

1 | Raison d'etat

Each state depended on the other. The well being of the state justified whatever means were employed to further it. The national interest supplanted the medieval notion of a universal morality.
— KBhHIST201Kissinger

A method of "sensible government" that promises to set aside personal ideological differences for the betterment of the country as a whole.

This makes politics non-secular, which means... Nonsecular wars less violent than holy wars because CLAIM KBhHIST201Kissinger: they did not involve emotion

1.1 | Exhibit A: France!

KBhHIST201FrenchRichelieuAndRaisonDeEtat

1.2 | Exhibit B: Federick the Great

CLAIM @KBhHIST201Kissinger: Federick the Great's decision to invade Silesia was pure strategy move

1. Conquest made Prussia a "*bona-fide* Great Power"
2. Prussia joined by France, Spain, etc. in war of 1740-1748
3. In 1756-1763, switched sides

CLAIM @KBhHIST201Kissinger: the side-switching was a pure result of calculations of benefit

1.3 | Failure and Overextension

CLAIM @KBhHIST201Kissinger — too much power without morality is no good, for instance

1.3.1 | Exhibit B: Still France!

- **Louis XIV**, under the guidance of KBhHIST201FrenchRichelieuAndRaisonDeEtat, gone trigger happy on the expansion
- Ultimately, this is detrimental
 - When most states starts being fully rational and not at all moral, this becomes less fun
 - If no one else is expanding, a country will keep taking advantage of others, which... does not make you a lot of friends

Under Raison d'etat, "The stronger would seek to dominate, and the weaker would resist by forming coalitions to augment their individual strengths"