**IUC Dubrovnik**

**Course: Social Philosophy**

Course directors: Dragica Vujadinovic; David Rasmussen; Patrice Canivez; Hauke Brunkhorst

**Time: 13.-18. 05. 2024**

**Topic: Peace, War and International Ordering**

***Course Description***

A never-ending chain of violence, massive human rights violations and ever more dirty wars began right after the second world war. However, these wars could be kept limited and to a considerable extend under international control – thanks to the UN system of ordering. Moreover, and worse, the Global South had to bear the brunt of the wars, and the members of the Western and Eastern Military Alliances experiences a long period of peace – thanks to the crying injustice of the unequal relations between the Global North and the Global South. With the implosion of the Soviet empire peace ended in the European part of the Global North in 1990 when the war of secession in former Yugoslavia broke out. Then came the criminal wars of aggression against Iraq 2003 and Ukraine 2022 that was called by the respective super-power a “military operation”, and hit the UN system lately. The war in Ukraine came closer than anything ever before to the stage of escalation (atomic war). Latest now, it is time to think about a new global ordering, and to do that on political, sociological, cultural, economic and legal levels of disciplinary engagement. (see also the two abstracts below).

Additional remark 2024: And now? – In World society every war is a world war, bigger of smaller. Since October 2023 we have two of them which are confronting directly most of the Global West with the Global East, and most of the Global North with the Global South, and on both sides we have *to a certain extend* (more or less) democratic and *to a certain extend* (more or less) authoritarian regimes, states, political organizations, civil war parties, small and big companies, and we have coalitions and more or less dense networks between all of them and many individual players, quickly & digitally associated groups, campaigns, movement, coming as suddenly as they go, on both sides of the front lines and inbetween, often confusing and unclear. (HB)

**Program**

**13.5. Monday**

13.00 Sequoya Yiaueki: Knowing Others: Social Ethics and Political Imagination

14.00 Dragica Vujadinović (University of Belgrade, Law): Theoretical-methodological premises of a feminist perspective

15.00 Tonci Valentic (University of Zagreb, Sociology): The End of Political Subject - Wars Without Revolutions

**19.00 Dinner Together**

**14. 5. Tuesday**

10.00 Stephan Kirste (Uni Salzburg, Law): Law and War

11.00 Patrice Canivez (Université Charles-der-Gaulle – Lille 3, Philosophy): A Few Post-Kantian Reflections on War and Peace in a Globalized World

12.00 Lucas Gontijo (Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte): The dismantling of human rights as a result of the rise of nationalism: study on the growth of authoritarianism as an effect of neoliberal subjectivity

**13.00 Lunch**

**15.5. Wednesday**

10.00 Christiane Bender (Helmut Schmidt Universität Hamburg, Sociology): New Realities of Power without a New World Order?

11.00 William Outhwaite (University of Newcastle, Sociology): Internal emigration revisited

12.00 Hauke Brunkhorst (Uni Flensburg, Sociology): The Democratic Disciplinary Subject—An Evolution in Three Phases: Revolution, Militarization, Emancipation

**13.00 Lunch**

**16.5. Thursday**

10.00 Gertrud Koch (FU-Berlin/ Uni Lüneburg, Film-Studies): The War of Drones

11.00 Gorm Harste (University of Aarhus, Staatswissenschaft): Unruly War

**12.00 Lunch**

14.00 David Rasmussen (Boston College, Philosophy): Constitutionalism, Interest and the Reconstruction of the Political (Remote)

15.00 Carsten Schlüter-Knauer (FH Kiel/ Kieler Sozialwissenschaftliche Revue):Tönnies‘ Friedensschriften *und* die Macht (Remote)

**16.00 Coffee in the Grand Café**

**17.5. Friday**

10.00 Final Discussion

**13.00 Lunch**

**28.5. Saturday**

Excursion to Lokrum with final discussions

**Further Participating:** David Spence (formerly EU Commission. His last role was in the External Action Service), Sead Međedović, PhD-Student from Belgrade; Marina Valadares, PhD-student from Belo Horizonte.

.

**Mail-Addresses**

gertrud.koch@posteo.de; dragicav@ius.bg.ac.rs; brunkhorst@uni-flensburg.de; tonci.valentic@zg.t-com.hr; patrice.canivez@univ-lille.fr; sequoya.yiaueki@univ-lille.fr; david.rasmussen@bc.edu; rasmussd@bc.edu; GHA@ps.au.dk; William.Outhwaite@newcastle.ac.uk; nabilaabbas@hotmail.de; bender@hsu-hh.de; Stephan.Kirste@sbg.ac.at; alvarengagontijo@gmail.com; spencedavid1946@gmail.com

**Abstracts**

**Gertrud Koch**

**The War of Drones**

It seems that the cold war doctrine of controlled peace thru control of weapons at the level of international agreements comes to an end. Under the umbrella of high tech weaponry that needs global financing new technologies evolved on a consumer level that allow unforeseeable participation in violent acts, militant border crossings or hackings of security and infrastructural IT-systems by partisan groups and states that aren’t global players. The technological digital revolution changes the balance in the world order.

**William Outhwaite**

**Internal emigration revisited**

The term ‘innere Emigration’ seems to have become current in Germany, for obvious reasons, around 1933. In the years following World War Two, it was the focus of acrimonious exchanges in West Germany between exiles and those who had remained in Germany or Austria. This paper examines these dilemmas and the broader sense of dissociation from political regimes seen as irremediably flawed or evil, with particular attention to the current situation in Russia.

**Carsten Schlüter-Knauer**

**Tönnies‘ Friedensschriften *und* die Macht**

Die Kulturindustrie machte nach dem Ende des Kalten Krieges aus der Friedenssehnsucht eine belächelte Phrase: >Was ist das Wichtigste für unsere Gesellschaft?<: >Weltfrieden< (Donald Petrie/Marc Lawrence, 2000, Miss Congeniality: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AfhVRAA4oGM>).

Solcherweise soll Tönnies‘ >ideeller< Begriff des politischen Körpers, sein Normaltyp des Staates, den >Weltfrieden< als modernes Entwicklungsziel < >souveräner Macht< keinesfalls ins Auge nehmen. Vielmehr ist es ihm eine *soziologisch >feststellbare Tatsache<*, >daß der Krieg und seine Folgen von den denkenden Menschen als ein ungeheures Uebel *immer mehr* erkannt wird …<. Die damaligen politischen Kollektivmächte gäben aber nur >schattenhafte Umrisse dessen…, was werden könnte, wenn die Vernunft .. die Oberhand gewönne über Tendenzen der … Zerstörung und Vernichtung<.

Auch wenn Tönnies 1926 einen sozialen und humanitären Kerngedanken in den >*demokratischen Republiken* Europas< implementierbar sieht, dessen supranationale sozialstaatliche Vertiefung die politische Voraussetzung sei, um den >Weltfrieden in einigem Maße< zu sichern, so lässt sich an seiner Kritik der Naivität damaliger Europaprojekte ablesen, in welcher Richtung er denkt. Die Einigung eines europäischen Staatenkomplexes müsse machtvoll ausgestattet sein, so dass keine der Großmächte mit ihm >zu spielen geneigt sein möchte<. Allerdings konstatiert er, dass Bündnisse von inneren Differenzen in ihrer Wirkungsmacht begrenzt werden und sich ihnen andere entgegensetzen könnten, weshalb die Kriegsgefahr bleibe, auch wenn sie zumindest >die Entstehung von Kriegen unwahrscheinlicher< machen würden. Warum es im Unterschied zu bisherigen Provisorien einer an den politisch herzustellenden >einmütigen Willen der gesamten Menschheit< gebundenen überterritorialen Zwangsgewalt bedürfte, was begrifflich an Hobbes als Richtschnur anknüpft.

Arno Mohr verweist darauf, dass Tönnies in seinen Friedensschriften Hobbes‘ rationales Naturrecht und die aufklärerischen Ideen Kants modifiziert. Der Vortrag will daran anknüpfend ideengeschichtlich-vergleichend zeigen, wie Tönnies Impulse von Hobbes, Abbé de Saint-Pierre, Rousseau und Kant in einer Weise aufnimmt, die sowohl zu realistischen Einsichten in das Verhältnis von Krieg und Frieden als auch wenigstens zu Maßstäben inkrementeller politischer Vorschläge führt.

**Hauke Brunkhorst**

**The Democratic Disciplinary Subject—An Evolution in Three Phases: Revolution, Militarization, Emancipation**

Modern democracy has subjective premises which are enmeshed with the structure of modern society, and which Hegel calls its *objective spirit* as distinct from its *subjective spirit*. I roughly distinguish three phases of development of the *subjective spirit* (or human subjectivity) since the outbreak of the great constitutional revolutions of the 18th century.

The *first* phase is that of the *revolutionary enthusiasm* of the 1780s and 1790s, followed by a longs period of constitutional fiver, wars and revolutions not only in the Atlantic and Caribbean but also in the Pacific world region. It also was the period of the birth of the *soldat-citoyen*. The entire period of revolutionary enthusiasm between 1750 and 1850 became (latest since 1810) a first period of world revolutions.

The *second* phase, between about 1850 and 1950, is that of the *male-determined “democratic” disciplinary subject*, which is just as optimally adapted to the existing ruling structure of the “most fateful power of our modern life: capitalism” (Weber) as it is to the capitalist but autonomously operating national state.

This development phase, which lasted until about 1950, is followed by a *third* one, in which, accompanied by massive setbacks, a highly diversified, autonomous subject of democratic self-determination appears to be hesitantly emerging in *a single*, global society: the *post-heroic democratic subject* which is due to a global series of (1) social, (2) gender/ sexual and (3) national/racial inclusive global movements and campaigns.