 3.3.2.2. The capability of defining norms
 - 3.3.2.3. Normification and the perception of political and military power

4. The use of force

4.1. The conceptual history of power

- 4.1.1. power as personal gift (Francesco Guicciardini, 1483 – 1540)
- 4.1.2. power as an element of institutions (Alberico Gentili, 1552 – 1608)
- 4.1.3. the equation of power with institutional assets (nineteenth-century political theory)
 - 4.1.3.1. Karl Ludwig von Haller (1768 – 1854), *Restauration der Staatswissenschaft* (1821)
 - 4.1.3.2. Karl Heinrich Ludwig Pölitz (1772 – 1838), *Die Staatswissenschaften im Lichte unsere Zeit* (1827-1828)
 - 4.1.3.3. Heinrich von Treitschke (1834 – 1896), *Politik* (1859)
- 4.1.4. Power as the expectation to be able to impose one's own will upon others (Max Weber)
 - 4.1.4.1. lack of absolute power
 - 4.1.4.2. the relational character of Weber's concept of power (power over whom?)
 - 4.1.4.3. the intentional character of Weber's concept of power (power to do what?)
- 4.1.5. Relational Power (Harold Dwight Lasswell, 1902 – 1978; *Politics. Who Gets What, When, How*, 1935; Morton A. Kaplan (1921-), *System and Process in International Politics*, 1957)
- 4.1.6. Soft Power (Joseph Samuel Nye, 1937- ; *Bound to Lead*, 1990; *Soft Power*, 2004)
- 4.1.7. Social Power (Michael Mann, *The Sources of Social Power*, 1986 [political, military, ideological, economic sources of power]; Robert W. Cox, 'Social Forces, States and World Orders', 1981 [social groups as power holders])

4.2. Power holders in international relations

- 4.2.1. international institutions and organisations
 - 4.2.1.1. the United Nations
 - 4.2.1.2. other international public organizations and institutions:
 - 4.2.1.2.1. the World Bank (since 1944)
 - 4.2.1.2.2. the International Monetary Fund (since 1944)
 - 4.2.1.2.3. the International Committee of the Red Cross (since 1863)
 - 4.2.1.2.4. the Universal Postal Union (since 1878)
 - 4.2.1.2.5. the International Organization of Migration (since 1951)

- 4.2.1.3. transnational institutions and groups
- 4.2.1.4. institutions of civil society
- 4.2.1.5. religious institutions and groups
- 4.2.1.6. the governments of sovereign states
- 4.2.1.7. institutions of governance within states
- 4.2.1.8. regional institutions
- 4.2.1.9. transgovernmental groups and institutions

4.3. Instruments for the measurement of power

- 4.3.1. conventional approaches
 - 4.3.1.7. state-controlled instruments of power
 - 4.3.1.7.1. territory
 - 4.3.1.7.2. population
 - 4.3.1.7.3. military means
 - 4.3.1.7.4. access to mineral resources
 - 4.3.1.7.5. economic achievements
- 4.3.2. the constructivist criticism of the conventional approaches
- 4.3.3. David A. Baldwin [in *Handbook of International Relations*, edited by Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A. Simmons (London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage, 2002), p. 173]'s categories of the measurement of power
 - 4.3.3.7. scope: the aspect of actor behaviour in a given situation
 - 4.3.3.8. domain: the number of secondary actors under the control of a power holder
 - 4.3.3.9. weight: the likelihood that the decision of the power holder entails consequences
- 4.3.4. indirect measurements of power
 - 4.3.4.7. the capability of determining the agenda
 - 4.3.4.8. the size of diplomatic services
 - 4.3.4.9. success in intermediations
- 4.3.5. the politics of determining the criteria for the measurement of power

4.4. Political decision-making between the implementation of norms and the use of power

- 4.4.1. theories of legally binding and legally non-binding obligations
- 4.4.2. the legal need of the implementation of norms and the commitment to legally binding obligations
- 4.4.3. the political need to implement legally non-binding obligations
- 4.4.4. politics of norm-breaking and its ascertainment
- 4.4.5. politics of breaches of treaties and their ascertainment
- 4.4.6. the logic of the 'scrap of paper': good reputation and the freedom of decision-making of governments of sovereign states

4.4.7. the problematique of the handling of unjust norms and the right of resistance

4.5. The balance of power

4.5.1. conceptual history of the balance of power and of the change of models of balance

4.5.1.7. the scales model

4.5.1.8. the machine model (static balance)

4.5.1.9. the model of the living body (dynamic balance)

4.5.2. rules of the balance of power

4.5.2.7. Emerich de Vattel (1714 – 1767) (*Le droit des gens*, 1758)

4.5.2.8. Morton A. Kaplan (1921-, *System and Process in International Politics*, 1957)

4.5.3. the balance of power as political propaganda

4.5.4. realism and the balance of power (Henry Alfred Kissinger, 1923- ; *A World Restored. Metternich, Castlereagh and the Problems of Peace. 1812 – 1822*, Ph.D. Diss., Harvard University, 1954; first published Boston, 1957)

4.5.5. the contested normativity of the balance of power

4.6. The concept of power politics

4.6.1. „Machiavellism“

4.6.2. Models of power politics

4.6.2.7. brute force: the law of the fist

4.6.2.8. the jungle

4.6.2.9. the state of nature

4.6.3. theorists of politics and the necessity of limiting power

4.6.3.7. Thomas Hobbes (1588 – 1679, specifically his *The Elements of Law*, 1650, *De corpore politico*, 1650, *Leviathan*, 1651)

4.6.3.8. Woodrow Wilson (1856 – 1924; specifically his address to Congress on 8. 1. 1918)

4.6.3.9. David Mitrany (1888 – 1975; specifically his *The Progress of International Government*, 1933, *A Working Peace System*, 1943, *The Functional Theory of Politics*, 1975)

5. Theories of the transformation of power

5.2. The quest for stability versus the perception of changing power relations

5.3. Arguments with power transition in the context of realism: Abramo F. K. Organski (*World Politics*, 1958; Organski und Jacek Kugler, *The War Ledger*, 1980) Power Transition Theory (the relative decline of power produces instability in the international system)

5.4. Arguments about hegemons and challengers in the context of realism: George

Modelskis (*Long Cycles in World Politics*, 1987) theory of global war (the economic, political and military costs of maintaining global leadership positions and the cycle of hegemony)

6. Diplomacy and war

6.2. The concept of patterns of behaviour

- 6.2.1. they are sequences of frequently recurrent actions that are not legally binding but can be enforced through legal instruments
- 6.2.2. they are distinct from habits and customs, traditions and rituals: present sociology connotes these concepts negatively and categorises them in proximity to the realm of the irrational
- 6.2.3. differences between patterns of behavior and legally binding norms: patterns of behaviour are neither legally nor morally enforceable but can be transformed into norms
- 6.2.4. patterns of behaviour are indicators of systemic structures
- 6.2.5. the change of patterns of behaviour points towards social change if the change of patterns of behaviour takes place within groups

6.3. Patterns of behaviour as a core indicator of the international system

6.4. Diplomacy and war as essential patterns of behaviour in relations between states

6.5. Diplomatic patterns of behaviour

- 6.5.1. the conventionalism of diplomatic practice
 - 6.5.1.7. the prioritisation of rank, status, precedence, formalism as elements of diplomatic practice
 - 6.5.1.8. the pluralism of rule-based, even legally regulated patterns of behavior
 - 6.5.1.9. the significance of honour in daily communication as well as in conflicts
 - 6.5.1.10. high significance of legal norms
 - 6.5.1.11. high sanctions against breaches of legal norms
- 6.5.2. transformations of conventions of diplomatic practice, specifically during the twentieth century
 - 6.5.2.7. change of the composition of the diplomatic Corps
 - 6.5.2.8. increase of the number of sovereign states with the entailing consequence of the increase of the number of diplomatic representations

6.6. Military patterns of behaviour

- 6.6.1. Conventional military theory and military patterns of behaviour
 - 6.6.1.7. the definition of war as the revocation of all legal commitments
 - 6.6.1.8. giving preference to factual actions in war (for example, in the course of

battle) over theories

- 6.6.1.9. categorising war as a rule-free sequence of antagonistic actions
- 6.6.2. theories about the context of war
 - 6.6.2.7. wars end and are being replaced by statutes of peace
 - 6.6.2.8. statutes of peace through peace treaties require norms of which some may even be observed under the conditions of preparations of war (for example, *ius ad bellum*)
 - 6.6.2.9. war can follow culturally specific norms
 - 6.6.2.10. the norms of the conduct of war change over time
 - 6.6.2.11. the problematique of the observation of norms and the application of patterns of behaviour under conditions of war

Part II: The Quest for Stability (Status quo) in Early Modern Europe as a Heuristical Problem and as a Research Controversy

1. Two perspectives on Early Modern Europe

- 1.1. The dynamic perspective
 - 1.1.1. observing the readiness to go to war for short-term gains (Johannes Burckhardt, 'Die Friedlosigkeit der Frühen Neuzeit, in *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* 24 (1997), pp. 509-574)
 - 1.1.1.1. the legitimacy deficit
 - 1.1.1.2. the institutionality deficit
 - 1.1.1.3. the equality deficit
 - 1.1.2. observing the readiness to apply diplomatic tactics for short-term gains (Paul W. Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, 1994)
 - 1.1.3. specific observations
 - 1.1.3.1. the increase of the numerical strength of armed forces, specifically the so-called „Standing Armies“
 - 1.1.3.2. the increase of the employment of diplomatic staff
 - 1.1.3.3. the bad reputation of warriors and diplomats in the general literature beyond specialized treatises on war and diplomacy
 - 1.1.3.4. contemporary criticism of the practices of the conduct of war (Jacques Callot, ca 1592 - 1635)
 - 1.1.3.5. contemporary criticism of the practice of diplomacy (Jean Bodin, 1530 - 1596)
 - 1.1.4. evaluations: lack of considerateness and egotism of political decision-making as criticisms of contemporaries and as a research perspective
 - 1.1.5. evaluations: lack of recognition of limits of war-making as a criticism of contemporaries and as a research perspective
- 1.2. The static perspective
 - 1.2.1. observing the willingness to hedge war
 - 1.2.2. observing the willingness to regulate the doings of diplomats
 - 1.2.3. research about efficient political control through printed international news media
 - 1.2.4. the phenomenon of „Reasoning“ specifically among the farming population and the problem of the making of the concept of “Absolutism“
 - 1.2.5. descriptions of the rule of law (Hugo Grotius, 1583 – 1645, specifically his *De iure belli ac pacis libri tres*, first published 1625)
 - 1.2.6. descriptions of the frequency of the conclusion of treaties (Christian Gottfried Hoffmann, 1692 – 1735, specifically his sketch *Entwurf einer Einleitung zu dem Erkänntniß des gegenwärtigen Zustands von Europa*, 1720)

- 1.2.7. the literary genre of programs for perpetual peace as a contemporary expression of theories about international relations
- 1.2.8. the deployment of armed forces to the end of maintaining public order
- 1.2.9. the role of armed forces as means for the strengthening of central government power

2. What is stability?

- 2.1. The word
 - 2.1.1. The Latin root *stare*
 - 2.1.2. *Stabilitas* versus movement in the perception of antique and early modern philosophers
 - 2.1.3. continuity as stability: patterns of name-giving in the kin groups: the Henrys and the Conrads, Hinz and Kunz
 - 2.1.4. derivations I: *Status, Staat, Stand, state, estate, stato, état, estado,*
 - 2.1.5. the stability of the world as a philosophical paradigm
 - 2.1.6. derivations II: statistics
 - 2.1.7. the stability of the world of states as a political paradigm
 - 2.1.8. symmetries in architecture
 - 2.1.9. aesthetics and stability: evenness as beauty
 - 2.1.10. trade without change: regulated trade (guilds, trading companies, trading privileges) and the “well-ordered republic”
- 2.2. The difference between stability and the absence of change
 - 2.2.1. on the perspective of „hot“ and „cold“ „societies“ (Claude Lévi-Strauss. 1908 -)
 - 2.2.2. change of „cold“ into „hot“ „societies“ as an expression of cultural change
 - 2.2.3. recorded stability as a contemporary measure of continuity in view of retrospectively ascertainable change
 - 2.2.4. change without impact on the system as a perceived manifestation of the stability of the system (on record for the period between the beginning of the sixteenth and the end of the eighteenth centuries)
 - 2.2.5. change with impact on the system as a record of systems change (on record for the period around 1800)
- 2.3. Perceptions of change versus recorded material change
 - 2.3.1. the distinction between perception of change and recorded material change
 - 2.3.2. the perception of change without recorded material change
 - 2.3.3. the perception of change with recorded material change
 - 2.3.4. material change with perceptions of change
 - 2.3.5. continuity without perceptions of change

3. The perception of diplomacy and war as factors of change

- 3.1. The sequence of war, peace and again war (the paradigm of the so-called „Inter-War Period“)
 - 3.1.1. the military theory of Carl von Clausewitz (1780 – 1831)
 - 3.1.2. positions of military historiography of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries on Early Modern warfare
 - 3.1.2.1. the dogma of the battle of annihilation
 - 3.1.2.2. the strategy controversy around Hans Delbrück (1848 – 1929)
 - 3.1.2.3. Geoffrey Parker (*The Military Revolution*, 1988)
 - 3.1.3. Positions of diplomatic historiography of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries on the conduct of international relations during the Early Modern period
 - 3.1.3.1. Johannes von Müller (1752 – 1809): history as a laboratory of change
 - 3.1.3.2. Leopold von Ranke (1796 – 1886) and the discovery of Venetian diplomatic correspondence for historical analysis (1830)
 - 3.1.3.3. Alan John Perceval Taylor (1906 – 1990)
 - 3.1.3.4. Paul W. Schroeder on the eighteenth century
- 3.2. Contemporary perceptions
 - 3.2.1. the sequence of peace, war and peace again
 - 3.2.2. the perception of theories of perpetual peace as theories of real politics
 - 3.2.3. war deductions as elements of the legitimation of war in the tradition of theories of just war
 - 3.2.4. new military and diplomatic history
 - 3.2.4.1. Jeremy Martin Black (*A Military Revolution?*, 1991)
 - 3.2.4.2. Christoph Kampmann (*Arbiter und Friedensstiftung. Die Auseinandersetzung um den politischen Schiedsrichter im Europa der Frühen Neuzeit*, 2001)
 - 3.2.5. Rules for diplomats
 - 3.2.5.1. Alberico Gentili, 1552 – 1608)
 - 3.2.5.2. Abraham de Wicquefort (1606 – 1767)
- 3.3. The search for stability as the hallmark of Early Modern Europe

Part III: Description: Cases of Diplomatic Practice

1. The problem of the origin of diplomatic service

- 1.1. Diplomats as special emissaries and as residents
- 1.2. Diplomatic networks and commercial as well as status-maintaining interests of diplomats
- 1.3. The emergence of regular correspondence around 1500
- 1.4. The beginning of consistent keeping of diplomatic records around 1500 (Florence, Venice, France, Spain)
- 1.5. The establishment of special postal services for diplomatic messages through special carriers (the Gonzaga Duke of Mantua demanding such services at the end of the fifteenth century) and the beginning of cryptography in the early sixteenth century:
 - 1.5.1. Johannes Trithem, Abbot of Sponheim, *Polygraphiae libri sex* (Basle: Haselberg, 1518) [written in 1502]
 - 1.5.2. Giovanni Battista della Porta, *De furtivis litterarum notis, vulgo De ziferis, libri III* (Naples: Scotto, 1563)
 - 1.5.3. Blaise de Vigenere, *Traicté des chiffres* (Paris: Angelier, 1586)
 - 1.5.4. code-making and code-cracking as special foreign-policy skills: the early codes were rather simple and thus had to be changed quickly; Antoine Rossignol devised a code (the *Grand Chiffre*) in France around the middle of the seventeenth century, which was not cracked until the 1870s, mainly because the French Foreign Office lost the key
 - 1.5.5. high skills of secretly opening diplomatic correspondence and closing it again developing in England around the 1650s, the *Cabinet Noir* operating in France to intercept diplomatic correspondence
- 1.6. The special role of Venice in European politics c. 1500: long diplomatic reporting, the reports being consistently preserved since 1425 (the *Relazioni al Senato*)
- 1.7. The sluggish emergence of diplomatic immunity:
 - 1.7.1. early cases of imprisonment:
 - 1.7.1.1. Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle (1517 – 1586), ambassador of Emperor Charles V in France, being arrested in 1528 for having angered King Francis I of France
 - 1.7.1.2. strong reactions against participation of diplomats in plots against their host governments: the Spanish ambassador in London being arrested for having joined plots against Queen Elizabeth I in 1569 and again in 1572; the English ambassador in France being arrested for having intrigued with the Huguenots against the French government in 1563
 - 1.7.2. emerging standards for qualifications of ambassadors: knowledge in history and

Roman Law, eloquence, including fluency in Latin as well as the language of the host country, hospitable, capable of keeping a large household; however, opinions were divided over the question whether diplomats should be honest

- 1.7.3. payment for diplomats disorganized and irregular throughout the fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, some governments (e. g. of England) having the habit of paying non-resident diplomats being dispatched by other governments, at least for a certain period of time; some regularity only for the papal nuncios during the reign of Pope Gregory XIII (1572 – 1585); the Dutch Republic forbade its diplomats to receive gifts from host rulers in 1651, Sweden followed in 1692; elsewhere the habit of giving gifts to departing diplomats continued to the end of the eighteenth century, in consequence of poor payment for diplomats
- 1.8. Case study of Vincenzo Quirini (c. 1479 – 1514)
- 1.9. Types of relations between rulers and the change of these types:
 - 1.9.1. ambassadors sent out by rulers, city councils, higher ranking aristocrats during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries
 - 1.9.2. the prerogative to send and receive diplomatic envoys of all ranks becomes the privilege of sovereigns during the seventeenth century and remains so, with the exception of the long-distance trading companies that obtain privileges to dispatch their own diplomats to states outside Europe
 - 1.9.3. ad hoc meetings
 - 1.9.4. planned and arranged conference: the Westphalia peace conference as a model
 - 1.9.5. structural relations (for example the triumvirate of rulers of Emperor Charles V, 1500 – 1558, reigned as Emperor 1519 – 1556, as King of Spain 1517 – 1555, as Duke of Burgundy 1506 – 1555, King Francis I of France, 1494 – 1547, reigned 1515 – 1547, and King Henry VIII of England, 1491 – 1547, reigned 1509 – 1547, in the sixteenth century)
- 1.10. The factor of distance: where do diplomats travel most frequently?
- 1.11. The boundaries of the continent of Europe c. 1500: where was the European international system?
- 1.12. The problem of religion: was diplomatic action religiously neutral?
- 1.13. Did diplomats act as mouthpieces of their rulers or independently?
- 1.14. Relations within and beyond the European international system: the Ottoman Turkish Empire and the Russian Empire as a problem of diplomacy
- 1.15. The conquest of America and the shaping of overseas relations
- 1.16. From inland lake to open sea: Changing perceptions of water

2. Geography, politics and the role of diplomats

- 2.1. The world picture and positioning the diplomats (the emerging opposition between the Old and the New World)
- 2.2. The concept of the border (linear border) and the emergence of the political

distinction between inside and outside

2.3. Diplomats as travellers and apodemics

3. Bureaucratisation, territorialisation and the professionalisation of diplomacy

3.1. Mercurino Arborio, Marchese di Gattinara (1465 – 1530)

3.2. Cardinal Thomas Wolsey (c. 1470 – 1530)

3.3. Special secretaries employed for the handling of foreign affairs in France under King Henry II (1547 – 1559), in England at the beginning of the sixteenth century

3.4. French diplomacy and the establishment of a foreign policy bureaucracy under Louis XIV (expanding a foreign ministry under Jean Baptiste Colbert, Marquis de Torcy, 1698 – 1715; twentyfold increase in the foreign policy staff and specialisation between 1661 and 1715; the genesis of a foreign policy authority through the amalgamation of the offices of two Secretaries of State for foreign affairs in the United Kingdom, 1782); however, the earliest established foreign policy office was established in Russia in 1549, the *Posolskii Prikaz*, which was headed by bureaucrats, not aristocrats, the number of its employees rose from 120 in 1718 to 261 in 1762; new foreign policy secretariats established in Spain in 1715 and at Vienna for the imperial administration in the mid eighteenth century

3.5. Short-lived institutions for the training of diplomats:

3.5.1. the school for diplomats in the Vatican, established in 1701

3.5.2. the Political Academy as the French school for diplomats (1712 – 1720)

3.5.3. the *Séminaire d'Ambassadeurs*, the Prussian school for secretaries to diplomatic missions (1747 – 1756)

3.5.4. a professorship for Arabic established at Oxford in 1699 to train diplomats

3.5.5. the Imperial school for junior diplomats in charge of relations with the Ottoman Turkish Empire, since 1754 at the Oriental Academy in Vienna

3.5.6. the academy for diplomats at Hanau, 1749

3.6. Changes of terms for diplomatic offices

3.6.1. various titles given ad hoc

3.6.2. the emergence of the technical term *Ambassadeur* as a term for a high-ranking diplomatic office early in the eighteenth century

3.6.3. the low number of „ambassadors“ in the eighteenth century (the British King dispatched 69 „Ambassadors“ between 1689 and 1789)

4. Breaking taboos and the conventions of diplomacy

4.1. Change of what was defined as a taboo in diplomatic practice

4.2. French-Turkish relations c. 1536

4.3. The Prague king-makers of 1618 and the Thirty Years War

4.4. King William III of Great Britain in 1701, the Balance of Power and the War of the Spanish Succession

4.5. The so-called Diplomatic Revolution of 1756

- 4.6. Benjamin Franklin (1706 – 1790) and American diplomacy in the period up to the French Revolution (ambassador in France, 1776 – 1785, American-Prussian treaty of 1785)

5. Some diplomats and foreign policy makers

- 5.1. Ewald Friedrich Graf von Hertzberg (1725 – 1795)
- 5.2. Charles Gravier Comte de Vergennes (1730 – 1798)
- 5.3. Wenzel Anton von Kaunitz-Rietberg (1711 – 1794)
- 5.4. The Elder William Pitt, 1st Earl of Chatham (1708 – 1778, Secretary of State during the Seven Years War, 1757 – 1761)
- 5.5. Cardinal Armand Jean du Plessis, Duc de Richelieu (1585 – 1642)
- 5.6. Cardinal Jules Mazarin (1602 – 1661)
- 5.7. Sigismund von Herberstein (1486 – 1566)
- 5.8. Fieldmarshal Friedrich Heinrich von Seckendorff (1673 – 1763)
- 5.9. Etienne François Duc de Choiseul (1719 – 1785)
- 5.10. Cardinal François Joachim de Pierre de Bernis (1715 – 1794)

6. Some diplomatic crises

- 6.1. Changes of the definition of the diplomatic crisis
- 6.2. 1525/26: the imprisonment of King Francis I of France
- 6.3. 1584: the murder of William the Silent at Arnheim
- 6.4. 1587: the execution of Mary Stuart
- 6.5. 1634: the murder of Albrecht von Wallenstein
- 6.6. 1649: the execution of King Charles I of Great Britain
- 6.7. 1689: the expulsion of King James II and the Glorious Revolution in Great Britain
- 6.8. 1700: the death of King Charles II of Spain
- 6.9. 1704: the first Polish succession crisis
- 6.10. 1740: the Habsburg succession crisis
- 6.11. 1779: the Bavarian succession crisis

7. Making peace: the main task of diplomats

- 7.1. The multilateral peace treaty of 1518
- 7.2. The peace of Madrid 1526
- 7.3. The peace of Cateau-Cambrésis 1559: Elizabeth I of England and Henry II of France, Henry II and Philipp II of Spain; restitution of Italian territories to the King of Spain; France obtains control over Calais
- 7.4. The peace of Prague 1635: the Emperor and the Catholic League and the Elector of Saxony, on terminating the war of the Imperial Estates against the Emperor; the suspension of the unilateral Imperial Act of Restitution of 1629 on the reformation of confessional territorial control in the Empire, acceptance of the normal year 1627
- 7.5. The Peace of Westphalia 1648

- 7.6. The peace of Rijkswijk 1697: confirmation of the changes of the distribution of confessional territories in favour of the Catholic side since the policy of expansion under Louis XIV
- 7.7. The Utrecht peace treaties 1713, ending the War of the Spanish Succession
- 7.8. The peace treaties of Rastatt und Baden 1714, ending the War of the Spanish Succession
- 7.9. The peace of Aix-la-Chapelle 1748: terminating the War of the Austrian Succession through the general recognition of the Pragmatic Sanction. Main actors: the Emperor, the King of France, the King of Great Britain
- 7.10. The peace treaties of Hubertusburg, ending the Seven Years War, and Paris, ending the British-French War over America and India, 1763
- 7.11. The peace of Teschen 1779, ending the War of the Bavarian Succession

8. Trade relations and diplomacy

- 8.1. Russia – Iran
- 8.2. Russia – China
- 8.3. France – Siam
- 8.4. The long-distance trading companies
- 8.5. The problem of the Trans-Atlantic slave trade

9. Alliances

- 9.1. France – Ottoman Turkish Empire
- 9.2. The Union of 1608
- 9.3. The League of 1608
- 9.4. The Confederation of 1618
- 9.5. The Quadruple Alliance of 1718
- 9.6. The League of the Princes of 1785

10. Changes

- 10.1. Turning diplomats into civil servants and the rise of corruption indictments
- 10.2. The transformations of rulers into representatives of states
- 10.3. Transpersonalisation and secularisation as a hallmark of the Early Modern period
- 10.4. Diplomacy / diplomatic practice and the globalization of the European international system in the course of the nineteenth century
- 10.5. The concurrent globalization of European international law
- 10.6. The concurrent globalization of European rules of free trade

Part IV: Description: Cases of the Conduct of War

1. Two major problems of military organisation: the choice between militiamen and professional warriors and the limitation of the war-making capability

- 1.1. Handling the medieval legacy: the separation of cavalry from infantry in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries
 - 1.1.1. the manifestation of social distinction in the creation of armies
 - 1.1.2. tactical considerations in the shaping of military organisation
 - 1.1.3. political aspects of military organisation
 - 1.1.3.1. theorists of militia organisation: the 'defence of the realm': Niccolò Machiavelli (1469 – 1527), *Libro dell'Arte della Guerra* (Florence: Giunta, 1521).
 - 1.1.3.2. Theorists of professional organisation: Lienhart Fronsperger (1520 – 1575), *Kriegßbuch* (Frankfurt: Feyerabendt, 1573)
- 1.2. Special cases
 - 1.2.1. the English longbowmen
 - 1.2.1.1. military organisation under King Edward III (1327 – 1377)
 - 1.2.1.2. Agincourt 1415
 - 1.2.1.3. English longbowmen as mercenaries in Italy: John Hawkwood (died 1394)
 - 1.2.1.4. Orleans 1429
 - 1.2.1.5. King Henry VIII and the Trained Bands
 - 1.2.1.6. The end of longbow archery in England
 - 1.2.2. the Genovese crossbowmen
 - 1.2.3. the military organisation of the Teutonic Order in Prussia
- 1.3. The concept of sovereignty and the limitation of war-making capability: who is entitled to go to war legitimately?

2. The Swiss

- 2.1. War and group consciousness: „Der Alte Schweizer und sein Krieg“ [The Old Swiss and His War] (Walter Schaufelberger, first published 1952)
- 2.2. The wars over Burgundy 1476 – 1477
 - 2.2.1. the army of Duke Charles the Bold
 - 2.2.2. the „Swiss battles“
 - 2.2.2.1. Grandson 1476
 - 2.2.2.2. Murten 1476
 - 2.2.2.3. Nancy 1477
 - 2.2.3. the image of Swiss warriors in the 1480s and 1490s
 - 2.2.4. the Swiss / Swabian War of 1499
 - 2.2.5. the Swiss and the role of infantry in late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century

warfare

3. The Lansquenets

- 3.1. Rivalries „Cow Swiss“ and „Pig Swabians“
- 3.2. Thérouanne 1479
- 3.3. Frankenhausen 1525
- 3.4. Pavia 1525
- 3.5. Metz 1544
- 3.6. Mühlberg 1547
- 3.7. The order of the Lansquenets
- 3.7.1. Jean Molinet (1435 – 1507) on King Maximilian at Bruges in 1488
- 3.7.2. the theory of the formation of the snail
- 3.7.3. Albrecht Altdorfer (ca 1480 – 1538), Battle of Alexander 1539
- 3.7.4. the reception of Lansquenet order in the sixteenth century
- 3.7.5. Willibald Pirckheimer (1470 – 1530) and the Swiss / Swabian war of 1499

4. The Spanish Tercios and the Dutch Revolt against Spanish Rule

- 4.1. Kortrijk 1402
- 4.2. Cortés and the conquest of Tenochtitlan 1520/21
- 4.3. Spanish warfare in the Netherlands at the end of the sixteenth century
- 4.4. The army of the revolters to 1594
- 4.5. The Spanish Armada in 1588
- 4.6. The army of the revolters after 1594 and the Oranian Army Reforms
- 4.6.1. sources of the Oranian Army Reform
- 4.6.1.1. military organisation of Antiquity
- 4.6.1.2. traditions of the Lansquenets and the words of command
- 4.6.1.3. English models and the words of command

5. The Thirty Years War

- 5.1. The thesis concerning the „lack of peacefulness of the Early Modern period “: wars as wars of state-making (cf. Part II, 1.1.1.: equality deficit, institutionality deficit, legitimacy deficit)
- 5.2. Politics and warfare in the early phase of the war
- 5.3. Warfare and intermediation
- 5.4. Some battles
- 5.4.1. the Battle at the White Mountain 8. 11.1620 (c. 21.000 men on the Protestant side, among them c. 5000 war dead; c. 29.000 men on the Catholic side [winning], among them c. 700 war dead)
- 5.4.2. the Battle at Lutter am Barenberg 17.8.1626 (c. 22.500 men on the Danish side, among them c. 4000 war dead; c. 20.000 men on the Imperial side [winning], among them c. 4000 war dead)

- 5.4.3. the Battle at Breitenfeld 7.9.1631 (c. 47.000 men on the Swedish side [winning], no clear record of losses; c. 40.000 men on the Imperial side, among them c. 12.000 war dead or wounded)
- 5.4.4. the Battle at Lützen 6.11.1632 (c. 19.000 men on the Swedish side [winning], among them c. 5200 war dead or wounded; c. 23.000 men on the Imperial side, among them c. 6000 war dead or wounded)
- 5.4.5. the Battle at Nördlingen 6.9.1634 (c. 25.600 men on the Swedish side, among them c. 6000 war dead or wounded; c. 33.000 men on the imperial side [winning], among them c. 3500 war dead or wounded)
- 5.5. The naming of the war and the end of the war
- 5.6. The theory of „army that remained standing“

6. Warfare in the age of Louis XIV

- 6.1. Military training in France since the beginning of the seventeenth century
- 6.2. French military expansion
- 6.3. Wars against the Ottoman Turkish Empire
 - 6.3.1. Vienna 1683
 - 6.3.2. Zenta 11.9.1697 (75.000 – 100.000 men on the Turkish side, among them c. 25.000 war dead; c. 55.000 men on the Imperial side [winning], among them 429 war dead)
- 6.4. Soldiers and officers
- 6.5. Non-military tasks of the „armies that remained standing“

7. The War of the Spanish Succession

- 7.1. Balance-of-power theory and warfare at c. 1700
- 7.2. Barrier thinking and the Netherlands
- 7.3. Military leadership and limiting war
- 7.4. Some battles
 - 7.4.1. the Battle at Höchstädt 13.8.1704 (c. 52.000 men on the British and Imperial side [winning], among them 4542 war dead; c. 56.000 men on the Bavarian-French side, among them c. 20.000 war dead and wounded)
 - 7.4.2. the battle at Ramillies 23.5.1706 (c. 82.000 men on the British-Imperial side [winning], among them 1066 war dead; c. 60.000 men on the Bavarian-French side, among them c. 13.000 war dead or wounded)
 - 7.4.3. the Battle at Malplaquet 11.9.1709 (c. 90.000 men on the British-Imperial side [winning], among them 25.000 war dead or wounded; c. 80.000 men on the French side, among them c. 11.000 war dead or wounded)
- 7.5. War, dynasty and the state in 1713

8. The Silesian Wars

- 8.1. The law of war, the reasons for the war and politics: Frederick II. as an example

- 8.2. The Silesian Wars as wars of succession
 - 8.2.1. the Polish succession
 - 8.2.2. the Habsburgische succession
 - 8.2.3. the succession of Emperor Charles VII
- 8.3. Some battles
 - 8.3.1. the Battle at Mollwitz 10.4.1741 (c. 23.400 men on the Prussian side [winning], among them 4849 war dead; c. 19.000 men on the Habsburg side, among them 4551 war dead)
 - 8.3.2. the Battle at Chotusitz 17.5.1742 (c. 23.500 men on the Prussian side [winning], among them 4778 war dead; c. 28.000 men on the Habsburg side, among them 6332 war dead and wounded)
 - 8.3.3. the Battle at Dettingen 27.6.1743 (c. 35.000 men on the British side [draw], among them c. 3000 war dead and wounded; 70.000 men on the French side, among them c 4000 war dead and wounded)
 - 8.3.4. the Battle at Hohenfriedberg 4.6.1745 (65.414 men on the Prussian side [winning], among them c. 4700 war dead and wounded; 71.880 men on the Habsburg side, among them 2029 war dead)
 - 8.3.5. the Battle at Roßbach 5.11.1757 (c. 22.000 men on the Prussian side [winning], among them 548 war dead; c. 41.000 men on the Habsburg-French side, among them c. 3000 war dead and wounded)
 - 8.3.6. the Battle at Leuthen 5.12.1757 (c. 29.000 men on the Prussian side [winning], among them c. 6400 war dead and wounded; c. 66.000 men on the Habsburg side, among them c. 10.000 war dead and wounded)
 - 8.3.7. the Battle at Zorndorf 25.8.1758 (c. 36.800 men on the Prussian side [winning], among them c. 12.000 war dead or wounded; c. 44.3000 men on the Russian side, among them c. 19.000 war dead or wounded)
 - 8.3.8. the Battle at Kunersdorf 12.8.1759 (c. 49.000 Mann on the Prussian side, among them 18.969 war dead or wounded; c. 71.000 men on the Russian side [winning], among them 16.512 war dead or wounded)
 - 8.3.9. the Battle at Torgau 3.11.1760 (c. 58.500 men on the Prussian side [winning], among them 16.751 war dead or wounded; c. 52.000 men on the Habsburg side, among them c. 15.200 war dead or wounded)

9. Overseas wars [outside the „European System“]

- 9.1. India (the Battle at Plassey, 23.6.1757, c. 3150 men on the British side [winning], among them 22 war dead; c. 5000 combatants on the Indian side, among them c. 500 war dead or wounded)
- 9.2. North America (the Battle at Trenton, 26.12.1776; c. 2400 on Washington's side [winning], small losses; c. 1400 on the British side [Hessian mercenaries, among them c. 25 war dead])
 - 9.2.1. the notion of „independence“

- 9.2.2. the notion of „human rights“ and the warfare of the American colonists
- 9.2.3. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben (1730 – 1794)‘s reforms
- 9.3. Wars of African rulers in the eighteenth century and European export of portable firearms

10. Changes

- 10.1. From professional warriors to the „well-trained soldier“
- 10.2. From the Trained Bands to the militia
- 10.3. From militiamen to professional soldiers
- 10.4. From professional soldiers to the „armies that remained standing“
- 10.5. The declining significance of the horse for warfare
- 10.6. The increasing significance of portable firearms in battle
- 10.7. Government-controlled armies engaged in European global warfare from the nineteenth-century; criticism of the global-war-thesis articulated by George Modelski and William R. Thompson, who objectivistically take the existence of the global international system for granted as a seemingly timeless feature of international relations [George Modelski, *Exploring Long Cycles* (Boulder: Rienner, 1987); William R. Thompson, *On Global War* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1988)

11. Some military leaders

- 11.1. Prince Eugen of Savoy (1663 – 1736)
- 11.2. John Churchill, First Duke of Marlborough (1650 – 1722)
- 11.3. Albrecht von Wallenstein (1583 – 1634)
- 11.4. Johann Tserclaes, Count Tilly (1559 – 1632)
- 11.5. Leopold von Anhalt-Dessau (1676 – 1747)
- 11.6. Leopold Count Daun (1705 – 1766)
- 11.7. Friedrich Wilhelm Baron von Seydlitz-Kurzbach (1721 – 1773)
- 11.8. Henri de la Tour d’Auvergne, Vicomte de Turenne (1611 – 1675)

Part V:

Analysis: Diplomatic Organisation and Perceptions of International Relations

1. The Context of the formulation and implementation of foreign policy and its change from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century

- 1.1. The differentiation between inside and outside and the formation of the concept of the foreign
 - 1.1.1. history of the word „foreigner“
 - 1.1.2. history of the concept of „foreigner“
 - 1.1.3. immigration „foreigners: the case of France and the formation of the concept of the „resident alien“
 - 1.1.4. emigrants as potential „foreigners“
 - 1.1.5. resident diplomats : where do the diplomats belong?
- 1.2. Change of the concept of the border
 - 1.2.1. from the zone to the line
 - 1.2.2. the border as a line of demarcation and as a connecting device and the perspectivity of the border
 - 1.2.3. internal and external borders
 - 1.2.4. the fortified border
 - 1.2.5. border checkpoint and passports
 - 1.2.6. the theory of the „segmented states“ (Philip G. Roeder, *Where Nation-States Come from*, 2007)
- 1.3. The notion of sovereignty
 - 1.3.1. medieval conceptions of sovereignty
 - 1.3.2. supremacy and sovereignty: Jean Bodin (1576) and the connection of sovereignty with equality
 - 1.3.3. diplomacy as the expression of the recognition of sovereign equality
 - 1.3.4. The concept of the state
 - 1.3.4.1. state and stability: the history of the words again
 - 1.3.4.2. state and territory: the spatial component of the concept of the state
 - 1.3.4.3. state and population: the demographic component of the concept of the state
 - 1.3.5. state and government: the institutional component of the concept of the state
 - 1.3.6. from the ruler to the state: the de-personalisation of the concept of the state
 - 1.3.7. diplomats as representatives of the state in its process of coming-into-existence
 - 1.3.8. the pluralism of states and the international system

2. State policy

- 2.1. Aspects of economic policy

- 2.1.1. mercantilism and the quest for stability through trade and production
- 2.1.2. physiocracy and the quest for stability through agriculture
- 2.1.3. traders as international actors: the long-distance trading companies
- 2.1.4. diplomatic services of the long-distance trading companies
- 2.1.5. the trading companies and the notion of the market: autonomy of economic actors and the regulation of trade
- 2.1.6. trade policy and the limitation of state sovereignty: direct diplomacy of the long-distance trading companies
- 2.1.7. The legality of diplomats: monopolization of diplomacy on institutions of the state in the nineteenth century
- 2.2. „Good policy“
 - 2.2.1. history of the word „police“ against the background of the history of the word „politics“
 - 2.2.2. from the „police“ as an instrument of regulation to the police as an institution
 - 2.2.3. policing orders as legal instrument for the preservation of stability
 - 2.2.4. the provision of security as a criterion of legitimacy: Justus Lipsius
 - 2.2.5. legitimacy and the European migration market
 - 2.2.6. legitimacy and the limitation of state sovereignty
 - 2.2.7. domestic political limitations of foreign policy
 - 2.2.8. the morality of diplomats: the juridification of the diplomatic business in the nineteenth century
- 2.3. Religion
 - 2.3.1. confessional controversies as matters of faith (1522 – 1648)
 - 2.3.2. confessional controversies as matters of politics (1648 – 1789): rationalisation and secularisation
 - 2.3.3. the divine right of kings versus secular legitimation of rule: the so-called Enlightened Absolutism
 - 2.3.4. the role and effect of church organisation in the Catholic and Protestant parts of Europe (Catholic universalism versus Protestant-Calvinist territorialism)
 - 2.3.5. the special role of the Holy Roman Empire: Catholic rule over a Catholic-Protestant population
 - 2.3.6. clerics as diplomats
 - 2.3.6.1. Richelieu
 - 2.3.6.2. Mazarin
 - 2.3.7. the neutrality of diplomats: the narrowing range of diplomatic activities, diplomats acting as state representatives, in the nineteenth century

3. Major concepts of foreign policy

- 3.1. „Universal monarchy“: the genesis of a negative slogan
- 3.2. „Natural Borders“: geography as propaganda
- 3.3. Primogeniture as a category of legitimacy: descent as politics

- 3.4. The „Sphere of Influence“: the genesis of political exclusionism
- 3.5. The „Cordon sanitaire“: maps as a model of politics
- 3.6. The „Court“: architecture as a model of politics
- 3.7. „Power“ (*podestà, pouvoir / puissance, Macht*): the person as a model of politics
- 3.8. *Arcana imperii*: diplomats as bearers of secrets
- 3.9. *Ratio status*: the problem of morality in politics
- 3.10. The disloyal: the foreign policy of the American revolutionaries

4. Main instruments of foreign policy

- 4.1. The mission
- 4.2. Resident diplomats
- 4.3. Personal networks, for example of Prince Eugene of Savoy
- 4.4. Espionage
- 4.5. The newsmedia
- 4.6. Public opinion and the court ceremonial
- 4.7. Treaties and the public debate about treaties (Jean Bodin)

5. Perceptions

- 5.1. Symbols: places as actors (the Holy See, the High Port, Vienna): the significance of diplomatic jargon as a factors of the separation of person and office
- 5.2. Diplomats as mouthpieces of their rulers: the practice of diplomatic correspondence
- 5.3. Instructions for diplomats: rulers' or ministers' instructions as means for the implementation of foreign policy
- 5.4. Memoranda as means of foreign policy decision-making
- 5.5. Political testaments as means for the preservation of stability of political decision-making

6. Factors of continuity of diplomatic organisation

- 6.1. The professional Code as a factor of stability of foreign politics
 - 6.1.1. the significance of the ritual
 - 6.1.2. the significance of conventions
 - 6.1.3. the politics of breaches of conventions
- 6.2. The expansion of legal systems as a factor of stability in foreign politics
 - 6.2.1. treaty politics
 - 6.2.2. precedence
 - 6.2.3. the politics of breaches of treaties

Part VI: Analysis: Theories of International Relations

1. Who has theories of international relations?

- 1.1. Scholars / intellectuals
- 1.2. Diplomats
- 1.3. Rulers (or all others)

2. What tasks can a theory of international relations have?

- 2.1. It can articulate perceptions of the world
- 2.2. It can offer categories for the description and analysis of the world
- 2.3. It can offer categories for the evaluation of actions
- 2.4. It can articulate predictions
- 2.5. It can offer explanations

3. Which sources of international theories exist in historical perspective?

- 3.1. Contemporary academic literature (see below Nr 4)
- 3.2. Diplomatic Correspondence
 - 3.2.1. the „Relations“ to the Senate of Venice
 - 3.2.2. memoranda for Emperor Charles V
 - 3.2.3. memoranda for and by Richelieu
 - 3.2.4. *Acta Pacis Westphaliae*
 - 3.2.5. Acts of the Congress of Utrecht 1713
 - 3.2.6. Correspondence of Count Kaunitz-Rietberg
- 3.3. Reflexions by and on rulers
 - 3.3.1. the imperial propaganda for Emperor Maximilian I, c. 1508
 - 3.3.2. Frederick II, King in / of Prussia
- 3.4. Notes and observations, for example by travellers and other outsiders
 - 3.4.1. Sigismund von Herberstein
 - 3.4.2. fictitious observations
 - 3.4.2.1. Charles-Louis de Secondat, Baron de la Brède et de Montesquieu (1689 – 1755), *Lettres persanes* (1721)
 - 3.4.2.2. Jonathan Swift (1667 – 1745), *Gulliver's Travels (Travels into Several Remote Nations of the World, 1721)*
 - 3.4.2.3. Daniel Defoe (ca 1659 – 1731), *Robinson Crusoe (The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, 1719)*
 - 3.4.3. “statistical” literature
- 3.5. Programs for perpetual peace
- 3.6. In historical perspective, theories are noteworthy if they are contemporary to the

epoch under review; by contrast later or retrospective theories have no significance as a source for the epoch under review

4. Some theorists of international relations in Early Modern Europe

- 4.1. Niccolò Machiavelli (1469 – 1527)
- 4.2. Francisco de Vitoria (c. 1492 – 1546)
- 4.3. Alberico Gentili
- 4.4. Jean Bodin
- 4.5. Justus Lipsius (1547 – 1606)
- 4.6. Giovanni Botero (c. 1544 – 1617)
- 4.7. Francisco Suarez (1548 – 1617)
- 4.8. Juan de Mariana (1536 – 1624)
- 4.9. Johannes Althusius (ca 1563 – 1638)
- 4.10. Henning Arnisaeus (1644 – 1725)
- 4.11. Francis Bacon (1561 – 1626)
- 4.12. Bartholomäus Keckermann (died 1609)
- 4.13. Hugo Grotius
- 4.14. Josiah Child (1630 – 1699)
- 4.15. Thomas Hobbes
- 4.16. Hermann Conring (1606 – 1681)
- 4.17. Cornelis van Bynkershoek (1673 – 1743)
- 4.18. Samuel von Pufendorf (1632 – 1694)
- 4.19. John Locke (1632 – 1704)
- 4.20. Charles Davenant (1656 – 1714)
- 4.21. Nicolaus Hieronymus Gundling (1671 – 1729)
- 4.22. Christian Gottfried Hoffmann (1692 – 1735)
- 4.23. Friedrich II., König von Preußen (1712 – 1786)
- 4.24. Charles-Louis de Secondat, Baron de la Brède et de Montesquieu
- 4.25. Ludwig Martin Kahle (1712 – 1775)
- 4.26. Johann Heinrich Gottlob Justi (1717 – 1771)
- 4.27. Emerich de Vattel (1714 – 1767)
- 4.28. Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712 – 1778)
- 4.29. Gottfried Achenwall (1719 – 1772)
- 4.30. Jakob Friedrich Freiherr von Bielfeld (1717 – 1770)

5. Some aspects of theories of international relations in Early Modern Europe

- 5.1. The balance of power (or powers)
 - 5.1.1. change of the models of balance
 - 5.1.1.1. the scales (dominant in the 15th / 16th centuries)
 - 5.1.1.2. the machine and the static balance (dominant in the 17th / 18th centuries)
 - 5.1.1.3. the living-body model and the homoeostatic balance (dominant in the 19th)

- / 20th centuries)
- 5.1.2. the change from bilateralism to multilateralism: the significance of the Peace Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle (1748)
 - 5.1.3. the „balancer“
 - 5.1.4. the genesis of balance of power as a legal norm
 - 5.1.4.1. balance as an analytical category (for example, Francis Bacon)
 - 5.1.4.2. balance as a norm (for example, Ludwig Martin Kahle)
 - 5.1.4.3. balance as law (for example, Emerich de Vattel)
 - 5.1.5. arguments with the balance of power in war deductions (for example, the case of the Prussian-Habsburg propaganda war during the Seven Years' War)
 - 5.1.6. arguments with the balance of power in peace theories (for example, Emeric Crucé, *Le Nouveau Cynée* (1623); *The New Cyneas of Émeric Crucé*, 1909)
 - 5.1.7. arguments with the balance of power in the context of quests for the maintenance of stability (for example, Vattel)
 - 5.2. Theories of international relations and contemporary ethics: the ethics of self-constraint
 - 5.2.1. origins in Antiquity: classical stoicism
 - 5.2.2. the tradition of the *specula principis* and the interconnectedness of ethics with politics
 - 5.2.3. ethics and politics in the sixteenth century: the discussion about Machiavelli's theory
 - 5.2.4. from political theory to theory of international relations and the ethics of self-constraint: Justus Lipsius
 - 5.2.4.1. problems of research: Gerhard Oestreich (1910 – 1978) and the so-called neostoicism
 - 5.2.4.2. problems of the sources: Lipsius and the Dutch Revolt
 - 5.2.5. the ethics of self-constraint and the quest for the maintenance of stability
 - 5.3. Contractualism as a theory of legitimacy
 - 5.3.1. the medieval legacy of contractualism
 - 5.3.2. contractualism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries
 - 5.3.3. the theory of the government covenant and the theory of the social contract
 - 5.3.3.1. Justus Lipsius
 - 5.3.3.2. Reception of Lipsius in Spain and elsewhere in the Catholic world (France, Bavaria)
 - 5.3.3.3. Johannes Althusius
 - 5.3.3.4. Thomas Hobbes
 - 5.3.3.5. John Locke
 - 5.4. Perception of the international system
 - 5.4.1. the system as a machine
 - 5.4.2. general systems theory
 - 5.4.3. Bartholomäus Keckermann and the mechanist theory of politics

- 5.4.4. the „European System“
- 5.4.5. inter-systemic relations
 - 5.4.5.1. Christian states and the Ottoman Turkish Empire
 - 5.4.5.1.1. the Treaty of Tsitva Torok (1604)
 - 5.4.5.1.2. the treaties of Carlowitz (1699)
 - 5.4.5.2. Europe and Russia
 - 5.4.5.3. Russia and Asia
 - 5.4.5.3.1. the Treaty of Nertschinsk (1689)
 - 5.4.5.3.2. the Treaty of Kiachta (1727)
 - 5.4.5.4. France and Siam (1685 – 1687)
 - 5.4.5.5. the long-distance trading companies
- 5.4.6. mechanistic perception of the system and the quest for the maintenance of stability
- 5.5. International law and the conquest of America
 - 5.5.1. John Major and the theory of natural slavery (1509)
 - 5.5.2. Francisco de Vitoria (1539)
 - 5.5.3. Bartolomé de Las Casas (1484 – 1566)
 - 5.5.4. human rights theories in the sixteenth century
 - 5.5.5. the problem of the Open Sea in the sixteenth century
 - 5.5.6. the controversy between Grotius (1609), Justo Seraphim de Freitas (*De Iusto Imperio Lusitanorum Asiatico Adversus Grotii Mare Liberum* 1625) and John Selden (1584 – 1654, *Mare clausum*, 1635) about the openness of the seas
 - 5.5.7. Hayashi Shihei, *Kaikoku heidan* (1786).
- 5.6. Treaties by international law as sources of law
 - 5.6.1. The principal problem: can treaties be a source of law? The question came up only at the turn of the twentieth century (legal positivism)
 - 5.6.2. the treaties of Westphalia (1648)
 - 5.6.3. the Utrecht peace treaties (1713)
 - 5.6.4. multilateralism and treaties by international law: the peace treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle (1748)
 - 5.6.5. collections of treaties and public acts by international law
 - 5.6.5.1. Jean Dumont, Baron von Carels-Croon (1667 – 1727), *Corps universel diplomatique du droit des gens*, 5 vols (1728)
 - 5.6.5.2. Anton Christian Leonhard Leucht Faber, *Europäische Staats-Kantzley*, 115 vols (1697-1760)
 - 5.6.5.3. Johann Christian Lünig, *Teutsches Reichsarchiv*, 24 vols (1710-1722)
 - 5.6.5.4. Johann Christian Lünig, *Teutsche Reichskantzley*, 8 vols (1714)
 - 5.6.5.5. Johann Joseph Pachner von Eggenstorf, *Vollständige Sammlung aller von Anfang des noch fürwährenden teutschen Reichstages de anno 1663 bis anhero abgefaßten Reichsschlüsse*, 4 vols (1740-1777)
 - 5.6.5.6. Johann Friedrich Pfeffinger, *Corpus iuris publici ad ductum institutionum*

iuris publici, 4 vols (1739-1754)

- 5.6.5.7. Cassander Christian Leonhard Thucelius, *Des Heiligen Römischen Reiches Reichs-Staatsacta vom jetzigen 18. Saeculo sich anfühend*, 5 vols (1715-1722)
- 5.6.5.8. Georg Friedrich von Martens (1756 – 1821), *Recueil des traités*, since 1761
- 5.6.6. the moral character of international law and the ethics of self-constraint
- 5.7. The main contents of theories of international relations in Early Modern Europe
 - 5.7.1. they set the frame for the preservation of stability as a political goal
 - 5.7.2. they are based on the assumption that human action shapes politics
 - 5.7.3. they are based on the assumption of the possibility that human beings have limited freedom of decision-making in international relations
 - 5.7.4. they define the „European System“ in terms of space
 - 5.7.5. they are based on the assumption that there is a pluralism of international systems and types of actors in international relations on the globe

Part VII: Analysis: Military Organisation and the Perception of War

1. The concept of „military organisation“ (the so-called Lower Tactics)

- 1.1. What is required for the conduct of war?
 - 1.1.1. the „human material“: who can be combatant?
 - 1.1.1.1. men or women, men and women
 - 1.1.1.2. selection of age cohorts
 - 1.1.1.3. selection of social status
 - 1.1.2. the weaponry: which instrument can, may or should be used?
 - 1.1.2.1. close combat weapons and long-distance weapons, close combat weapons or long-distance weapons
 - 1.1.2.2. the use of the human body as a weapon
 - 1.1.2.3. the use of non-specific materials as weapons (for example farming instruments)
 - 1.1.3. other parts of the equipment
 - 1.1.3.1. horses
 - 1.1.3.2. machines
 - 1.1.3.3. transport capacity
 - 1.1.4. battle formations: the problem of order in battle
 - 1.1.5. command structure
 - 1.1.6. logistics
 - 1.1.7. establishing connections between combatants and non-combatants: the genesis of the concept of the „nation in arms“
 - 1.1.8. preparing for war at times of peace
 - 1.1.8.1. learning by doing
 - 1.1.8.2. regulated training
 - 1.1.8.3. differences between professional warrior bands and militia units
 - 1.1.9. the problem of the so-called „standing armies“
 - 1.1.10. military medicine
 - 1.1.11. war financing
 - 1.1.12. the law of war
- 1.2. Major elements of Early Modern „military organisation“
 - 1.2.1. the relationship between professional warrior bands, militia units and the so-called „standing armies“
 - 1.2.2. changes of the naming of military units: the battalion (units in battle), the regiment (the organizational structure of an army)
 - 1.2.3. selections of types of weaponry
 - 1.2.3.1. pikes and portable firearms
 - 1.2.3.2. the development of the bayonet

- 1.2.3.3. arches
- 1.2.3.4. heavy cannon
- 1.2.3.5. the deployment of technical instruments and machines
- 1.2.4. the coordination of units
 - 1.2.4.1. the downgrading of the cavalry
 - 1.2.4.2. integration of the artillery into the infantry
- 1.2.5. the problem of state-controlled care of invalids (continuing until the present)
- 1.2.6. the „military enterprisers“ and the emergence of officer corps (continuing until the present)
- 1.2.7. military music and the cultivation of the signals (continuing until the present)
- 1.2.8. rulers as military organisers
 - 1.2.8.1. the Oranians
 - 1.2.8.2. King Frederick II in / of Prussia
- 1.2.9. Creating uniforms and economic aspects of military production during the age of mercantilism (continuing until the present)
- 1.2.10. forage and legal problems of the conduct of war in enemy areas
- 1.2.11. the problem of control: the chief of the regiment as accountant and as judge
- 1.3. Main changes of Early Modern „military organisation“
 - 1.3.1. the genesis of regularised trained units
 - 1.3.2. the regularisation of drills
 - 1.3.3. the genesis of specialised irregular units (for example, the Husars) and the concept of the „Little War“ (predecessor of the guerilla)
 - 1.3.4. the decline of the number of war dead
 - 1.3.5. the regularisation of military production under the control of rulers
 - 1.3.6. the establishment of music battalions
 - 1.3.7. the increase of the flexibility of the battalions

2. Contemporary perceptions of war

- 2.1. In art and fiction (fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries)
 - 2.1.1. cruelty
 - 2.1.1.1. Honoré Bouvet (c. 1340 – c. 1410) and Christine de Pizan (1363 – c. 1430)
 - 2.1.1.2. Alain Chartier (c. 1385 – 1449)
 - 2.1.1.3. Jacques Callot
 - 2.1.2. lawlessness
 - 2.1.2.1. Emperor Maximilian I (1459 – 1519)
 - 2.1.2.2. Hans Wilhelm Kirchhof (c. 1525 – c. 1602)
 - 2.1.2.3. Hans Jakob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen (1621 – 1676)
 - 2.1.3. wastefulness
 - 2.1.3.1. William Shakespeare (1564 – 1616)
 - 2.1.3.2. Francis Beaumont (1584 – 1616) and John Fletcher (1579 – 1625), *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* (1607)

- 2.2. In the literature on military theory (sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries)
 - 2.2.1. regularity
 - 2.2.1.1. Franz Georg von Miller (1759 – 1801), *Reine Taktik der Infanterie, Cavallerie und Artillerie*, 2 vols (1787 – 1788)
 - 2.2.1.2. David Dundas (1735 – 1820), *Principles of Military Movements* (1788)
 - 2.2.2. lawfulness
 - 2.2.2.1. Roger Ascham (ca 1515 – 1568), *Toxophilus* (1545)
 - 2.2.2.2. John Smythe, *Certain Discourses Military* (1595)
 - 2.2.3. good order
 - 2.2.3.1. Louis de Montgomery, Sieur de Courbouson, *La milice françoise* (1610)
 - 2.2.3.2. the military reforms of the Oranians in the Netherlands and in some smaller territories of the Holy Roman Empire
- 2.3. Analysis of pictorial sources

3. The changing context of „military organisation“

- 3.1. Politics
 - 3.1.1. the institutionalisation of the state (continuing until the present)
 - 3.1.1.1. limiting war-making capability to sovereign rulers and governments
 - 3.1.1.2. the mediatisation of the lower aristocracy
 - 3.1.1.3. the end of the law of the feud
 - 3.1.1.4. autonomous war-making city governments
 - 3.1.1.4.1. Venice
 - 3.1.1.4.2. Genova
 - 3.1.1.4.3. Augsburg
 - 3.1.1.4.4. Nuremberg
 - 3.1.1.4.5. Frankfurt on the Main
 - 3.1.1.4.6. Ulm
 - 3.1.1.4.7. Lübeck
 - 3.1.1.4.8. Hamburg
 - 3.1.1.4.9. Bremen
 - 3.1.1.4.10. Florence and Milan as territorial principalities
 - 3.1.1.5. the de-personalisation of rule as the separation of person from office (continuing until the present)
 - 3.1.2. the acceptance of the contractualist theory of legitimacy
 - 3.1.2.1. security providing capability as the nucleus of rulers' legitimacy
 - 3.1.2.2. the comprehensive notion of security
 - 3.1.2.3. the competitive market of security providers
 - 3.1.3. the impact of church institutions at the time of the confessional controversy
 - 3.1.3.1. church discipline and politics
 - 3.1.3.2. inquisition and witch hunting as means of control

- 3.1.3.3. holders of ecclesiastical offices as politicians
- 3.1.3.4. the church and science: the case of demography
 - 3.1.3.4.1. John Graunt (1620 – 1674)
 - 3.1.3.4.2. Johann Peter Süßmilch (1707 – 1767)
- 3.1.3.5. Piety, religious dissent and sectarianism as reasons for war
- 3.2. The economy
 - 3.2.1. Mercantilism and regulated trade
 - 3.2.2. the centralisation of production: the manufactures
 - 3.2.3. the energy crisis of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and the beginning of the Industrial Revolution

Part VIII: Analysis: Theories of War

1. What did not exist before the nineteenth century: a general theory of war (as distinct from military theories)

(even though a lot was written and published about virtually all aspects of war and the military)

2. What is the achievement of a general theory of war?

- 2.1. It defines concepts of war and weapons
 - 2.1.1. Clausewitz, *On War*: 'war is the continuation of diplomacy with other means' (juxtaposing war against diplomacy in terms of means)
 - 2.1.2. Clausewitz, *On War*: War is a violent conflict among nations in arms with regular armed forces deployed by legitimate governments implements the definition of international law)
 - 2.1.3. It explains why wars happen
 - 2.1.4. Greed and the pursuit of honour: Ekkehard Krippendorff: 'La guerre – c'est moi!', in: Krippendorff, *Staat und Krieg. Die historische Logik politischer Unvernunft* (Frankfurt, 1985), pp. 272-299: the pursuit of military glory as a manifestation of rulers' success
 - 2.1.5. The pursuit of economic interest (Lenin)
 - 2.1.6. Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, *The War Trap* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981): expected utility (war is a means of policy chosen by governments in whose judgment the maintenance of peace involves higher costs than the conduct of war)
- 2.2. It determines the principles of „military organisation“
 - 2.2.1. Defensive versus offensive
 - 2.2.2. Humanitarian intervention versus regular war
 - 2.2.3. "Asymmetrical War", "Irregular War": Thomas Rid and Marc Hecker, *War 2.0* (New York and London: Praeger, 2009)
- 2.3. It determines the relationship between the armed forces and other institutions of the state (in conceptual as well as in organisational respects)
 - 2.3.1. The distinction between non-combatant civilians and combatants
 - 2.3.2. The grouping of regular armed forces into land armies, navies and air forces
- 2.4. It predicts the conditions for success in battle
- 2.5. What has not been included: the question why wars end
 - 2.5.1. Some authors have discussed processes of the ending of wars ('how wars end'), among them Harold Augustin Calahan, *What Makes a War End?* (New York: Vanguard Press, 1944) [second edn 1991; reprinted 2005]; William T. R. Fox, ed., *How Wars End* (New York: Academy, 1979) (Annals of the American of Political and

Social Science. 392.)

- 2.5.2. Few authors have raised the question why wars end. Among them: Fred Charles Iklé, *Every War Must End* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971) [newly edited 1991; 2005]
- 2.6. War in the perspective of recent international relations theories:
 - 2.6.1. war in the perspective of realism: principled assumption of war-proneness and lack of effectiveness of institutional constraints of decision-making in sovereign states: Janice E. Thomson, 'State Sovereignty in International Relations. Bridging the Gap between Theory and Empirical Research', in: *International Studies Quarterly* 39 (1995).
 - 2.6.2. war in the perspective of functionalism: principled assumption of peaceful human behaviour and trust in the constraining capability of international institutions: Joseph A. Camilleri and Jim Falk, *The End of Sovereignty? The Politics of a Shrinking and Fragmented World* (Aldershot: Ashgate 1992). Heather Rae, 'Theories of State Formation', in: *International Relations Theories for the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Martin Griffiths (London and New York: Routledge, 2007).
 - 2.6.3. war in the perspective of constructivism / postmodernism: seeks to specify who defines what type of conflict as war and does so for what purpose: Thomas J. Biersteker and Cynthia Weber, eds, *State Sovereignty as a Social Construct* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996). Richard Devetak, 'Postmodernism', in: *Theories of International Relations*, edited by Scott Burchill, third edn (New York and Basingstoke: PalgraveMacmillan 2005).

3. Why was there no general theory of war before the nineteenth century?

- 3.1. The pluralism of organisers of war
 - 3.1.1. rulers as personal sovereigns
 - 3.1.2. long-distance trading companies
 - 3.1.3. city councils
 - 3.1.4. private military enterprisers
 - 3.1.5. contractual autonomous warrior bands, for example in rural areas
 - 3.1.6. the fallacy of the conceptualization of 'asymmetric war', as generalized from late twentieth-century patterns of warfare
 - 3.1.7. the ideology of the conceptual limitation of war:
 - 3.1.7.1. war versus 'humanitarian intervention'
 - 3.1.7.2. war versus 'Peace Enforcement Operations'
 - 3.1.7.3. the logical contradictoriness of unilateral declarations of the end of a war
 - 3.1.8. Lack of rigidity of the definition of the state (as the allegedly sole legitimate war-making agent), categorised in terms of the triad of unities of territory, government and population
- 3.2. The comprehensive concept of security

- 3.2.1. connecting security and insurance and the pluralism of security providers
- 3.2.2. contractualism as a theory of legitimacy and the provision of comprehensive security as a condition of legitimate rule and as a task of rulers
- 3.2.3. theories of just war
- 3.3. The extraordinariness of war in theoretical perspective
 - 3.3.1. the sequence Peace – War – Peace according to St Augustine (354 – 430)
 - 3.3.2. the sequence war – Peace – War according to nineteenth-century military theory
 - 3.3.3. the segregation of the armed forces
 - 3.3.3.1. garrisons in cities
 - 3.3.3.2. battle fields outside settlements
 - 3.3.4. separate patterns of behaviour in the city and in the garrison
 - 3.3.5. the rarity of long and bloody sieges
 - 3.3.6. the interconnectedness of war-making and peace negotiations among the warring parties

4. Aspects of a theory of war according to Early Modern sources

- 4.1. The control of the use of weapons (the „law of the use of weapons“) and the regularization of the armed forces
 - 4.1.1. farmers and weapons: farming tools as potential weapons, protest and unrest among the farming populations and the dangers for rulers emerging from such unrest, if coalitions happen between farmers and other groups of the ruled
 - 4.1.2. cities as zones of peace
 - 4.1.2.1. the prohibition to carry weapons in cities
 - 4.1.2.2. mercenaries and militiamen commissioned by city councils
 - 4.1.2.3. city councils as proprietors of weapons, ammunition and military architecture
 - 4.1.2.4. logistics in cities
 - 4.1.2.5. unrest among urban populations: the “running”
 - 4.1.2.6. city quarters as mobilisation districts and as recruitment structures at times of urban unrest
 - 4.1.2.7. outlining the principles for the permission or banning of weapons and weapons systems
 - 4.1.3. territorial rule as an institution of control for armed forces and the regularisation of the armed forces through drill; intensifying rulers’ control over the armed forces between 1648 and 1789
 - 4.1.3.1. Henry VIII, King of England (in office 1509 – 1547)
 - 4.1.3.2. Elizabeth I, Queen of England (in office 1559 – 1603)
 - 4.1.3.3. Maurice of Orange, military leader of the Dutch Revolt (1567 – 1625)
 - 4.1.3.4. John VII of Nassau-Siegen (1561 – 1623)
 - 4.1.3.5. the court of Louis XIV, King of France
 - 4.1.3.6. Frederick II, King in / of Prussia

- 4.2. Tactics: military drill and planning war
 - 4.2.1. the English Trained Bands, the Dutch militia units and the rise of regulated drill
 - 4.2.2. military manuals and drill books
 - 4.2.2.1. Lienhart Fronsperger (1520 – 1575), *Funff Bucher von Kriegsregiment* (1555)
 - 4.2.2.2. Lazarus von Schwendi (ca 1522 – 1584)
 - 4.2.2.3. Louis and Maurice of Orange
 - 4.2.2.4. John VII of Nassau-Siegen
 - 4.2.2.5. Landgrave Moritz of Hesse-Kassel (1572 – 1632, in office 1592 – 1627)
 - 4.2.2.6. Wilhelm Dilich (1571 – 1650), i.e. Wilhelm Scheffer
 - 4.2.2.7. Gustav Adolf, King of Sweden (1594 – 1632, in office 1611 – 1632)
 - 4.2.2.8. Leaders of regiments in the Imperial army as authors of drill books
 - 4.2.2.9. Prince Eugene of Savoy
 - 4.2.2.10. the Berne city council
 - 4.2.2.11. Frederick William I, King in Prussia (1688 – 1740, in office 1713 – 1740)
 - 4.2.2.12. Frederick II, King in / of Prussia
 - 4.2.3. planning battle through drill
 - 4.2.4. the battle field as a chess board
 - 4.2.5. evolutions
 - 4.2.6. the concept of the „well trained soldier“
- 4.3. Strategy
 - 4.3.1. Launching war and the practice of compiling war deductions
 - 4.3.2. propaganda and desertion
 - 4.3.3. the just war and the legitimacy of war aims
 - 4.3.4. determining war aims and selecting alliance partners
 - 4.3.5. practical limitations of military capacity
 - 4.3.5.1. war finances
 - 4.3.5.2. war subsidies
 - 4.3.5.3. the number of combatants and military production
 - 4.3.5.4. the law of war and the limitation of the choice of tactics
 - 4.3.5.5. focus on the restoration of war
 - 4.3.6. the end of the war and the search for compromises
 - 4.3.6.1. the restitution of peace as a war aim
 - 4.3.6.2. amnesty as a legal term
 - 4.3.7. positioning the state of nature as the hypothetical or past state of war in political theory
 - 4.3.7.1. Hobbes, *Leviathan* (1651), Part I, chap. 13.
 - 4.3.7.2. John Locke (1632 – 1704), *Two Treatises of Government* (1690), Treatise II, § 108
 - 4.3.7.3. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Le contrat social* (1762), cap. 3-6.
 - 4.3.8. Avoiding war: Jean Rousset, *Les interest presents et les pretensions des puissance*

de l'Europe, third edn, 3 vols (Paris, 1733), charts in each volume of about thousand pages the contending dynastic claims of rulers in Europe for hereditary succession based on dynastic principles. Most of the potential conflicts resulting from these claims did not materialize.

5. The restorative character of early modern military theory versus the demand for war as an engine of change in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries

6. A comparative look at Asia: Japanese military theory during the Tokugawa Period

- 6.1. Philosophical traditions of Buddhism
- 6.2. Issai Chozan, *Neko no myōjutsu* (i. e. Tanba Juro Saemon Tadaaki, 1659 – 1741)
- 6.3. Hayashi Shihei, *Kaikoku heidan* (1738 – 1793)

7. The history of military theory and the limitations of current military theory

- 7.1. Charles Tilly (1929-2008; 'War Making and State Making as Organized Crime', in: *Bringing the State Back In*, edited by Peter Evans, Dieter Rueschemeyer and Theda Skocpol, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985, pp. 169-187; *Coercion, Capital and European States. AD 990 – 1990*, Cambridge, MA, and Oxford: Blackwell, 1990: 'Wars make states and states make wars')
- 7.2. The dangers of the dynamism inherent in nineteenth- and twentieth-century military theories:
 - 7.2.1. the strict conceptual separation of war from peace (setting the criteria for the measurement of military success excludes the maintenance of peace as a goal)
 - 7.2.2. the perception of war as an engine of change determines the formulation of revisionist war aims (instead of status-quo-oriented war aims)

Part IX:

Patterns of Action: Ethics of Self-Constraint and Theories of Peace

1. What brings together diplomacy and war in early modern Europe?

- 1.1. The parallelism of the efforts to preserve the status quo
- 1.2. The increase of regularisation as the process of the imposition of rule-conforming patterns of behaviour
- 1.3. Diplomacy does not merely follow a perennial internal logic
- 1.4. Warfare does not merely follow a perennial internal logic
- 1.5. The histories of diplomacy and war are part of the general history of culture
- 1.6. Interdependence of foreign-policy decision-making , not merely with domestic policy (contra the alleged primate of foreign policy), but also with military theory and organisation
 - 1.6.1. the case of Kaunitz
 - 1.6.2. the case of Daun
 - 1.6.3. the heuristical problem of the retrospective determination of motives and causes in interdependent decision-making, given the scarcity of available sources
- 1.7. The widening gap between diplomacy and war in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries

2. Categories for patterns of action

- 2.1. Categories of ethics: the negation of the ethics of self-constraint
- 2.2. Categories of epistemology: mechanicism versus biologism
- 2.3. Categories of anthropology: types of human action: path-orientation versus goal-orientation

3. Ethical Aspects of Early Modern Patterns of Action

- 3.1. The Ethics of Self-Constraint
 - 3.1.1. Justus Lipsius, his career, his work
 - 3.1.2. Lipsius and Classical Philology
 - 3.1.3. Lipsius and Contractualism
 - 3.1.4. Lipsius and Security
 - 3.1.5. Lipsius as author of a mirror for magistrates and his advocacy of duties of rulers
 - 3.1.6. Lipsius as a theorist of politics and the identification of international law as a moral category
 - 3.1.7. Lipsius as a military theorist and „Military Organisation“
- 3.2. The Ethics of Self-Constraint and Contractualism
 - 3.2.1. Contractualism before Lipsius
 - 3.2.1.1. Engelbert of Admont (c. 1250 – 1331)
 - 3.2.1.2. Johann Quidort of Paris (c. 1255 – 1306)

- 3.2.1.3. Aristotelianism and Contractualism
- 3.2.2. The Reception of Lipsius's Work in the later sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries (see also VI, 5.3.3.2.)
 - 3.2.2.1. Lipsius and the Dutch Revolt
 - 3.2.2.2. Johannes Althusius and Consocialism
- 3.2.3. The Ethics of Self-Constraint and Security
 - 3.2.3.1. Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646 – 1716) and Insurances
 - 3.2.3.2. Bartholomäus Keckermann and the notion of the system: the efforts to preserve stability as the effort to maintain security
- 3.2.4. The ethics of self-constraint and international law
 - 3.2.4.1. Samuel von Pufendorf and the System
 - 3.2.4.2. Emerich de Vattel: balance of power as a legal term
- 3.2.5. The narrowing scope of the security concept and the dynamisation of the balance of power

4. Epistemological Aspects of Early Modern Patterns of Action: the dominance of mechanicism up until the end of the eighteenth century

- 4.1. René Descartes (1596 – 1650)
 - 4.1.1. The Notion of Method
 - 4.1.1.1. Jean Bodin
 - 4.1.1.2. Pierre de La Ramée (1515 – 1572)
 - 4.1.2. The „School“ and the „System“
- 4.2. Thomas Hobbes
 - 4.2.1. The Machine Model
 - 4.2.2. The Significance of the Clock as the Model for the World
 - 4.2.3. The Symbolism of the Machine in Politics
- 4.3. Hobbes and Contractualism
- 4.4. Hobbes and Security
- 4.5. Hobbes and International Law

5. Anthropological Aspects of Early Modern Patterns of Action: the dominance of path-orientation up until the end of the eighteenth century

- 5.1. The Notion of Time
 - 5.1.1. Augustine and the Augustinian time paradox
 - 5.1.2. Fossils and the Conquest of America
 - 5.1.3. Biblical Eschatology and the Crisis of the World
 - 5.1.4. The System and Species: Carl von Linné (1707 – 1778)
 - 5.1.5. The End of Time and the End of the World
- 5.2. From Giambattista Vico (1668 – 1744) to Johann Gottfried Herder (1744 - 1803) and Immanuel Kant (1724 – 1804)
 - 5.2.1. Vico's Chronology

- 5.2.2. Herders Philosophy of the Origin of the World
- 5.2.3. Kant's notion of the „Plan of Nature“ and his Idea of Peace
- 5.3. Eschatology and Peace Theory
 - 5.3.1. The notion of Perpetual Peace
 - 5.3.1.1. Emeric de Crucé, *Le Nouveau Cynée* (1623)
 - 5.3.1.2. William Penn (1644 – 1718)
 - 5.3.1.3. Charles-Irenée Castel Abbé de Saint-Pierre (1658 – 1743)
 - 5.3.2. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the Machine and Peace
 - 5.3.3. Perpetual Peace and the Conclusion of Peace Treaties
 - 5.3.4. Restorative War Aims and Peace Treaties: the Practice of the „Normal Year“
 - 5.3.5. The French Revolution and Kant's Skepticism

6. The Essential Conservatism of Early Modern Europe

- 6.1. The State and the Status quo
- 6.2. The Change of the State System according to the Perceptions of Early Modern Theorists
- 6.3. Natural Law, Change and the Quest for Improving the World: the Lawyers, the Philosophers and the Physiocrats
- 6.4. The Market of Security Providers and the Competition for Migrants
- 6.5. The Ethics of Self-Constraint, Contractualism and the Limits of Diplomacy (Balance-of-Power Doctrines) and of Warfare (Regularisation of War)
- 6.6. Johann Gottlob Fichte (1762 – 1814) ridicules of the Balance of Power

7. The misnomer of 'peace treaties' and the ending of war

- 7.1. The notion of 'unequal treaties' in the light of the theory of international law
- 7.2. 'Peace treaties' as 'unequal treaties'
- 7.3. The Nanjing Treaty of 1842 as a case
- 7.4. Peace as the opposite of war (West) versus peace and war as correlated patterns of behavior (East Asia / Japan)
- 7.5. The difficulty of accomplishing a globally valid definition of peace overarching culturally specific patterns of behaviour
- 7.6. Peace as a goal-oriented pattern of behaviour (PEO), including the conceptualisation of war as a means to enforce peace
- 7.7. Peace as a process-oriented pattern of behaviour, the warrior as a peace preserver, the professional who can fight but has lost when he starts combat

Part X: Patterns of Action: The Theory of Just War

1. The Concept of „Law of War“

- 1.1. The Legacy of the Middle Ages
 - 1.1.1. St Augustine
 - 1.1.2. St Thomas Aquinas (c. 1225 – 1274)
 - 1.1.3. Francisco de Vitoria
- 1.2. Hugo Grotius
 - 1.2.1. The Structure of his „Three Books“
 - 1.2.2. The *ius ad bellum*
 - 1.2.2.1. The Concept of Sovereignty within the Law of War
 - 1.2.2.2. The Legal Limitation of Legitimate Participants in War
 - 1.2.3. The *ius in bello*
 - 1.2.3.1. Orienting War on Peace
 - 1.2.3.2. The Legal Limitation of Legitimate Actions in War
 - 1.2.4. Grotius and the Ethics of Self-Constraint
 - 1.2.4.1. The Postulate of the Legitimate Self-Interest of Sovereign Rulers
 - 1.2.4.2. The Pursuit of Legitimate Self-Interest versus the Rule of Law
 - 1.2.4.3. Differentiating between Legality and Legitimacy in the Seventeenth Century
 - 1.2.4.4. Rulers not subjecting themselves to the Ethics of Self-Constraint
 - 1.2.4.5. Rulers subjecting themselves to the Ethics of Self-Constraint
 - 1.2.5. Grotius and the Separation of Person and Office
 - 1.2.5.1. Types of Rule: *dominium* and *imperium*
 - 1.2.5.2. Rule under *dominium* as the Element of Private Law
 - 1.2.5.3. Rule under *imperium* as the Element of Public Law

2. The Law of the Hereditary Succession of Rulers

- 2.1. Change of the Models of Good Government
 - 2.1.1. The Kin Group and the Farmhouse and Models for Good Government in the Early Middle Ages
 - 2.1.2. The City as the Model of Good Government in the Late Middle Ages
 - 2.1.3. The Clock as the Model of Good Government in Early Modern Europe
- 2.2. The Rising Contradiction between Kinship and Office as Determinants for the Hereditary Succession of Rulers
 - 2.2.1. The *lois fondamentales* of Jean Bodin
 - 2.2.2. Rulers' Succession as the Realm of the *imperium*
 - 2.2.3. House Law versus State Law
 - 2.2.4. The Problem of the Designation and the Last Will of a Ruler
 - 2.2.5. Wars of Hereditary Succession as a Type of Early Modern Wars

- 2.2.6. Rulers' Succession and the Problem of the Collective Identities of the Ruled: the Significance of the Utrecht Peace Treaties of 1713 for the Structure of the Law of War
- 2.2.7. Diplomatic Conflict Resolution
 - 2.2.7.1. The Transfer of Rulers
 - 2.2.7.1.1. Stanislaus Leszinski (1677 – 1766), King of Poland 1704 – 1709, 1733 – 1734, Duke of Lorraine 1737 – 1766
 - 2.2.7.1.2. Francis Stephen (1708 – 1765), Duke of Lorraine 1729 – 1737, Grand Duke of Tuscany 1737 – 1765, as Francis I., Roman Emperor 1745 – 1765
 - 2.2.7.2. Treaties on Marriages and other Treaties
 - 2.2.7.2.1. Louis XIV (1638 – 1715, ruled 1643 – 1715, after the Peace of the Pyrenees of 1659 Marriage in 1660 with Maria Theresa, Daughter of King Philipp IV of Spain (1638 – 1683)
 - 2.2.7.2.2. Protestant Succession in the United Kingdom
 - 2.2.7.2.3. The Pragmatic Sanction
- 2.2.8. Military Conflict Resolution
 - 2.2.8.1. The War of the Spanish Succession (1701 – 1713/14)
 - 2.2.8.2. The War of the Austrian Succession (1740 – 1748)
 - 2.2.8.3. The War of the Bavarian Succession (1778 – 1779)
- 2.2.9. The Consequences of the Separation of Person and Office in Political Theory and in the Practice of Rule
 - 2.2.9.1. The Increase of the Significance of the *lois fondamentales*
 - 2.2.9.2. The Stabilisation of Institutions of Territorial Rule
 - 2.2.9.3. The Decline of the Number of Legitimate War Aims
 - 2.2.9.4. The Bureaucrtisation of Rule
 - 2.2.9.5. The Formation of Collective identities and Climate Theory
 - 2.2.9.6. The Increase of the Political Significance of Linear Borders
 - 2.2.9.6.1. Border Control against Deserters
 - 2.2.9.6.2. Passports
 - 2.2.9.6.3. Political Concepts of „Natural Frontiers“
 - 2.2.9.7. The Emergence of National Language Standards in the Eighteenth Century
- 2.2.10. The Military Consequences of the Separation of Person and Office in the Theory and Practice of War
 - 2.2.10.1. The Depersonalisation of Military Service
 - 2.2.10.2. „Men of the King“ as Soldiers in Service of the State
 - 2.2.10.3. The Dual Role of the Armed Forces as Providers of Security against External Threats and as Instruments to Enforce Order Domestically
 - 2.2.10.3.1. Units of Warriors against Enemies from the Outside
 - 2.2.10.3.2. Units for the Domestic Enforcement of Order and Security within the State

3. The State, the Ethics of Self-Constraint and the Law of War

- 3.1. Patterns of Action versus patterns of behaviour Max[imilian] Weber's (1864 – 1920) Sociology
 - 3.1.1. The Problematique of the Notion of „Social Disciplining“
 - 3.1.2. Max Weber and the „Protestant Ethics“ (1904-05)
 - 3.1.3. Gerhard Oestreich's Habilitation Thesis on Justus Lipsius (posthumously published in 1989)
 - 3.1.4. Research on Johannes Althusius as Chief of the Administration in the City of Emden (Frisia)
 - 3.1.5. The Expansion of the Concept of Social Disciplining and the Critique of the Concept
 - 3.1.5.1. Ronnie Po-chia Hsia, *Social Discipline in the Reformation* (1992)
 - 3.1.5.2. Robert von Friedeburg, *Sündenzucht und sozialer Wandel* (1993)
 - 3.1.5.3. Susanna Burghartz, ‚Disziplinierung oder Konfliktregelung? Zur Funktion städtischer Gerichte im Spätmittelalter: Das Zürcher Ratsgericht‘, in: *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* 16 (1989), S. 385-407.
 - 3.1.5.4. Stefan Breuer, ‚Sozialdisziplinierung. Probleme und Problemverlagerungen eines Konzeptes bei Max Weber, Gerhard Oestreich und Michel Foucault‘, in: *Soziale Sicherheit und soziale Disziplinierung*, hrsg. von Christian Sachsse und Florian Tennstedt (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1985), S. 45-69. Hans Maier, ‚Sozialdisziplinierung – ein Begriff und seine Grenzen‘, in: *Glaube und Eid*, hrsg. von Paolo Prodi (München: Oldenbourg, 1993), S. 237-240 (Schriften des Historischen Kollegs. Kolloquien 28.) Ralf Pröve, ‚Dimension und Reichweite der Paradigmen „Sozialdisziplinierung“ und „Militarisierung“ im Heiligen Römischen Reich‘, in: *Institutionen, Instrumente und Akteure sozialer Kontrolle und Disziplinierung im frühneuzeitlichen Europa*, hrsg. von Heinz Schilling (Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1999), S. 65-85 (Studien zur europäischen Rechtsgeschichte. 127.) Mohammed Rassem, ‚Bemerkungen zur „Sozialdisziplinierung“ im frühmodernen Staat‘, in: *Zeitschrift für Politik*, N F., Bd 30 (1983), S. 217-238. Winfried Schulze, ‚Gerhard Oestreichs Begriff der Sozialdisziplinierung der Frühen Neuzeit‘, in *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* 14 (1987), S. 371-411
 - 3.1.5.5. Looking Back: The Retrospectiveness of the Concept of Social Disciplining (there is no contemporary phrase for this concept)
 - 3.1.5.6. Problems with Determining what is „Social“ in Disciplining
 - 3.1.5.7. Problems with Determining Norm and Deviation of Behaviour
 - 3.1.5.8. Problems of Applying the Concept of Social Disciplining at the Level of International Relations (research being focused on domestic aspects of social organization supports the wrong impression that the ethics of self-constraint had no relevance in international relations.)
- 3.2. The State as the Institutional Result of the Application of the Ethics of Self-Constraint
 - 3.2.1. The Change of the Concept of Power from Personal Gift to Institutional Asset
 - 3.2.2. The Genesis of Statistics

3.3. The Law of War (International Law) as the Normative Result of the Application of the Ethics of Self-Constraint

3.3.1. Treaties as Instruments of Setting International Law

3.3.2. Collections of Treaties between States as Expression of Efforts to Document Positive

4. The Historicity of Diplomacy

5. The Historicity of Warfare

6. The Embeddedness of Diplomacy and War into Culture