



A Socio-Historical Analysis of Machiavelli's Political Thought in

The Prince and The Discourses

Asst. Prof. Dr. Mahir Abdulwahid Aziz

Social Work Department – College of Arts – Salahaddin University - Erbil

mahir.aziz@su.edu.krd

Abstract

This theoretical socio-historical study tries to elaborate and analyze the place of power in the state in Machiavelli's political thought. It will explore Machiavelli's thought through his major works: *The Prince*, and *The Discourses*. In doing so, the study will try to answer the following major questions: To what extent does Machiavelli represent the realistic school of political thought? Was Machiavelli a Machiavellian? To What extent did he deserve his negative reputation? Why has Machiavelli's use of the distinction between mean and ends in politics caused moral concern? The study illustrates the historical situation in Italy from the late fifteenth century to the mid-sixteenth century. The study will offer a detailed discussion of the concepts of *Virtù* and *Fortuna* which are central to Machiavelli's theory of government. By bringing all these together, the study tries to demonstrate that Machiavelli was not amoral and that the maxim that the 'end justifies the means' attributed to him is inaccurate. Machiavelli has, indeed, become a synonym for 'cunning, crafty, guileful, and deceitful'. Hence the term "Machiavellian" - is a concept that is likely to remain with us regardless of historical accuracy. This study also examines the place of Machiavelli's *Prince* in the history of ethics and the history of leadership philosophy. The study argues that Machiavelli was not a 'Machiavellian', because he advances an ethical system for leadership that involves uprooting corruption and establishing rule of law. Machiavelli's main arguments were stated in his two famous works, namely, '*The Prince*' and '*The Discourses*'. Both can be seen as prescriptions for the maintenance of political stability in two different regimes: 'Principalities in *The Prince*, and 'Republics' in *The Discourses*. However, it is not easy to understand either of the above without acute knowledge of the Italian state of affairs during Machiavelli's time.

Keywords: Machiavellian, fortune, virtue, the end, the means



Introduction

This study tries to answer the following major questions: To what extent does Machiavelli represent the realistic school of political thought? Was Machiavelli a Machiavellian? To What extent did he deserve his negative reputation? Why has Machiavelli's use of the distinction between mean and ends in politics caused moral concern? In doing that the study has been divided into eight sections; section one is devoted for the introduction. The second section explains the objectives of the study and the method. Section three treats the issue of Machiavelli as represented the Realistic School of Political Thought. Section four illustrates the historical situation in which Italy facing during the late fifteenth-century to the mid-sixteenth century. Section five focused on the two major books of Machiavelli, namely *The Prince* and *The Discourses*. Section six devoted to define and analyzes the meaning of *Virtù*: *Virtue* and *Fortuna*: *Fortune* in Machiavelli's Political Thought. Section seven is assessing the American political scientist Wolin in his claim that Machiavelli was advocating an economy of violence. Section eight in devoted for the discussion and the conclusion of the study.

During the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century, Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527), belonged to a period before the reformation. His status as the first political scientist has significantly increased since he died in (1527). Until recent years he was acknowledged as a major political thinker of the early sixteenth century. Machiavelli's contributions to political thought are so great that the American political scientist Sheldon Wolin (1922-2015), and many other scholars call him 'the first truly political thinker'. Machiavelli was a pragmatist and realist who was more concerned with what was happening in practice, than dwelling upon what would be nice in theory. This, however, led him to distance himself from his contemporary writers and challenge the Christian morality of his time, with a new moral view of politics. The British intellectual historian and political scientist Quentin Skinner accused him of being a preacher of evil, (Skinner,1978: 137). Machiavelli was born in (1469) in Florence to an old citizen family, whose name has become a byword for perfidy within political life since he wrote 1513 his treatise on how to rule, *Il Principe* (Machiavelli,1975). The superficial is those who, based on reading solely of *The Prince* and believe that Machiavelli was cunning, unscrupulous, and amoral cynics i.e. to be Machiavellian. 'The Prince' had a bad reputation, partly because of tradition, and because it is more often cited than read. (Machiavelli,1975: 10). If, as Aristotle says, 'the purpose of the state is to secure the good life' (Skinner, 1981: 59), should the state not take the necessary means to ensure it can carry out that function? This may sound like a pretext for fascism, but, as is shown later, Machiavelli strictly limits the use of these necessary means. We may not, quite understandably, be entirely comfortable with Machiavelli's methods, but we cannot condemn the end: after all, the end is nothing more than self-determination - an idea accepted today as a fundamental principle of democratic freedom, international law, and good governance. The corrupt, meanwhile, tend to be cunning, unscrupulous, and amoral cynics who selectively use 'The Prince' as a manual for life. From the main works of Machiavelli, namely 'The Prince', 'The Discourses', and to a lesser extent 'The Art of War', a composite picture of Machiavelli's view of politics can be discerned. This picture should modify the common perception of Machiavelli, although it will not change it entirely. Machiavelli sees politics 'as a battle-a constant struggle for power. (Hale,1966: 29). Machiavelli maintained that the state must do its best to gain the consent of people by 'the use of laws, political institutions, and habits of civility'. (Wolin,1961: 223). In short, there is no doubt that Machiavelli presented a political philosophy in his *Principe* which served as a handbook of political guidance to many a modern ruler. Among those who have personified 'Machiavellianism', to a greater or lesser degree, are Frederick the Great, Richelieu, Napoleon, Bismarck, Metternich, Clemenceau, Lenin, Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini, Muammar Gaddafi, Saddam Hussein to cite but a few among the many who were schooled - or schooled themselves - by Machiavelli. (Abraham,1954: 26-27).

The Objectives of the Study and the Method

This study does not pretend to submit Machiavelli's ethical theory to a detailed critical examination. Its main intention is to elaborate and analyze the place of power in the state in Machiavelli's political thought, followed by an analysis of the historical situation in Italy from the late fifteenth-century to the mid-sixteenth century. The objectives are: firstly, to elaborate and discuss his major contribution in the field of political theory by focusing on his very famous treatise 'The Prince' published in (1513),



secondly, to problematize the main points on which Machiavelli focused in his realistic arguments in his second book, 'The Discourses' written in (1531) which reveals his fundamental preference for a republican state. The main argument of the study is that Machiavelli was not a 'Machiavellian', because he advances an ethical system for leadership that involves uprooting corruption and establishing rule of law. Methodologically, the study lies at the intersection of sociology, political science, and political theory. It should be emphasized that this study has been done according to a historical and explanatory approach method, which is applied in both fields of political theory and political sociology. The explanatory approach is a method to make us understand something by describing and illustrating.

Machiavelli and the Realistic School of Political Thought

According to James Loucks, Machiavelli is generally regarded as one of the founders of the 'realistic' school of political thought. His teaching is based on a conception of human nature which sees man as irrational, selfish, and driven only by necessity. Machiavelli denies the influence of transcendental norms on human behavior. He seeks to account for social phenomena in empirical terms. Here he encounters the same kind of dilemma which confronts many of the realistic thinkers who came after him. This is to explain the transition of depraved man from the elemental state of isolation into the state of society. One may say that man was driven by the necessity to join with others for mutual security. But this can only account for an immediate necessity and implies a simple form of union. The bond would be dissolved as soon as the necessity has passed. In the absence of a rational foresight that could influence the will there can be neither the obligation nor incentive to retain the forms which were hastily devised to meet a specific situation. For Machiavelli, human nature is the primary obstacle to the formation of political order. Political order is exceedingly difficult to establish and impossible to maintain in perpetuity because humans are inherently selfish, violent, and bent on domination. Yet human nature is also an opportunity for the rare individual, the heroic political actor, to create order out of this seemingly unpromising material. The prince must make humans ready for the introduction of order by temporarily disciplining their destructive, primordial nature. Only then can he introduce or reintroduce laws and institutions. The harsh, deceitful, and, according to conventional standards, cruel methods used by the prince to restrain the worst effects of human nature are advocated by Machiavelli because no alternatives exist. The prince himself, and the methods by which he must establish order, are not the end, but the beginning. The goal of the prince is to establish a state that can outlive the prince himself. This is possible only through the introduction of "modes and orders" through which those whom the prince reduces to obedience learn to govern themselves. The desire to dominate, which must first be subdued by the prince, must later be incorporated into the prince's political vision, for it can never be eliminated from human nature. The prince must harness the desire to dominate, transforming it from the chief obstacle to order into an ingredient of state-building. The founders of great People accomplished this by arming their citizens and creating a citizen army. (Loucks, 2000: 10-11).

Italy during the late fifteenth-century to the mid-sixteenth century

Machiavelli's philosophy could not be properly comprehended unless it is regarded in the political setting of his time. Machiavelli had been expelled from his beloved Florence in (1512) when the Medici had returned to power. Being a political exile, one of the quite apparent reasons for writing *The Prince* was his hope of regaining the favor of the Medici. (Abraham, 1954: 25). Historically speaking, fifteenth and sixteenth-century Europe was very much approved of war and recognized its virtues e.g. knights were provided opportunities for gain, kings ways to extend their domain, and the two provided a means to channel conflict outside of their realm. (Bush, 1967: 102). If we look back to the sixteenth century, we can observe that Machiavelli stands outside the main tradition of European political thought. He thinks and speaks of government differently from the most medieval political theological thinkers, and different too from the great writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The political theory of these two centuries was rooted for the most part, in theology. (Plamenatz, 1963: 1). The historical situation of Machiavelli's time had a significant influence on the way he saw the use of power and violence. His historical period was full of growing conflict and corruption. Therefore, it is not wondering that he could see the use of violence as the best way to bring about safety and stability. An important characteristic of any Italian state seeking to resist foreign domination was to adopt a



ruthless attitude towards external aggressor(s). During his life span, Italy suffered from incessant and brutal warfare. The Italian states were crushed by rival ambitions of foreign powers. At the age of twenty-five, he witnessed the Spanish invasion of Naples. Indeed, Machiavelli was very conscious of the weakness of Italy in the last years of the fifteenth century, disturbed by Venice and Naples being dominated by Spanish powers. In 1494, France invaded Florence; this was an even greater setback for Machiavelli who devoted his life to serving Florence and engaged in Florentine public affairs. The events of the last years of the fifteenth century made a deep and lasting impression on Machiavelli (Machiavelli,1975: 11-12). Machiavelli saw the collapse of the Medici and was depressed by the instability of a government not based on the goodwill of the people, he witnessed the strife of the Florentine factions during the stormy period of Savonarola's domination and realized the need for a powerful government based on internal unity. In 1498 when he was about thirty of age he was appointed secretary and second canceller, his work brought him mainly diplomatic responsibilities. Machiavelli was employed on administrative and military errands and held office for fourteen years until the downfall of the republic in 1512. (Machiavelli,1975: 12-15). The ongoing power struggle between nations left a deep impression on Machiavelli that politics is about managing power: acquiring, maintaining, and executing it with precision. The correct use of power will enhance the sovereignty and stability of a state. Machiavelli favored a strong state – powerful at the center, capable of imposing its authority on a hopelessly divided Italy. He continuously stresses that the Prince must build his state on the goodwill of the people. (Machiavelli,1975: 16). Machiavelli never really intended to have 'The Prince' give a general theory of politics. It was simply designed to portray the customs, the ways of thinking, and the general demeanor of the times. It was a political masterpiece, written for Machiavelli's contemporaries. It was meant for the Italians of a definite period in history - and perhaps not even for all Italians of his time, but chiefly for the Medici and those other influential contemporaries who were in a position to unify Italy and enhance its prestige. (Abraham,1954: 26). He was interested in the state, rather than in form of its government, and the state as a 'self-sufficient' entity in continual conflict with other states.

5. The Prince and The Discourses

Whenever a state is founded, the founder must rely upon force, first to seize power, then to ensure the adoption of his orders. Romulus needed to make himself obeyed by people who were more like beasts than men. As pointed out by Quentin Skinner, in 'The Prince', which is based on Machiavelli's fifteen years' experience in chancery service, and aims to offer so many crucial advice to the Princes, he repeatedly declared that the main goal of a new ruler was to 'preserve the existing state of affairs and attainment of worldly honor and glory. (Skinner, 1978: 29-30). Machiavelli wrote that '[f]or anyone who sets out to play the part of the virtuous man on all occasions is bound to come to grief among so many who are not virtuous. (Machiavelli,1992: 67). But as a general rule, the prince should "seem to be merciful, true to his word, humane, honest, and religious, and he really should have those qualities". (Machiavelli,1992: 75). In both books; 'The Prince and later 'The Discourses', Machiavelli stresses that in case of advanced political corruption, it will always be necessary to rely on the strong rule of a single man to restore the pristine Virtù of a commonwealth, but the states in 'The Discourses', that his preference will always be for a life of political liberty, and hence for the republican form of Government. (Skinner,1978: 124). The British philosopher, and political theorist Isaiah Berlin (1909 -1997), pointed out that in 'The Prince' Machiavelli preferred the republican form of the constitution to the democratic one. Broadly, Machiavelli is a political theorist; he fairly bristles with generalizations, which are convenient to the classical world on one hand, and to the modern one on another hand. Furthermore, he divorces political behavior as a field of study from the theological world picture. (Berlin,1979: 74). Machiavelli sees the job of the Prince as the establishment of the rule of law. The Prince may act in whatever way necessary to establish stability (and certainly Machiavelli suggests many ruthless and draconian measures), but it is for that particular purpose only that he may use such measures and no other. Contrary to the popular perception, at no point does Machiavelli support tyranny (i.e. Rule by one person in his interest); for example, he declares that "a prince who does what he likes is a lunatic". (Machiavelli,1983: 257). The Prince's role is an interim one: effectively his job is to put himself out of a job. When the proper laws and institutions are established, and the virtue of the populace has been restored, the populace will be fit to govern itself. The state becomes a republic, the type of government which Machiavelli feels is best because 'alike in goodness and glory the populace is far superior'. (Machiavelli,1983: 256). Machiavelli, however, believes that men are never content with what they have; their ambition will cause corruption to spread, and the state will return to the beginning of the cycle again. Thus the state constantly changes corruption and Virtù dominates in turn. As can be seen, Machiavelli's opin-



ions and arguments are very broad. The choice of government is reduced to principality or republic, and even then he never fully explains what course the government should take in terms of a legislative program. There is much talk of good laws and institutions, but he does not elaborate further making it different to conceive of a typical Machiavellian system. Machiavelli's methods are more often than not described as amoral. This is at best over-simplistic, and worst incorrect. It is over-simplistic in the sense that Machiavelli advocated behavior that we might consider amoral only in limited circumstances, i.e. when the liberty of the state was threatened. He never suggested that amoral actions should be the norm. As was shown earlier in this study, he believed that man should act in a way appropriate to the times, and this rule applied to morality. It is simply not practical to take the moral line always. Machiavelli states 'A prince who desires to maintain himself must learn to be not always good, but to be so or not as necessity may require... Nor need he be about incurring censure for such vices, without which the preservation of his state may be difficult'. (Machiavelli,1975: chapter xv). In *The Discourses*, Machiavelli shows a radically different outlook on the world of politics. In this carefully argued commentary on Livy's history of republican Rome, Machiavelli proposed a system of government that would uphold civic freedom and security by instilling the virtues of active citizenship, and that would also encourage citizens to put the needs of the state above selfish, personal interests. Ambitious in scope, but also clear-eyed and pragmatic, *The Discourses* creates a modern theory of republic politics.

The meaning of Virtù and Fortuna in Machiavelli's Political Thought

Machiavelli goes much further in this sense, coining a whole new set of ideas and concepts for concretely thinking and explaining political action in the human realm. To do so, he originally reworks traditional concepts against the tradition itself. In this section, I try to explain how he does this in his use of the categories of virtù, fortuna, necessity, and occasion. These categories traditionally refer to the ontological structure of the universe. However, Machiavelli reworks them and transforms them into conceptual tools specifically adapted to understanding the political realm, and successfully acting in it. It should be noted here that two central concepts bind together his main political contribution into some sort of coherence. These concepts are "Virtù: Virtue" and "Fortuna: Fortune". Virtù: Virtue has no simple, direct English translation; commentators have described it as 'Vitality' or energy and courage. (Plamenatz,1963: 29). Usually, Virtù means something like 'ability', but it can mean 'strength' or even 'Virtue'. It is left untranslated so that you can make your own decisions about what Machiavelli means by it on a given occasion. Fortuna is a simpler concept than Virtue, not surprisingly, it is essentially fortune. This word occurs nearly 60 times in *The Prince*. Most occurrences of it could be translated as 'luck', but for Machiavelli, its meaning is broader than that-something more like 'circumstances beyond one's control'. The interplay between this and Virtù is a dominant theme in *The Prince*. So Fortuna is left un-translated except where Machiavelli writes of someone's private Fortuna, meaning his status or condition as an ordinary citizen (rather than someone with rank and power). Fortuna for Machiavelli is a sudden, awful, and challenging contingency of events arising unexpectedly. Machiavelli believes that circumstances, chance, or fortune can act as a restrictive force on our actions, but they need not determine our fate. In *The Prince* fortune is compared to a river: the river will be calm at times but will flood and cause damage to others. However, the flooding can be prevented simply by taking the precaution of building dykes and embankments. Secondly: "Virtù: Virtue", refers to the whole range of qualities the Prince may find necessary to acquire to maintain his state (Skinner,1978: 138), or 'the idea of the tremendous force of will and inner strength that will enable one to overcome the most recalcitrant opposition and to overcome the most perilous adversity'. (Wood,1965: 16). In addition, Virtù: is a quality that may be found in states as well as individuals. This civic virtue is "compounded of many ingredients: a balanced constitution; sound military organization; intelligently planned expansion; respect for religion and the Laws; and above all...Liberty (Anglo,1960: 102). Overcoming fortune requires Virtù; the Virtuous man will know how to act as fortune requires. "Success awaits the man whose actions are following the times, and failure the man whose actions are out of harmony with them" (Machiavelli,1992: 99),(Harris, 2006: 8-12). Many political philosophers have based their theories on the assumption that the individual is more important than the state - and indeed most people living in democracies would agree with them. Machiavelli, on the other hand, felt that such an idea was too simplistic and impractical. While John Locke contested that 'Liberty, is plain, consist in a power to do or not to do; to do or to forbear doing as we will' (Locke,1975: 270), Machiavelli would have pointed out that such liberty is contingent upon the state is free from external domination, and internal stability. Therefore, the priority of the state is to secure its liberty, to secure the liberty of its citizens. To this end, the state may use whatever means



necessary, '[if] or when the safety of one's country wholly depends on the decision to be taken, no attention should be paid to either justice or injustice, to kindness or cruelty, or to its being praiseworthy or ignominious. On the contrary, that alternative should be wholeheartedly adopted which will save the life and preserve the freedom of one's country. (Machiavelli, 1983: 515). If, as Aristotle says, the purpose of the state is to secure the good life (Aristotle, 1982: .59), should the state not take the necessary means to ensure it can carry out that function? This may sound like a pretext for fascism, but, Machiavelli strictly limits the use of these necessary means. As pointed out by the British political theorist Bernard Crick (1929-2008), Machiavelli's Necessity is only ever hypothetical or consequential: if you wish to achieve X, you must do Y and Z, but that does not necessarily mean X can always be attained as one cannot have any control over Fortuna. A prince must know how to act like a beast as well as a man. The prince needs the quality of Fox and Lion; Fox to analyze, and the Lion to be prepared to do what is necessary to do to save the state. We may not, quite understandably, be entirely comfortable with Machiavelli's methods, but we cannot condemn the end: after all, the end is nothing more than self-determination-an idea accepted as a fundamental principle of international law. As a methodology, Machiavelli tries to support his conclusions by an appeal to historical facts. His generalizations about men and government, as also his practical advice, are the fruits of his experience much more than of systematic readings. (Machiavelli, 1983: 155). As the times change, so the fortunes of states change. Thus, this change can also be attributed to the degeneration of Virtù into corruption on the part of both individuals and the populace as a whole. Machiavelli's advocacy of acting in harmony with the times, combined with his view of the role of the state, resulted in the prescriptions for different types of government at different times which are set out in 'The Prince' and 'The Discourses'. Essentially, Machiavelli believes in the need for two types of government: rule by the individual or a prince (a principality), which is necessary during a time of civic corruption; and rule by the people (a republic) during a time of stability. In 'The Discourses', Machiavelli wrote;

'Hence it is necessary to restore to extraordinary methods, such as the use of force and an appeal to arms, and before doing anything, to become a prince in the state, so that one can dispose of it as one thinks fit' (Machiavelli, 1983: 163).

During a period of corruption and instability in the state, Machiavelli believes that existing laws and institutions need radical change to return the state to order, and the only way to bring about these changes is to place a single person in charge of the state: the Prince. In 'The Discourses', Machiavelli wrote, 'One should take it as a general rule that rarely, if ever, does it happen that a state, whether it be a republic or a kingdom, is either well-ordered at the outset or radically transformed vis-a-vis its old institutions unless this is done by one person. (Machiavelli, 1983: 132).

Assessing Wolin's claim that Machiavelli was advocating an economy of violence

Sheldon Wolin maintains that while most political thinkers before Machiavelli accepted 'the elementary proposition that security for man is impossible unless it is conjoined with power (and using violence as the hardcore of exercising power)' it was Machiavelli who first declared 'power the dominant mark of the state' (Wolin, 1961: 220). Wolin however rejects the idea that Machiavelli was obsessed with power and the use of violence and asserts that what Machiavelli was advocating was an economy of violence. Wolin defines the economy of violence as a 'science of the controlled application of force (which) preserves the distinguishing line between political creativity and destruction' (Wolin, 1961: 221). He asserts that Machiavelli was only advocating such a controlled application of violence and maintained that 'every application (of violence) had to be considered judiciously' (Wolin, 1961: 222). Furthermore, Machiavelli believed that 'the indiscriminate exercise of force and the constancy revival of fear provoke the greatest of all dangers for the government' (Wolin, 1961: 222-223). Machiavelli's science of force, Wolin claims, required using a precise dosage of violence 'an appropriate tool to bring about political stability and reduce suffering in society. To minimize the need for violence, Machiavelli maintained that the state must do its best to gain the consent of people by 'the use of laws, political institutions and habits of civility' (Wolin, 1961: 223). Wolin also maintained that Machiavelli's views regarding the external forms of violence show much the same concern with the economy as the internal form of violence. According to Wolin's analysis, at the heart of Machiavelli's economy of violence is his recognition that power can be only maintained through various forms of coercion. And in turn, this is reflecting Machiavelli's perception of the world, which, considers mankind imperfect, and the political world unstable. It was such a viewpoint; Wolin claims that made Machiavelli see the use of violence as inevitable. In *The Prince*, Machiavelli suggested that a prince should not be worried 'about incurring reproach for those vices without which he can hardly



maintain his position as on contrary to people's belief if the prince practices 'some qualities that look like virtues' they might lead to his destruction, whereas 'other qualities that look like vices..... will bring him safety and well-being' (Machiavelli,1983: 66). Machiavelli asserted that using violence by a prince could bring about peace and keep the subjects of the prince united and loyal. Therefore, a prince who uses violence can be considered 'more merciful than those who. Through too much mercy, let evils continue, from which result in murders or plunder because the latter commonly harm a whole group, but those executions that come from the prince harm individuals only' (Machiavelli, 1983: 61-62). In *The Discourses*, Machiavelli reconfirmed much of what he had said in *The Prince* regarding the hardly used of violence and avoiding using cruel means which can lead to a hearted toward the ruler. A ruler he declared must always ensure that 'the force employed should be proportionate to the resistance offered' (Machiavelli,1983: 467). He also recommended that to gain the people's support, the ruler must act according to 'common humanity and demonstrate 'Kindness and generosity' (Machuiavelli,1983: 461). Machiavelli's major works seem to substantiate Wolin's claim that a major theme of Machiavelli's writings is the economy of violence. Machiavelli considered the use of violence by a ruler to preserve the state of affairs and achieve honor and glory as a justifiable action. To him, the use of violence was a necessary action to prevent society from destruction and anarchy.

8. Discussion and Conclusion

It has already been indicated at several points that this study is not intended as a thorough study of Machiavelli's political theory. Nor is it, in the full sense of the word, a comparative study of common elements in his approach to political problems. It deals primarily with certain common aspects of his work which have a bearing on

some of the most important questions facing modern political thought. I believe, however, that it has been shown that Machiavelli's thought is not purely empirical. It has set in a definite normative framework which makes it meaningful and worthy of being reckoned with in our modern situation. I have seen that Machiavelli's interpretation of social and historical facts was conditioned by his conception of the nature of man. It is an essential aspect of the inverse deductive method that empirical generalizations should accord with known principles of human nature. The relationship to the modern political thought of the question of politics and ethics as treated by Machiavelli is rather more obscure. There is a strong movement in modern political theory towards an extreme positivist position. This viewpoint insists that the political thinker qua scientist must put all questions of valuation aside and concern himself solely with the description and analysis of that aspect of behavior that we designate as political. All questions of ethics and all normative judgments are thought to be matters for philosophical speculation and beyond the scope of a genuine political science. Politics as an empirical realm is considered to be completely distinct from ethics which belongs to the normative realm.

Five hundred and seven years ago Machiavelli, in discussing the extent to which a ruler should deliberately use duplicity as an instrument of policy, pointed out that the wise ruler, though he would not hesitate to lie or break faith, would not do so more than was necessary, since if he did so, he would forfeit public confidence, and his efficiency would be reduced. Machiavelli's negative reputation as an immoral writer would be a mistaken generalization. Precisely, it is a wrong idea to classify Machiavelli's political thought based on our conception of morality, as our moral absolutism is simplistic. Wolin's interpretation is quite right that, for Machiavelli, there were two levels of morality or ethics: Public and Private. The moral worth of one was not inherently superior to the other, but if a conflict arose between the two then the one which would produce the most practical result should take precedence. In practice this meant, if necessary, taking publicly moral action (i.e. designed to secure the liberty of the state) at the short-term expense of private morality. As Wolin pointed out, 'The moral pathos resided in a situation, not where the end justifies the means, but where the end dictated means of a type which rendered both the wholly good man and the wholly evil man superfluous.' (Wolin, 1960: 208). Circumstances periodically require that the government acts in ways which, to Machiavelli, will be publicly moral, but privately immoral: so how, under our conception of morality, do we classify such actions? To say they are amoral is merely a deft way of avoiding the issue! Then, morality is a redundant concept in the characterization of Machiavelli. My intention in this study has not been to agree or disagree with any of Machiavelli's arguments; it has been solely to clarify that "to what extent did Machiavelli deserve his negative reputation"? And hopefully, to answer that, was he Machiavellian? It is appropriate to note that most people consider the adjective "Machiavellian" both pejorative and demeaning; it is usually used as



an insult. Most people have not read “The Prince”, but almost have an opinion about it anyway. Machiavelli’s work was exclusively for application in the public sphere; he was not concerned with private relations. The role of the government was to secure the stability, liberty, and self-determination of the state. Whether the state was a principality or a republic, the ruler was never to act in his interest; tyranny and corruption were despised and viewed as being entirely contrary to the interest of the state. Fortune was such that it was believed that the state would inevitably become corrupt at times, and on those occasions, a single ruler with great Virtù: would be needed to rebuild the legal system and the institution of normal government. When this framework was in place, the republican government could take over and the rule would be following public and private morality. Machiavelli would not have supported a general maxim that the end justifies the means; he believed that one particular end (Liberty) dictated the means. He was not amoral and unscrupulous: he simply believed that our morality was dangerously dogmatic, impractical, and irresponsible. Machiavelli can be regarded as the first political scientist because he analyzed power and the state. His ideas were shaped by his reading and his experience as a diplomat. Reflecting on history, Machiavelli presented Roman politics as a model for Europe in ‘The Discourses’. Moreover, he had established the authority of the roman republic by taking issue with classical political philosophy and with aristocratic Roman traditions. The British Renaissance historian John Hale, (1923-1999) argues that ‘if we are to think realistically about Politics, perhaps we still need the pugnacious common sense of Machiavelli the man; (Hale,1966: 33), and this would illustrate the positive “side” of Machiavelli’s political thought. Machiavelli was primarily and chiefly concerned with the practical goal of the national unification of Italy. Machiavelli is the first political thinker, in that he conceives of politics as a distinct activity, with rules of conduct quite separate from those of personal morality or religious ethics. Many of his ideas contain seeds for theories that are now considered important for leadership today.

Bibliography

Abraham, Henry J., (1953), Was Machiavelli a “Machiavellian”?, *Social Science*, Vol. 28, No. 1 (January 1953), pp. 25-29, : <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41884214>. Accessed: on 27th August 2021.

Anglo, Sydney, (1960), *Machiavelli: A Dissection*, The Camelot Press, London.

Berlin, Isaiah, (1979), *Against the current: essays in the history of ideas*, edited and with a bibliography by Henry Hardy; with an introduction by Roger Hausheer, Hogarth, London.

Bush, M. L., (1967), *Renaissance, Reformation, and the Quarter World: 1450 -1660*, Blandford Press, London.

Hale, J. R., (1966), “Machiavelli and the Self-sufficient State, in David Thomson (edt), *Political Ideas*, Penguin, London.pp:22-33.

Harris, Phillip, (2006), *Machiavelli: Marketing and Management*, Inaugural Professorial, <https://www.chester.ac.uk/sites/files/chester/Machiavelli.pdf>, PP: 1-32. 8, 12, October.

Locke. John, (1975), *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, (edt), Peter Nidditch, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Loucks, James, F., (2000), *The Empire of Human Nature: Machiavelli’s Appeal to the Ancient Republic and Montesquieu’s Critique of It*, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, submitted to the University of Toronto.

Machiavelli, Niccolo, (1975), *The Prince*, Translated by George Bull, Penguin, London.

Machiavelli, Niccolo, (1983), *The Discourses*, edited by, Bernard Crick (Introducer), Brian Richardson, Translated by Leslie Walker. Penguin, London.

Machiavelli, Niccolo, (1992), *The Prince*, Everyman’s Library Classics & Contemporary Classics, London.

Plamenatz, John, (1970), *Man and Society*, Longman, London.



Skinner, Quentin, (1978), The Foundations of Modern Political Thought: Vol. 1: The Renaissance, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Wolin, Sheldon. S, (1960), Politics and Vision: Continuity and Innovation in Western Political Thought, expanded ed. Princeton University Press.

Wood, N, (1965), Introduction in Niccolo Machiavelli, The Art of War, De Capo Press, New York.

تحليل اجتماعي - تاريخي للفكر السياسي لمكيافيلي في كتابه: الأمير والخطابات

أ. م. د. ماهر عبدالواحد عزيز

قسم الخدمة الاجتماعية - كلية الآداب - جامعة صلاح الدين - أربيل

الملخص

تحاول هذه الدراسة الاجتماعية - التاريخية النظرية شرح وتحليل مكانة السلطة في الدولة في الفكر السياسي لمكيافيلي. تحاول الدراسة أن تتطرق لفكر مكيافيلي من خلال عرض ومناقشة وتحليل كتابه المشهورين: الأمير، والخطابات. ولأجل القيام بذلك، ستحاول الدراسة الإجابة على الأسئلة الرئيسية التالية: إلى أي مدى يمثل مكيافيلي المدرسة الواقعية في الفكر السياسي؟ هل كان مكيافيلي ميكافيلياً؟ إلى أي مدى استحق مكيافيلي سمعته السلبية؟ لماذا تسبب استخدام مكيافيلي للتمييز بين الوسيلة والغاية في السياسة في إثارة قلق أخلاقي؟ تتطرق الدراسة وبإسهاب للوضع التاريخي في إيطاليا من أواخر القرن الخامس عشر إلى منتصف القرن السادس عشر. ستقدم الدراسة مناقشة مفصلة لمفهومى الفضيلة والحظ واللذين يعتبران مفهوميين مركزيين في نظرية مكيافيلي عن الحكومة. من خلال التطرق لكل هذه الجوانب معاً، تحاول الدراسة إثبات أن مكيافيلي لم يكن غير أخلاقي، وأن القول بأن «الغاية تبرر الوسيلة» المنسوبة إليه غير دقيقة. لقد أصبح مكيافيلي بالفعل مرادفاً لـ «الماكر والمكر والذنب والخداع». ومن ثم فإن مصطلح «ميكافيلي» - هو مفهوم من المرجح أن يبقى معنا بغض النظر عن الدقة التاريخية. تبحث هذه الدراسة أيضاً في مكانة كتاب الأمير لمكيافيلي في تاريخ الأخلاق وتاريخ فلسفة القيادة. تجادل الدراسة بأن مكيافيلي لم يكن «ميكافيلياً»، لأنه يقدم لنا نظاماً أخلاقياً للقيادة يتضمن اقتلاع جذور الفساد وإرساء سيادة القانون. تم ذكر الحجج الرئيسية لمكيافيلي في عمليه المشهورين، وهما «الأمير» و «الخطابات». يمكن اعتبار كلاهما وصفات للحفاظ على الاستقرار السياسي في نظامين مختلفين: «الإمارات في الأمير، و«الجمهريات» في الخطابات. ومع ذلك، ليس من السهل فهم أي مما سبق دون معرفة دقيقة بالحالة الإيطالية خلال فترة عيش مكيافيلي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: ميكافيلي، الحظ، الفضيلة، الغاية، الوسائل



شىكردنهۋەكى سۆسىۆ- مېژوۋىيى ھزرى سىياسى مىكافىلى
له ھەردوو كىتى مىر و گوتارەكان

پوختە

ئەم لىكۆلىپىنەۋە تىۋرىپە سۆسىۆ- مېژوۋىيە ھەۋلى باسكردن و شىكردنهۋە پىگە دەسەلات لە دەۋلەت لاي مىكافىلى داۋە بەپى شىكردنهۋە تاوتوۋىكردى ھەردو كىتپە بەناۋبانگەكەى: مىر و گوتارەكان. بەمەبەستى جىپەجىكردى ئەم كارە لىكۆلىپىنەۋەكە ھەۋلى ۋەلامدانەۋە ئەم پىسپارە سەرەكپانە ى خوارەۋە ى داۋە: ئاخۇ لەھىزى سىياسىدا مىكافىلى تا چ رادەپىك نوپنەراپەتى قوتابخانە ى رىالىستى دەكات؟ ئايا مىكافىلى مىكافىلىپى بوۋە؟ تا چ رادەپىك مىكافىلى شايستە ى ئەو ناۋبانگە نەرتىپەپە؟ بۇچى بەكارھىتپانە گوتە ى(ئامانچ پاساۋدەدات بە ئامرازىاخوس بلىپن ئامانچ پاكانە بۇ ھۆكار دەكات) لەسىاسەتدا كىشەپەكى رەۋشتى بۇ مىكافىلى ھىتپاە كاپەۋە؟ ئەم لىكۆلىپىنەۋەپە زۆر بە ووردى باس لە باردۇخى مېژوۋىيى سىياسى ئىتالىا لە كۆتاپى سەدەپە پازدەھەم تاكو كۆتاپى سەدەپە شازدەھەم دەكات. لىكۆلىپىنەۋەكە تاوتوۋىكردىكى ھەمەلاپەنەپە ھەردوو چەمكى خودباشى ھەل كە دوو چەمكى سەرەكپن لە تىۋرى مىكافىلى سەبارەت بە فەرمانرەۋاپى و حوكمەت. بە باسكردن و بەدۋاچوون بۇ ھەموو ئەۋلاپانانەۋە ئەم لىكۆلىپىنەۋەپە ھەۋلى داۋە كە بسەلمىتپن كە وا مىكافىلى بەدرەۋشت نەبوۋە لە پروانگەپە ھىزرى سىياسى و بەھۆپ گوتە ى(ئامانچ پاساۋدەدات بە ئامراز) ناۋپ مىكافىلى بەبى وردىپىنى كىردن ناۋزەردىكراۋە. ئەم لىكۆلىپىنەۋەپە ھەۋلى شىكردنهۋەپە كىتپى مىرداۋە بە تاپەتپە كە مىكافىلى سىياسەت بە كىردارىكى دوورلە پەۋشت دەپىنپت بەلام لە ھەمان كاتدا نەك بەم شىۋەپەپە كە مىر ھىچ رەۋشتىپە نەپىت. لە دىدى ئەۋەۋە سىياسەت ھونەرى دامەزىراندنپە دەۋلەتپكى تۆكەپە كە بتوانىت مسۆگەرىپە ئاساپى ھاۋلاتپەكانى بكات لە ناۋەۋە و لە دەرەۋەپەپە لە سنوورى ياسادا.

كىلپە ۋشەكان: مىكافىلىپى، خودباشى، ھەل، ئامانچ، ئامراز.