

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUTE STUDIES
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCIES
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

**THE POLITICAL PROGRAM OF NICCOLÒ MACHIAVELLI ON *THE PRINCE* AND
*THE DISCOURSES ON TITUS LIVY***

BY

TADIE DEGIE YIGZAW

May, 2014
Addis Ababa

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUTE STUDIES
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCIES
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

**THE POLITICAL PROGRAM OF NICCOLÒ MACHIAVELLI ON *THE PRINCE* AND
*THE DISCOURSES ON TITUS LIVY***

BY

TADIE DEGIE YIGZAW

ADVISOR

DAGNACHEW ASSEFA (PhD)

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY, SCHOOL OF
GRADUATE STUDIE, ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF ARTS IN PHILOSOPHY**

May, 2014
Addis Ababa

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUTE STUDIES
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCIES
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY**

**THE POLITICAL PROGRAM OF NICCOLÒ MACHIAVELLI ON *THE PRINCE* AND
*THE DISCOURSES ON TITUS LIVY***

BY

TADIE DEGIE YIGZAW

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS:

Advisor

Signature

Date

Examiner

Signature

Date

Examiner

Signature

Date

Chairman

Signature

Date

**May, 2014
Addis Ababa**

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge my advisor, Dr. Dagnachew Assefa, for his guidance, and support. This thesis would not have this form without his valuable comments and suggestions. I also would like to thank all the members of Addis Ababa University Department of Philosophy for their support in my ongoing quest for knowledge. I would like to thank Mekuriaw Asmare, who is a lecturer at Dilla University and now studying his PhD at Addis Ababa University, for his willingness to edit this thesis. I am grateful for my classmates, especially for Abraham Tsehay, Mengistu Alamenh, and Temesgen Brhanu, for our effective debates on Philosophical issues. Thanks for Tejitu Molla for her utter support during my education. Finally, I would like to express my internal gratitude for my family since my personality is their reflections.

Content	Page
Acknowledgments	i
List of Contents	ii
Abstract	iii
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Machiavelli's Political Program in <i>The Prince</i>	3
1.1 The Role of Machiavelli's Concept of Power in his Political Program.....	3
1.2 Machiavelli's Political Program in <i>The Prince</i> and Democracy	20
Chapter 2: The Role of Conventional Values in Machiavelli's Program in <i>The Prince</i>	26
2.1 The Role of Morality in Machiavelli's Political Program	26
2.2 The Role of Christianity in Machiavelli's Political Program.....	31
2.3 The Role of Machiavelli's Concept of <i>Virtù</i> in his Political Program	36
Chapter 3: Machiavelli's Political Program and Reason of State in <i>The Prince</i>	41
3.1 The Concept of Reason of State	41
3.2 The Role of Machiavelli's Reason of State in his Political Program.....	48
3.3 The Shifting Points of Machiavelli's Program from <i>The Prince</i> to <i>the Discourses</i>	53
Chapter 4: Machiavelli's Political Program in <i>the Discourses on Livy</i>	56
4.1 Indicators of Machiavelli's Political Program in <i>the Discourses</i>	56
4.2 The Aim of Machiavelli's Political Program in <i>the Discourses</i>	60
Conclusion	71
References	74

Abstract

The political thought of Niccolò Machiavelli is the most remarkable issues in the sphere of world politics. Due to his arguable political thought it is not possible to arrive at a common understanding in his works. Different thinkers interpreted his works differently in their understandings and they grouped him only from his particular work. Many thinkers consider him as advocator of tyranny due to his work in *The Prince*. On the other hand others grouped him as advocator of republicanism by considering his writing in *the Discourses*. Some thinkers consider him as a patriot that exhausted his whole life for his country. Some thinkers also consider his writings as inconsistent and unrelated to each other. Therefore, Machiavelli is one of the most misinterpreted thinkers in the world. But for me, his political thought should be understood in his totality since it is in this way that his political thought will be clear and understandable. Machiavelli had a political program of establishing republican system in Italy by considering the Romans republic as a model. He used *The Prince* as a necessary prerequisite to establish republican system in Italy. His republican system depends on his political program in *The Prince*. So, he developed his first political program to succeed his final political program in *the Discourses*. Therefore, my purpose in this thesis is to argue that the main goal of Machiavelli's political thought, in *The Prince* and *the Discourses*, was to establish republican system in Italy like the Romans. Therefore, the whole argument in this thesis revolves around this idea.

Introduction

Niccolò Machiavelli (1469-1527) was one of the most outstanding thinkers in his political thought. He was considered as a philosopher, a republican, the founder of political science, the “Old Nick”, and the like. Different thinkers interpreted his political thought differently. Many of them recognize him just from his view of politics in *The Prince*. Others grouped him as advocate of republican system by taking *the Discourses*. On rhetorical account, *The Prince* focuses on how to secure the state while *the Discourses* paying attention on how to govern a free republic. Still, some writers said that his political thought is inconsistent and unrelated to each other (Seaman 2007, pp. 1-3).

Thus, all these divergent thoughts show that there is no universal consensus in his political thought. But, for me, his political thought should be understood in his totality rather than his particular works like *The Prince* or *the Discourses*. His thought has negative as well as positive lessons. Machiavelli had a program of establishing Republican system in Italy by using *The Prince* as a means for *the Discourses*. His aim of writing *The Prince* was to make a strong national state of Italy under a princely rule.

Moreover, different people may pose the question of how do we know his program of establishing republican system by using *The Prince* (tyrannical system) as a means? There are different notions that show this program in *The Prince* and *the Discourses*. For example, Machiavelli (1996, p. 23), in *the Discourses*, argued that ‘It is necessary to follow the Roman order and not that of the other republics...to arrive at Roman greatness.’ It is evident that the establishment of the Roman republic was through fratricide. In *The Prince*, in the opening of chapter 1, Machiavelli (1903, p. 3) introduces two types of governments: republics and monarchy and he asserted that after he addresses monarchical system in *The Prince*, he will confirm the Roman republic as a model in *the Discourses*; that is, republican system is possible

after tyrannical beginning. Machiavelli (1903, p. 71) also declared that the “end justifies the means”; republican system is possible by using wicked means. *The Prince* is a means for *the Discourses*. *The Prince* is tyrannical in its nature and he used it to bring republican system. Therefore, the above thoughts give a clue about his program in general.

His political thought in *The Prince* is not conducive for human life but for him using any means that contributes for the triumph of his journey towards his aim are necessary. His political thought in *The Prince* and *the Discourses* seem inconsistent and self-contradictory but they are related to each other and consistent according to his program. His thought will be clear when we understood Machiavelli in his totality. Therefore, in this thesis I argue that the main goal of Machiavelli’s political thought, in *The Prince* and *the Discourses*, was to establish republican system in Italy like the Romans. Thus, throughout this thesis, I will defend and illustrate this thought by developing different arguments that consolidates this view.

This thesis has four main chapters. The first chapter focuses on Machiavelli’s political program in *The Prince*. In this chapter I explore how Machiavelli developed his political program in *The Prince*. The second chapter emphasizes on the roles of morality, Christianity, and Machiavelli’s concept of virtue in *The Prince* for his political program. The third chapter also focuses on Machiavelli’s political program and reason of state in *The Prince*. In this chapter, I scrutinize the role of his reason of state in *The Prince* in his program. Finally, the fourth chapter deals with Machiavelli’s political program in *the Discourses on Titus Livy*; and in this chapter, I will show different indicators and aim of his program in *the Discourses*.

Chapter 1: Machiavelli's Political Program in *The Prince*¹

1.1 The Role of Machiavelli's Concept of Power in his program

Before I dive into my discussion it is better to understand the concept of power since power is a key ingredient in Machiavelli's program. There is no common consensus among thinkers about the concept of power; but in the works of Niccolò Machiavelli² in *The Prince* and Thomas Hobbes in the *Leviathan* modern notion about power begins. Athenians, in the earliest time, grouped between lawful and unlawful power in which it increases the honor of a particular individual. Machiavelli (1998), in *The Prince*, defined power as domination and controls; the wise prince controls people by power and it is a means of national unity and protecting the state from alien threats and internal disorder. Politics is the constant struggle for power and it should be seen just in political and social context. Hobbes (1651, p. 53), in the *Leviathan*, defined power as 'the power of a man is his present means, to obtain some future apparent good.' For him, power is broader than social power and it focuses on sovereignty. Power and political authority are different. John Locke defined political power as a right of making laws. Unlike Hobbes, the right of making laws is political authority for Locke (Robert 2007, p. 709). For Fredrick Nietzsche, power is the competence to define reality. If you can define the real and the moral, you create the condition of legitimacy. Every expression of human life is an expression of power; and power is at the center of human values, institutions and practices (Herman & Vasti 2008 , pp. 460-464).

¹ For this thesis I used four different translations of *The Prince*. The first is Pete Bondanella's translation in 2005; the second is Harvey C. Mansfield's translation in 1998; the third, George Bull's translation in 1981 and, Luigi Ricci's translation in 1903.

² He was born in 1469 in Florence, Italy, during a time of political transition in Florentine from republics to despotism. Machiavelli wrote a number of books like *The Prince*, *The Art of War*, *Florentine History*, *the Discourses on Livy*, and novels like the *Mandragola*, *Clizia*, and the like. He was also an intellectual, government official, and a diplomat.

There is enduring debate on the idea why Machiavelli wrote his celebrated book, *The Prince*. For some thinkers, he wrote it to regain public office in Florence. For John Najemy, Machiavelli wrote it to save Italy from the barbarians. Others argue that he wrote it to advise a prince on how to secure and maintain his state (Seaman 2007, p. 3). Manfred J. Holler believes that Machiavelli wrote it to form a united state of Italy (Leonidas 2011, p. 28). For Sebastian de Grazia, he wrote it due to his imprisonment, racking, and suffering (Seaman 2007, p. 438). However, for me, Machiavelli wrote *The Prince* for the aim of establishing a strong national state of Italy under a princely rule that protects its sovereignty from foreign enemies and to transform it into a republican system. He used *The Prince* as means for *the Discourses*.

There are also many thinkers that question his divergent political thought in *The Prince* and *the Discourses*. Many of them understood his political thought merely from his view of politics in *The Prince*. Others believed that his right political thought is found in *the Discourses*. As a result, some thinkers considered him as advocator of democracy. On the contrary others named him advocator of tyranny. For Alberico Gentili, Machiavelli advocated democracy and detested tyranny. For Denis Diderot and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, he was an advocator of republicanism. In view of Bertrand Russell's *The Prince* is a handbook for "gangsters". For Italian patriots like Garrett Mattingly, and Maurizio Viroli, Machiavelli was an advocator of Italian unification (King, 2007 pp. 234-236). For Strauss (1957), 'Machiavelli follows the policy of "iron and poison" to succeed his goal'.

However, his political idea should be understood in his entirety rather than his view in *The Prince* or *the Discourses*. If we examine his celebrated works, we grasp his political thought in *The Prince* and *the Discourses*. *The Prince* and *the Discourses* vary notably in

emphasis since they discuss two divergent types of political systems. The focus of *The Prince* is all about principality in which the prince exhausted his effort on how to keep absolute power and how to secure the state. Conversely, the *Discourses* are emphasizes on republicanism that makes people free from political tyranny (Seaman 2007, p. 3). However, for me, according to his program, these two works are consistent and related to each other.

Therefore, the main goal of Machiavelli, in his celebrated books, *The Prince* and *the Discourses*, was to establish republican system in Italy like the Romans. To do this, he developed his own political program in his notable book, *The Prince*, since republican system in Italy in the long run is not possible unless his program in *The Prince* is succeeded. In *The Prince*, the first and the most important thing for him were to form a strong untied state of Italy under a princely rule that defends itself from internal and external enemies. To accomplish this task he developed a numbers of “sub-agenda”. Now I am going to discuss these “sub-agenda” to have a general picture about his political program in general.

Machiavelli’s concept of power is the most essential thing for the triumph of his program. Now I am going to scrutinize his concept of power in *The Prince* and its role for his program. *The Prince* consists of 26 chapters and with the exception of the last chapter; all are successively talking about power. The final chapter of *The Prince* is all about ‘a prophetic call for the liberation of Italy from the barbarians’³. *The prince* is a handbook that describes essential qualities that requisite for the prince on how to rule and maintain power. It is all about how to use power, how to keep power and how to run a state through power. This book begins with a discussion of two kinds of governments (republics and principalities); and four kinds of absolute ruling system or principalities (hereditary, mixed, new, and religious principalities) (Machiavelli 1998, p. 5). In this section, Machiavelli argued that after I address monarchical system of

³ This term for Machiavelli refers to foreigners that invaded Italy during his time like Spain, France, and England.

government, I will see the Roman republic as a model. This shows his program of establishing republican system in the long run after a monarchical beginning. Therefore, when I am talking about Machiavelli's concept of power, I am directly talking about his eminent book, *The Prince*. Thus, to conceptualize his concept of power, I am going to inspect his guide of power politics, *The Prince*.

In the preliminary part of *The Prince* and in chapter 18, Machiavelli (1998, p. 69) declared that "the end is everything;" that is, a prince exercise means that could be immoral to consolidate his power. Actions are good or bad on the effects rather than moral principles. Rulers like Agathocles kill people to have power and this is justified for them and this view is advocated by Machiavelli. For him, sometimes what is called evil can bring good results. Using any means, just or unjust, is essential to keep power and actions are not inherently good or bad but they are judged according to their use. Coming into power in any means is possible, whatsoever the method used. For example, Machiavelli (1998, p. 35) said that Agathocles of the Sicilian's come to power through crime. Thus, for him, illicit actions become necessary to maintain power.

Accordingly, Machiavelli's concept of power is essential to preserve the state from foreign enemies and internal disorders even though the means that he used to maintain power and the state affects the life of citizens. He used humanity, morality, and religion as a means to found a strong and united state of Italy.

In chapter two of *The Prince*, monarchical system of government is declared by Machiavelli. Machiavelli (1998, pp. 34-35) suggested that princes should hold power at all costs. In monarchical system, power is in the hands of one person and he uses any means to maintain it. His power politics focuses on the means of attaining and preserving absolute rule over the other. People have not the right to against the political system while the prince has unlimited rights and

absolute power; since Machiavelli (1981, p. 100) said that ‘no prince ever lacked good excuses or legitimate reasons to colour his bad faith.’ Accordingly, his teaching in *The Prince* promotes the idea of absolute power and the acquiring of power by force to establish a strong united state of Italy under a princely rule.

From chapters 3 to 11 of *The Prince*, Machiavelli discussed about how to use power in different kinds of new principalities. In chapter 3, he discusses mixed type of principality. To maintain power in this kind of principalities, the prince should take different measures like destroying the family of the prince which previously ruled, protecting any foreign power not to enter into the region, and weaken strong powers that could be the threat for the prince. Machiavelli considered King Louis XII of France as a best case since he lost Milan immediately after he occupied it due to his inapt use of power (Machiavelli 1903, pp. 11-13). In chapter 5, Machiavelli (1903, p. 18) consider those states that are governed by their own laws. For him, such states can be governed by the prince through destroy them, or to go and live there in them, or to permit them to rule under their laws and assign dictator ruler and taking tribute of them. However, devastating them totally is the best method for Machiavelli; since the Romans destroyed Capua, Carthage, and Numantia in order to rule them enduringly.

In chapter 6, Machiavelli (1981, pp. 22-23) considered the cases of Moses of Israel, Cyrus of Persia, Romulus of Rome, and Theseus of Athens, those who depend on their own virtue to secure their power. All these are armed prophets. Conversely, Girolamo Savonarola⁴ failed since he lacked his own virtue and he was unarmed prophet. All armed prophets were successful since they depend on their own virtue while all unarmed prophets failed since they lack own virtue. Machiavelli used the word *virtù* in relation with politics, and it is crucial for his

⁴ Italian religious and political reformer;

concept of power since it used to keep and secure the power of the ruler. I will discuss briefly in chapter two about the role of his concept of virtue for the triumph of his political program.

To secure the power, Cesare Borgia⁵ was a fine case for Machiavelli. In chapter 7, he considered the case of Borgia as a model that rulers should follow. Borgia came to power on fortune and the power of his father, Pope Alexander VI (1431-1503) unlike Francesco Sforza. Sforza came to power and became the governor of Milan from an ordinary individual through his own virtue after different challenges. Borgia was an evil man since he murdered his brother and others not to share his power (Wagner 2006, p. 49). Machiavelli (1903, pp. 24-30) admired Borgia due to his cunning strategies, and governance with power even if he came to power through the help of his father and fortune. Borgia did his best to consolidate his power and win the support of Romagna⁶. He settled peace and shifted his responsibility to his deputy, Ramiro de' Orco, even those who were killed by him. However, Borgia failed due to his reliance on the power of his father and fortune when he was come to power. For Machiavelli, power should be preserved at any cost like Borgia. Therefore, Machiavelli remarked a prince came to power through his own virtue like Romulus and Francesco Sforza and by fortune like Borgia. But for him, the foundations of any state should be, at first, based on virtue, than fortune.

Those who came to power through wickedness were advocated by Machiavelli. This is found in chapter 8. In this chapter, Machiavelli (1903, pp. 32-33) considered the case of Agathocles of Syracuse⁷ and Oliverotto of Fermo. Agathocles came to power through crime. He was a common guy and joined the militia and came to a leading rank in the army. One day, he called an assembly of the senate and his men executed the whole senators and he came to power.

⁵ Who was named Duke of Romagna, by Pope Alexander VI, Italian Cardinal and military leader and model for Machiavelli's prince (1475-1507).

⁶ Italian region north of Rome;

⁷ A city in southeastern Sicily in 8th century B.C;

Likewise, Oliverotto of Fermo became a prince by killing his caretaker uncle Giovanni Fogliani and all principal men in dinner feasts. For Machiavelli, the use of power in a wicked manner drives from its consequence. Thus, through crimes and cruelties great empires were built in history like the Romans empires. Similarly, Machiavelli had a plan to do this in his program.

Machiavelli advises rulers on how they build their military. For him, princes should be relying on their own military. Chapters 11 to 14 of *The Prince* focus on the military foundation of a triumphant prince's power and the key causes for the devastation of Italy. In chapter 11, Machiavelli (1998, p. 53) suggested that Italy was failed due to its reliance on auxiliary and mercenary troops. In chapter 12, he validated the roles of good laws and armies for uniting Italy. Machiavelli (1903, p. 47) described the value of law to maintain the security of the state:

The principal foundations of all states, whether new, old, or mixed are having good laws and good arms... there can't be good laws where there are not good arms, and where there are good arms there should be good laws.

The above paragraph indicates that to implement a law in any form of states having good arms that consists of its indigenous subject is mandatory. Machiavelli (1903, p. 54) portrayed that both mercenary and auxiliary troops are useless for rulers to maintain and preserve their power and the state. This is described in chapter13 of *The Prince* like this:

The greatest dangers with mercenaries lie in their cowardice and reluctance to fight, but with auxiliaries the danger lies in their courage. A wise prince... always avoids these forces and has recourse to his own, and would prefer rather to lose with his own men than conquer with the forces of others, not deeming it a true victory which is gained by foreign arms.

Therefore, for him, states must have their own armies like Roman and Sparta and the prince must exert his effort on the making of his own military. Since Machiavelli (1903, p. 53) suggested that Pope Julius II of Florence and the Byzantine empire gave up their hand for auxiliary troops due to lack of their own armies. Florence employed one thousand France soldiers to control Pisa. However, they failed to achieve their goal due to their weakness. Likewise, the king of Constantinople sent one thousand Turkey troops to Greece to defend

themselves from the surroundings. But in the end of the war, the military refused to leave Greece. Therefore, unless the prince relies on his army, then no state is secured; since in his view having faithful and skilled native military is the best way to secure power. Thus, he considered military as an instrument to secure the power of the prince and to bring national unity. This thought is a good lesson for any state and laid the foundations for modern military.

How to maintain power is the central ingredient of Machiavelli's power politics; because maintaining power by any means is the first thing to achieve his program. This concept is discussed from chapters 15 to 23. Machiavelli (1998, p. 61) remarks that when it is essential, a victorious prince should ignore conventional values; and he also declared that a prince 'must learn to be able not to be good and must use or not use such knowledge as necessity demands.' He urges rulers to ignore traditional virtue and to use cruelty when compassion and mercy would make problems worse. For him, by using any means the primary activities of any prince should be focused on preserving of power because it is through power that the unity and order of the state will exist.

For Machiavelli (1998, p. 67), the power of any prince must be founded more on the fear than on the love of his subjects and realizing that everyone are wicked to maintain the power and to preserve the security of the state. This is found in chapter 17 and Machiavelli said that:

Men have less hesitation to offend one who makes himself loved than one who makes himself feared; for love is held by a chain of obligation, which, because men are wicked, is broken at every opportunity for their own utility, but fear is held by a dread of punishment that never forsakes you.

In the above paragraph Machiavelli asserted that being feared is better than being loved if both are not possible; because love is in interest on the free will of the lover while fear is depends on the virtue of the prince. This view of Machiavelli is emanated from his hope of maintaining power and establishing a strong state in Italy. Therefore, for him, any prince who wants to stay in power must be prepared to do anything like evil; and force makes people to obey

the prince. Thus, a prince can promote peace and legitimize power through introducing fear and threat in to his subject and must sustain political power through cruelty, murder and all types of brutality. This notion discussed by Machiavelli (1981, p. 97) by saying his view ‘men sooner forget the death of their father than the loss of their patrimony.’

For him, Hannibal became successful in the leading of multitude troops under his government which consisted of different men from different contries through his cruelty and being feared by his troops unlike Scipio of Rome. His ruthless and cruelty made him respected by his soldiers. On the other hand, the love and forgiveness of Scipio brought for the rebel of his army against him in Spain. This was due to his compassion and lack of being feared by his soldiers. Thus, for Machiavelli, being feared is better than being loved. He preferred to protect his power at any cost since he made a cost benefit analysis on how to secure power than the wellbeing of the people. The wellbeing of his subject was not his business; since he was a despotic ruler that focused on how to maintain power and secure the state by force to succeed his political program.

As said by Machiavelli (1903, p. 7), sometimes it is necessary to break agreements and seem to have all traditional virtues such as compassion, integrity, good faith, and humanity to maintain and preserve power. This notion is portrayed in chapter 18 of *The Prince* as follows:

Therefore, a prudent ruler ought not to keep faith when by so doing it would be against his interest, and when the reasons which made him bind himself [sic] no longer exist. If, men were all good, this percept would not be a good one; but as they are bad, and would not observe their faith with you, so you are not bound to keep faith with them.

Therefore, Machiavelli claimed that to protect the state and the interest of the prince; traditional values and agreements will be desecrated. In the above paragraph, he also preached the wicked nature of men and instrumental use of traditional values. The prince can hold norms when it serve his purpose and ignore them when it does not serve his purpose and to shift his

personality along with situation. Machiavelli (1903, p. 71) advised rulers like this ‘prince must have a mind disposed to adapt itself according to the wind, and as the variations of fortune dictate.’ He considered Alexander VI, as an example that he ruled for an extensive time through deceiving and cunning his subjects. Thus, for him, any prince should act like him. Therefore, the role of politics and government should be focused on the preserving of power by any means. For Machiavelli (1998, p. 69), the prince to be successful, he must be crafting, cunning and tricking others and must become half of man and half of beasts. The prince must be the master of deception for him because cunning, deception, and tricking are means to maintain the power and to secure the state.

The other essential advice that Machiavelli (1998, p. 71) suggested for the prince to preserve power and to secure the state is to avoid the contempt and hatred of his subjects. This notion is portrayed in chapter 19. It is evident that his intention was to maintain his power at any cost and rely on his *virtù* (power) since relying on once virtue is the best means to succeed once goal. According to Machiavelli (1998, p. 76), a prince should not be living a humble life, being lover of justice and rival of cruelty since these qualities leads to a failure. For example, the ancient Roman kings like Marcus, Pertinax, and Alexander had the above qualities; but except Marcus, all came to a terrible end. On the other hand, Severus was very cruel guy. However, he always ruled happily since his virtue made him so marvelous by his subjects. Therefore, for him relying on once power is the most essential way to maintain power.

Machiavelli (1903, p. 80) affirmed that to keep power successfully, princes must keep their subjects with the changeability of their actions. A prince can protect power through his ability to safeguard internal security and defend his state from external enemies, building skilled indigenous troops, and imposing cruel punishments on those who are threatening the security of

the state. Therefore, if a prince can master these means then his power is preserved. For him, (1998, p. 90), stability is important than justice to protect the state and to maintain power. But for John Rawls, justice is crucial in politics since individual rights should not be violated for the interests of the majority (Knowles 2001, p. 215). Thus, Rawls theory of justice conflicts with Machiavelli's power politics in *The Prince*. But the notions of justice and morality have not any place in the political thought of Machiavelli. If justice is useful for political purposes then it should be used unless it is without objective values for him.

Machiavelli (1998), in *The Prince*, argued that those who are dangers for the prince should be penalized in a cruel ways. Because it is through power that the security of the state is protected and national unity under a princely rule is possible. Of course, it is necessary to punish those who affect the real interests of the nation. However, sometimes people may against the prince within the rationality of protecting the interest of the state. But he characterized all the common people irrational and childish. He believed that through cruelty, the power of the prince should be preserved however that is not the merely means to preserve prince's power enduringly.

In most cases, in any government, the degree of liberty and tyranny or to be ruled or not to be ruled is the determination of the people to be free and their willingness and ability to resist tyrants. So, the power of any prince is determined by the people and in their strength to resist the prince's power. Machiavelli perceived his subjects as simple minded and unimportant in political life. This thought is challenged by Karl W. Deutsch. For him, even the political powers of totalitarian governments depend on the will of the populace they rule. This notion is stated as:

Totalitarian power is strong only if it does not have to be used too often. If totalitarian power must be used at all times against the entire population, it is unlikely to remain powerful for long. Since, totalitarian regimes require more power for dealing with their subjects... such regimes stand in greater need of widespread and dependable compliance habits among their people; more than that they have to be able to count on the active support of at least significant parts of the population in case of need. (Sharp 2010, p. 19)

Thus, this quote affirms that the consent of the people to be ruled by the prince is essential to maintain power. However, for Machiavelli, any forms of actions are justified to maintain and preserve power and the security of the state because his program in *The Prince* was to establish a strong united state of Italy under a princely rule. However, the above expression of Deutsch challenges his view.

Machiavelli (1903, pp. 97-102) was asked different questions like why the princes of Italy missed their rulings and did not keep their power? What is the role of fortune and virtue to come to power? These questions are discussed in chapters 24 and 25 of *The Prince* respectively. For him, the princes of Italy have missed their rulings and power since they lacked the virtù to arm themselves. For example, the king of Naples and the duke of Milan have lost their states with the lack of their own armies. Fortune and virtue are the two distinct ways in which the prince comes to power since fortune controls half of one's actions while free will determines the other half. To manage fortune, men should be virtues and flexible according to situations since fortune is a violent river. A violent river can be controlled through the construction of dams and dikes. Likewise, fortune can be managed by force and by being flexible according to situations. Therefore, the notions of virtue and fortune are essential elements for Machiavelli in gaining power and preserving the state.

As I said in the beginning of this chapter, the final chapter of *The Prince* makes him a patriot of Italy since in this chapter, Machiavelli (1998, pp. 96-101) declared an “exhortation of Italy from the barbarians”. In this portion, he seems more idealistic and allows citizens to take part in political affairs since he was disseminating his prophetic call to save Italy from foreign enemies through the help of others. This call shows his hope of establishing a united and strong state of Italy. In this chapter Machiavelli (1998, pp. 103-105) asserted that:

... [i]t is not marvel if none of the Italians named before has been able to do what it is hoped will be done by your illustrious house....Thus, if your illustrious house wants to follow those excellent men who redeemed their countries, it necessary before all other things, as a true foundation of every undertaking, to provide itself with its own armies....Then may your illustrious house take up this task with the sprit and hope in which just enterprises are taken up, so that under its emblem this father land may be ennobled.

The above paragraph shows that Machiavelli was in a hope to establish a strong and united state of Italy under a princely rule.

There are also different indicators of his program in *The Prince*. For example, in the times of Machiavelli, Italy suffered from unending brutal conflict. Italy was divided in many parts like Florence, Milan, Venice, Naples, and the like. Following this historical crisis foreign power invaded Italy. According to Machiavelli (1981, pp. 10-11), the Italian states became under the control of foreign powers like Spain, France, and England (barbarians). King Charles VIII controlled the throne of Naples, in Italy. His descendant, Louis XII, brought the power of Spain into Italy by bargaining for the partition of Naples with Ferdinand of Argon (Spanish kingdom). These all made him regret painfully due to the partition of Italy; and inspired him to establish a strong state of Italy under a princely rule to defend itself from foreign enemies.

The dedicatory letter that Machiavelli wrote to Lorenzo de, Medici⁸ also expressed his program (read his letter in *The Prince*). Besides this, to succeed his program, he followed two basic methods: first, maintaining power by any means and the second building one's own military and fight foreign enemies. In the first step, he considered two historical leaders in the use of their power: the case of Cesare Borgia in *The Prince* and the case of Romulus in the *Discourses*. For him, to create a united national state of Italy, a prince should follow the experiences of Cesare Borgia and Romulus. Both of them were wicked in the use of their powers. For Machiavelli (1996, p. 30), Romulus, who was the founder of Rome, killed his brother, Remus, to control political power, and Titus Tatius, who was elected to share power

⁸ He was the ruler of Florence during Machiavelli's time (1449-1492). Please read *The Prince* for its detail.

with him. Machiavelli (1998, p. 29-30) considered the history of Cesare Borgia as the best scenario that illustrates his program in *The Prince*:

One the duke had taken over Romagna, he found it had been commanded by impotent lords who had been readier to despoil their subjects than to correct them, and had given their subjects matter for disjunction, not for union. Since that province was quite full of robberies, quarrels, and every other kind of insolence, he judged it necessary to give it good government, if he wanted to reduce it to peace and obedience to a kingly arm. So he put there Messer Remirro de Orco, a cruel and ready man, to whom he gave the fullest power. In a short time Remirro bring peace and unity, with the very greatest reputation for himself then the duke judged that such excessive authority was not necessary, because he feared that it might become hateful; and he set up a civil court in the middle of the province, within he most excellent president where each city had its advocate. And because he knew that past rigors ad generated some hatred for Remirro, to purge the spirits of that people and to gain them entirely to himself, he wished to show that if any cruelty had been committed, this had not come from him but from the harsh nature of his minister... he had him placed one morning in the piazza in two pieces, with a piece of wood and a blood-spattered knife beside him. The ferocity of this spectacle left the people at once satisfied and stupefied.

This paragraph indicates Borgia's tricking and cunning strategies of using power so as to bring order and unity in Romagna. He shifts his evil doing towards Remirro and makes himself responsible. Nevertheless, his strategy of uniting the state was through an evil way; however, Borgia was desired to have unity and order in his state. All these forms of cunning and tricking are for the purpose of preserving power. Therefore, all these doings of Borgia were advocated by Machiavelli. Hence, for him, the actions of Borgia to save his power and to bring unity in Romagna are the best lesson to accomplish his program effectively. That is the reason why he frequently advice his compatriots to follow the lessons of Borgia. Thus, Machiavelli advocated any murder if it would result peace, order, and national unity.

Therefore, both Cesare Borgia and Romulus were cruel and used humanity as means. For instance, Lindsay (1934, p. 174) in the article called *Kant* argued that in Kant's categorical imperative theory, human should not used as a means for another ends. But for Machiavelli (1903, p. 71), these illicit actions have their own justifications since:

Everybody sees what you appear to be, few feel what you are, and those few will not dare to oppose themselves to the many, who have the majesty of the state to defend them; and in the actions of men, and especially of princes from which there is no appeal, the end is everything [or the end justifies the means].

In chapter 7, Machiavelli (1903, p. 25) argued that unlike Romulus, the program of Ceasare Borgia failed due to the death of his father and his reliance on fortune. Nevertheless, the program of Romulus was successful and brings the Roman republic since he depends on his own virtue. Consequently, Machiavelli's writing of these two historical leaders' shows his political program in *The Prince*. He believed that republican government is possible after a princely or tyrannical system. The shift from tyrannical system of government to democratic system of government is possible through cruelties. Machiavelli (1996, p. 29) portrayed the above, in *the Discourses*, in book 1 as follows:

... I say that many will perhaps judge it is bad example that a founder of a civil way of life, as was Romulus should first have killed his brother, and then consented to the death of Titus Tadius the Sabine, chosen by him as partner in the kingdom... the opinion would be true if one did not consider what end had induced him to commit such a homicide. This taken as a general rule: that it never happens that any republic is ordered well from the beginning or reformed altogether anew outside its old orders unless it is ordered by one individual.

This quote shows his program and the consistency between *The Prince* and *the Discourses*. Therefore, to achieve his goal using any means that enables to contribute for national unity and the common good is advisable. In this regard, the princes should use power effectively. To secure power, the prince should use different means like deceiving the subjects, having good reputation, and so on. In chapter 18, Machiavelli (1998, p. 70) described:

It is necessary to appear merciful, faithful, humane, sincere, religious, and to be so but you must have in mind so disposed that when it is needful to be otherwise you may be able to change to the contrary.

Thus, Machiavelli had a program to keep power and to form a united and strong state of Italy. Therefore, he used power in different ways to do well his political program.

The second device that Machiavelli (1903, pp. 54-57) used to succeed his program was to build one's own military. For him, to protect the security of the state and to maintain power depending on native troops is imperative while using auxiliary, mercenary and mixed troops are useless. But the use of mixed troops is more important than that of the two types of troops.

Therefore, unless a prince should order his own native troops, then the state can never be secure. The use of internal troops is a solution to maintain power and to secure the state. Therefore, he advocates autonomous power and these types of force are crucial to protect the state from external enemy and to consolidate the unity of the state.

For him, any prince should study the art of war. To win the state, the prince must devote his effort in the study of the art of war both mentally and physically. He warns rulers to study the geographical areas of the surrounding and its impact on the battle strategy, and the history of the great leaders since it is fundamental to secure and maintain power and to defend the country from the outsiders. This notion is depicted by Machiavelli (1903, p. 54):

The prince should always be out hunting and through this accusation the body to hardship; and meanwhile he should learn the nature of the sites, and recognize how mountains rise, how valleys open, how plains lie, and understand the nature of rivers and marshes-and in this invest the greatest care.

Accordingly, his teaching of the art of war is really an important contribution for world politics since his lesson is useful for modern states in the area of military and politics. Machiavelli in his book, *The Art of War*, discussed in detail about the nature of military organizations and how to defend the state from internal and external enemies (read *The Art of War*).

Therefore, the history of Louis XII⁹, Oliverotto, Casare Borgia, Agathocles, the useless of mercenary troops and the values of militias also arise from the needs of *the Discourses* (Seaman 2007, p. 65). Machiavelli discussed about all the above cases in *The Prince* to have an experience of establishing republican system by using *The Prince* as a means.

According to St. Augustine of Hippo, justice is found on injustice, morality rest on immorality, and freedom on tyranny (Strauss & Cropsey 1987, p. 302). That is, democracy is possible after undemocratic beginning, or republican system is possible after tyrannical

⁹ King of France from 1462 to 1515;

beginning. Likewise, Machiavelli (1996) followed the same procedures of Romans republic and Augustine political system to form a republican government in Italy. All the above thoughts show the consistency between *The Prince* and *the Discourses*. Therefore, all the above discussion portrays successively his program in *The Prince*.

Therefore, Machiavelli used different means to obtain power and to build a strong national state of Italy under a princely rule. In this regard his political program in *The Prince* or his way of making national unity under a princely rule influences the political system of the world and the life of the people. For example, Roseanna Mueller claims that *The Prince* has served as a manual for tyrants and dictators like Mussolini (Seaman 2007, pp. 426 & 430). After the death of Machiavelli his work deceives so many people. In the rule of Catherine de Medici, 50,000 French Protestants were murdered due to his advises in *The Prince*. For Musa, the English dramatists like Marlowe and Shakespeare used Machiavelli as murderous and his advice represents evil characters. In the book of, *Machiavelli: Philosophy of Power*, King (2007, p. 233) argued that Hitler used *The Prince* as a guidebook for his ruling system. Therefore, his program in *The Prince* influenced the world both positively and negatively.

According to Machiavelli any prince should maintain his power by any means. Because forming a strong national state of Italy under a princely rule that defends itself from internal and external enemies is possible through power. Power is the first and the most essential thing for him. It is through power that the security of the people and the state is maintained. Therefore, *The Prince* aims to form a strong state that defends itself from internal as well as external enemies. It is a form of tyrannical system and Machiavelli used it as a means to establish republican system in *the Discourses*. It is a wicked means and this cruel and evil means by itself is not suitable for human life.

1.2 Machiavelli's Political Program in *The Prince* and Democracy

For many thinkers democracy is a means of acquiring power within the state. Because they believe that democracy is a reference point or the means of gaining and losing of power. Democracy is a system of government in which the power of the government is based on the consent of the people. In a democratic system, the right to life, liberty, property, security and other rights of individuals are respected. In this system, any form of absolute government is not tolerated since people are able to decide on political affairs and the power of the government is limited. In a democratic system, people are the ultimate power holders whether it is direct or indirect (Barcalow 2001, p. 450). But Machiavelli's program in *The Prince* disregards democracy since his purpose in *The Prince* was not the protections of democratic values and the well-being of his subjects rather he focused on to form strong united state of Italy under a princely government. However, in *the Discourses* he advocates democracy since in his republican system the well-being of his subjects is the first thing that the prince expected to do.

For Barcalow, John Rawls argued that a fully democratic government is defined as:

... the authority to determine basic social policies resides in a representative body selected for limited terms by and ultimately accountable to the electorate...all sane adults, with certain generally recognized exceptions have the right to take part in political affairs, and the percept one elector vote is honored as far as possible. Elections are fair and free and regularly held...The principle of participation also holds that all citizens are to have an equal access at least in the formal sense to public office. Each is eligible to join political parties, to run for elective positions and to hold places of authority. Decision making uses... majority rule...for all significant political decisions. (Barcalow 2001, p. 451)

However, according to Machiavelli democracy should not be used for the purpose of democracy, morality for the purpose of morality, or immorality for the purpose of immorality. For him, a prince comes to power either democratically or undemocratically, legally or illegally and a prince is not necessary governed to democratic principles. But a prince can use democracy, when it is useful, for his own purpose.

The guiding principles that Machiavelli put in *The Prince* to secure political power are characterized as undemocratic but they are useful for his program. Some of his advice like killing the bloodlines of the former ruler, the brutal subjugation of revolts and political control through violence are evil from the views of democracy but it is useful for him to maintain power and preserve state. Machiavelli (1998, pp. 9, 18 & 21) argued that to control power and maintain it, the blood lines of the earlier prince should be eliminated totally. This is useful for his program. He did not care about democracy by itself unless it is constructive or useful for his goal.

His political teaching in *The Prince* is incompatible with democracy since Machiavelli (1981, p. 101) describes if it is necessary for the security and survival of the state, any actions are justified including killing, torturing, and any form of wicked actions. The case of Romulus and Cesare Borgia is the best case for this. These rulers were emphasized in the end they do not worry about humanity. The experiences of Romulus and Cesare Borgia were undemocratic since they hold power through wickedness. This historical experience is advocated by him in *The Prince* since for Machiavelli (1996, p. 29), any prince should follow the experiences of Cesare Borgia and Romulus to preserve his power. All his advices on how rulers to come to power in *The Prince* like “the end justifies the means”, a prince must combine the qualities of “a lion and a fox”, considering human nature low and ungrateful, and support despotic rule are wicked and evil from the perspectives of democracy but he used these as a means to succeed his program.

Machiavelli used humanity as a means for his power politics. He sees the ordinary citizen as unimportant and childlike creature. Because in *The Prince*, Machiavelli (1981, p. 100) describes ‘men are so simple, and so much creatures, that the deceiver will always

find someone ready to be deceived.’ Therefore, his concern was to maintain power by deceiving and cunning the ordinary citizens since the ordinary citizens were unintelligent and simple minded. He also used individual liberty, equality, freedom, and justice as means for the triumph of his program. Machiavelli (1981, p. 95) affirmed this as follow:

...so a prince must not wary if he incurs reproach for his cruelty so long as he keeps his subject united and loyal. Being too compassionate, allow disorders which lead to murder and rapine. These nearly always harm the whole community, whereas executions ordered by a prince only affect individuals.

This expression on how princes keep their subjects loyal to their reign oppressed individual liberty, equality, and justice since his purpose was to establish a strong state of Italy. For him, giving freedom for individuals allows disorders and become the danger of the prince rather killing and abusing the rights and liberties of individuals is a just case to keep subjects united and loyal. However, different thinkers argued that the unity of the state and the power of the government depend on the consent of the people. For John Locke, ‘only consent can make individuals as members of a state’. Government is legitimized only by consent. To make law, the will of the people is mandatory and it is not adequate that a law should be good law; it should be established by the right people in the right form (McClelland 2005, p. 230). Korvela (2006, p. 33) added that the center of Machiavelli’s politics is “interest”. He never discussed about the consent of individuals, rights, and freedom. Locke supported the violations of the law by the king in times of national emergency in order to preserve the safety of the public (McClelland 2005, p. 228). But for Machiavelli maintaining power in any means is possible whatever the method used.

He also warns rulers to have the qualities of “a lion and a fox” to rule their subjects. The qualities of the “lion and the fox” are proper to rule man for him. But having the qualities of “a lion and a fox” for a ruler in democratic system is not advisable because

human behaviors can be easily governed by law. By force may be subjected to the prince for a time to bring peace and order; however it is not the ultimate remedy to secure the power. Therefore, his advice for the rulers on how to gain and maintain power is undemocratic. In *The Prince*, Machiavelli (1981, p. 101) also declared that:

To those seeing and hearing the prince, he should appear a man of integrity, compassion, a man of good faith, a kind and a religious man. But, he should know how to do evil, if that is necessary. Men in general judged by their eyes rather than by their hands; because everyone sees what you appear to be, few experiences what you are.

The above paragraph shows that by any means the prince should preserve power like cheating, and deceiving the ordinary people in political affairs. He is concerned in bringing order and peace out of civil war through coercion.

According to Machiavelli conquering virtue by force is also another means of preserving power. Machiavelli in *The Prince* (1903, p. 102) argued that:

I certainly think that it is better to be impetuous than cautious, for fortune is a woman it is necessary, if you wish to master her, to conquer her by force and it can be seen that she lets herself be overcome by these rather than by those who proceed coldly.

However, many thinkers argued that this thought of Machiavelli undermines women's equality. For example, for King (2007, p. 235), many feminists in the late 20th century found his work problematic since his thought undermines females and promotes the superiority of males. In the views of Jo Ann Cavallo, Machiavelli developed pessimistic view on women and this is found in some of his writings (Seaman 2007, p. 124). However, his intention was not about the issues of equality of men and women rather he was interested on how to control fortune. Because fortune for him is an important means to come to power. For example Cesare Borgia comes to power through fortune and the help of his father. He also believed that fortune controls half of once action and free will determines the other half. Therefore, for him fortune should be controlled through virtue and by being flexible.

For Machiavelli, power should be in a single prince to form a strong and united state in Italy. This thought is also found in *the Discourses*. In this book he said that the task of law making should be given for a single individual. Of course, this concept of power leads to political absolutism since Machiavelli (1998) thought that power politics is the means and authoritarian absolute state is the end. He also gave different arguments that illustrate the absolute power of the prince. For example, Machiavelli (1903, pp. 14 & 71) argued that:

In those states which are governed by a prince and his servants, the prince possesses more authority, because there is no one in the state regarded as a superior besides himself, and if others are obeyed it is merely as ministers and officials of the prince, and no one regards them with any special affection...let his sentence be irrevocable, and let him adhere to his decisions so that no one may think of deceiving him or making him change.

But, for him, to establish laws and institutions the power should be given for a prince.

Consequently, his power politics is not conducive for human life since he used human right, justice, equality, morality and other values of the society as a means for his program. He also biased about human nature since Machiavelli (1998, p. 67) argued that all men are wicked creatures and used humanity as a means. To establish a government assuming all men as wicked is indispensable for him. However, if “all men are wicked”, then why men desire to have good thing and hate bad thing? Men do evil within the desire of avoiding evil and seeking good. Men act badly within their inclinations like desires, and emotions. Rational men are good by nature. Therefore, he simply characterized human nature as wicked without considering why men act wickedly. He did not also focused on what is best for the state rather he gave due emphasis on how to ensure power in any means.

Different writers claim that *The Prince* and *the Discourses* are inconsistent and self-contradictory. However, according to his program his political thoughts are consistent and not self contradictory. Machiavelli aimed at establishing republican system in Italy by using

The Prince as a means and *the Discourses* as an end. He believed that republican system is possible after tyrannical beginning; that is, *the Discourses* rest on *The Prince* and he advises his contemporaries to study the Romans history and to follow it. However, when we look at the history of Roman, Rome was founded through fratricide, Romulus killed his brother Remus. Therefore, his writings are consistent and not self-contradictory according to his political program.

Chapter 2: The Role of Conventional Values in Machiavelli's Program in *The Prince*

2.1 The Role of Morality in Machiavelli's Political Program

There are different thinkers that maintain various views on the moral or immoral nature of *The Prince*. For instance, according to Leo Strauss, Machiavelli is the “teacher of evil” (Seaman 2007, p. 275; Drury 2005, pp. 115, & 117). His advice was evil for princes on how to maintain and preserve the state. In the view of Jean Jacques Rousseau, *The Prince* is the true expression of reality that shows how princes act. While for Harvey C. Mansfield, Machiavelli was an evil man who disseminates evil thoughts. Considering him as supporter of republican morality is irrational since he promotes the morality of tyranny (Seaman 2007, p. 286). For Frederick II,¹⁰ the works of Machiavelli were immoral while for Hume, Rousseau, and Montesquieu, he was considered as the one who publicized the nature of political tyranny (Machiavelli 2005, p. viii). However, Machiavelli used morality and immorality for his program.

Besides this, there are also disagreements among thinkers in his view of politics and morality. As said by Benedetto Croce and George Peabody Gooch, Machiavelli detached politics from morality. For Croce, he makes politics an independent entity. Politics is out of the issue of morality and ruled by its own laws. On the word of Isaiah Berlin, those who advocate the view that Machiavelli detached politics from morality are mistaken since his deed is beyond the division of politics and morality since he creates two different moralities; that is, the morality of the pagan and the Christian. For him, politics and morality are incompatible to each other (Seaman 2007, p. 291). This implies that Machiavelli employ morality according to his necessity. The concept of necessity is imperative for him since it is through his necessity that he used anything which is appropriate for his program.

¹⁰ King of Prussia from 1740 to 1786;

Now, I am going to argue and explore how Machiavelli used traditional morality for his program. To make my argument sound and credible, I use the exact expressions of Machiavelli on the issue and the views of different thinkers and commentators. In *The Prince*, Machiavelli (1998, pp. 34-35) argued that political life could not be governed by moral rules and moral rules are means for the success of his goal. For Machiavelli (1998, p. 65), the primary aim of a ruler is preserving the state by using different means like killing, cunning, deception, and the like. He urges rulers to make successful state and this goal is feasible if states have their own morality, the morality of triumph in any means in the area of army that protects the state from external and internal enemies (Seaman 2007, p. 280). Due to this reason, he used dual standard morality, morality for private life and morality for public life which are incompatible to each other.

As Machiavelli (1998, p. 71) described, “the end justified the means”; that is, the prince can employ both the moral and immoral means to consolidate his power. Traditional morality and religion are not relevant unless they contribute to his power. This makes him as a pragmatic. The issue of morality and religion are not his concern they are without objective value; he is simply interested in the creation and maintenance of a strong state (A.R.M.Murray 2010, p. 56 & 59). Machiavelli (1903, pp. 3-13) also argued that princes can build the right to rule by power and being morally good has nothing to do with being powerful. For Machiavelli (1998, p. xviii), when it is crucial, a conquering prince should disregard the norms of the society and morality. In chapter 15, Machiavelli (1998, p. 61) declared that a prince ‘must learn to be able not be good and must use or not use such knowledge as necessity demands.’ In this quote, he used traditional morality as a means for his end and he did not provide any value by itself unless it has political use. According to him, sometimes, it is indispensable to contravene agreements and seems to

have all traditional virtues such as sympathy, honesty, good faith, and kindness to maintain the power. Machiavelli (1903, p. 70) illustrated this thought in chapter 18 as follows:

Therefore, a prudent ruler ought not to keep faith when by so doing it would be against his interest... If, men were all good, this percept would not be a good one; but as they are bad, and would not observe their faith with you, so you are not bound to keep faith with them.

Keeping faith in traditional morality is an essential aspect; however, he urges a wise prince ought not to keep faith when it has a bad consequences. This expression proved his position as a relativist who depends on conditions. Therefore, the issues of morality for the princes are not their business since Machiavelli (1903, p. 70) said that the prince holds norms when they serve his purpose and ignores them when they do not serve his purpose depending on conditions. In chapter 15, Machiavelli (1903, p. 61) added ‘the prince can do those vices to save his power...and a ruler who wishes to maintain his power must be prepared to act immorally when it becomes necessary.’ This quote describes that moral principles are conditioned by the interest of the prince. Machiavelli (1981, p. 95) argued that a prince should not worry about his cruelty as long as he keeps his subject loyal and united. All the above advices that Machiavelli forwarded for his contemporaries was to maintain the state and power.

Moreover, the writing of different thinkers also reveals how Machiavelli used traditional morality in his power politics to succeed his program. For instance, according to Mary Walsh Machiavelli verified that acting cruelly without considering the existing morality was the key to triumph (Seaman 2007, p. 279). Machiavelli considered politics as a public responsibility that is free from private morality. He made a distinction between private and public morality since both private and public life are guided by their own laws. She also argued that for Machiavelli, to be successful in politics, doing whatever is imperative and acting cruelly without considering the existing morality was the key to political success (Seaman 2007, p. 173 & 274). The thought of Garret Mattingly in the book of *Renaissance Diplomacy*, as well consolidate this fact since he

argued that *The Prince* missed any sense of moral foundation for politics (Korvela 2006, p. 31). Because Machiavelli used morality for his program rather than the purpose of morality itself.

Overall, in *The Prince*, there are the morality and immorality thoughts of Machiavelli. He did not use morality for the purpose of morality or immorality for the purpose of immorality rather he used morality or immorality for his program. In Chapter 18, Machiavelli (1998, p. 70) declared his position of morality and immorality by stating a prince ‘shouldn’t deviate from what is good, if that is possible, but he should know how to do evil, if that is necessary’. Machiavelli (1998, p. 69) also argued that ‘it is necessary for a prince to know well how to use the beast and the man.’ Therefore, the prince can be moral or immoral depending on his necessity. The necessities of the prince have a significant role for his action. Thus, a prince should be out of the domain of morality. But he may use both the immoral and the moral acts for his interest. Hence, private and conventional moralities are useful for him if it is helpful for princes’ purpose and desecrated when it is against the interest of the prince. Therefore, both morality and immorality are tools for the prince. For Machiavelli (1903, p. 71), the violation of morality is just parts of acquiring of power since:

[a] prince, and especially a new prince, cannot observe all those things which are considered as good by men, being often obliged, in order to maintain the state, to act against faith, against charity, against humanity, and against religion. Therefore, he must have a mind disposed to adapt itself according to the wind, and as the variations of fortune dictate.

He suggested that morality is trivial for a prince since he is the maker of morality and law he is beyond the realm of morality. This view of Machiavelli was also promoted by Max Weber. According to Weber, politics can merely accomplished by violence and the violation of morality needed for such purposes as well. But for Kant and Erasmus¹¹, the thoughts of Machiavelli and Weber were evil (Honderich 2005, p. 216). When it is necessary, Machiavelli endorsed the use

¹¹ He was a Dutch theologian and the leading renaissance scholar and against any forms of violence (1466-1536).

of immoral means by the prince for the preservation of state. The primary concern of any ruler should focus on power (Honderich 2005, p. 549). According to Machiavelli (1981), morality is important for the populace since it is simply moral citizens that are ready to ruled and ordered by the prince. The prince should worry about how states should run in any means rather than how morals are to be followed. If it is necessary, the prince must be act like a beast. This is found in chapter 18, and Machiavelli (1998, p. 69) insisted that the prince be a mixture of “a lion and a fox”. This is the moral value that every prince should hold and this morality is not that of the conventional morality it is the morality of the prince. For him, one must use strength, courage and any means to be successful in politics (Stokes 2006, p. 59).

Machiavelli gave instrumental value for morality and used it for his program. Machiavelli (1998), in *The Prince*, advices princes to avoid conventional values like justice, mercy, temperance, love and other good qualities and to use cruelty, violence, deception, and the like. Therefore, he made injustice on traditional morality since he used it for his own purpose. Different thinkers reject Machiavelli’s view of using morality for his program. Hobbes (1651, p. 80), in the *Leviathan*, argued that the failure to do agreement is injustice but, in *The Prince*, Machiavelli advices his compatriots to ignore agreements when it is necessary to keep the security of the state. He not at all left any moral room, this as bad and that as good. His writings in *The Prince* merely talk about how to use different means to maintain power and preserve the state. Therefore, for him morality and immorality should not be used for their own seeks rather they should be used for political goals.

2.2 The Role of Christianity in Machiavelli's Political Program

There is no universal understanding among thinkers on Machiavelli's view on religion particularly on Christianity. For Medieval political philosophers, religion was the basis of the state. For example, Aquinas (1964, pp. 1100, 1146 & 1210), in *Summa Theologica*, said that man requires the guidance of the divine law. But Machiavelli detached the state from the control of religion. He was influenced by the thought of St. Augustine of Hippo since his thought on Christianity and politics are similar. For St. Augustine, politics is the result of domination by force and Machiavelli also believed in this idea. For him, 'politics is seen as evil and the result of fallen man and the state was founded by a fratricide, Cain'. Thus, there is no justice in this world. It is true that the city of Rome was founded by fratricide, Romulus. Therefore, Machiavelli considered his political view from Augustine (Korvela 2006, p. 111). In the article called *Augustine and the Case for Limited Government*, Raeder (2003) also affirmed this view. Since Linda C. Raeder argued that, for Augustine, coercive rule was a compulsory aspect of human life since government and law exist as a punishment for the sin of Adam and Eve. Accordingly, for him, "political man is a fallen man".

Why the Christian theologians and thinkers developed different views on Machiavelli's power politics in *The Prince*? Both Fredrick Nietzsche and Niccolò Machiavelli forwarded horrific remarks on Christianity (Korvela 2006, p. 31). One of the main factors that led to Machiavelli's critics on Christianity was during his time; religion had a great role in political affairs. Political life is subordinate to religion but the church was unable to direct and united Italy these irritated Machiavelli and pave the way to criticized Christianity (Korvela 2006, p. 54). Machiavelli argued that Christianity makes the world womanish (Rahe 2008, p. 96) since Christianity is worthless in politics. It supposes that humans are naturally liable to goodness

(Korvela 2006, p. 112); however, in *The Prince*, Machiavelli (1903, p. 70) considered all men as wicked. For him, political greatness and the unity of the state are possible when princes shift their character according to situations rather than by being virtuous (Korvela 2006, pp. 18-19). The state is autonomous, sovereign, and superior over all institutions. State is out of and above religious and moral considerations and it is secular. As well, according to Machiavelli (1981, p. 62), a prince is out of the confines of religion:

... [a] ruler and especially a new prince cannot always act in ways that are considered good because, in order to maintain his power he is often forced to act treacherously, ruthlessly or inhumanity and disregard the precepts of religion.

Christian moralities are useless for him in itself and he used religion for the realization of political goals. State power for him is the end and Christianity should be used as an instrument (Strauss & Cropsey 1987, p. 308). For example, for Machiavelli (1903, p. 88), in Spain, Ferdinand of Aragon used religion as a tool and came to power through it. According to Machiavelli (1998), politics is independent and has its own rules and puts it at the center and judge others in reference to it. Christianity must be judged by its consequence and if it is politically harmful, it must be omitted.

In the views of Christianity, Machiavelli's understanding of religion was not religion at all. His meaning of Christianity is unusual and different (Korvela 2006, p. 18). His notion of the "internals" was unorthodox for Christians since he thought that the human soul is not able to find its own peace and has not natural rule of integrity. The characteristics of the soul are to increase once own power in politics. The highest form of human consciousness is possible when people are engaged in political affairs (King 2007, p. 196). For Plato and many Christian thinkers, anguish is better than doing wickedness; but Machiavelli advises princes to do evil to maintain their power (Korvela 2006, p. 23).

He was known as the opponent of Christianity (Rahe 2008, p. 4) since he used Christianity for his own program as a means. This view is supported by different thinkers. According to William E. Klein, Machiavelli discarded Christian morality and used it as a means for his political purpose (Seaman 2007, p. 407). In reaction to this, as said by Olli Loukola, Machiavelli did not accuse Christian morality he simply said that Christian morality did not fit into the world we live in (Leonidas 2011, p. 102). Conversely, for Giuseppe Prezzolini, Machiavelli was cynical thinker who rejects the worth of Christian morality for politics. For Machiavelli, the ultimate goal of a prince is to realize great things like glory, fame, and to maintain the state. Following the Christian virtue led to the failure of the state. From the view of Christianity, the virtue of Christianity is imperative for political purposes but due to his evil and silly thinking, Machiavelli rejects Christianity. For Christianity, the Holy Bible preaches goodness which is a key element to live peacefully within the state; since the Holy Bible said that 'Do unto others as you would have them do unto you' Matthew 7:12 and Luke 6:31 (Leonidas 2011, p. 46). This is an essential principle to administer the people peacefully. While the thought of Machiavelli contradict with this thought of Christianity.

Christians make Machiavelli responsible for the murder of St. Bartholomew's in 1572 and the religious war in Europe. Ambrogio Catrino-Politi, the Bishop of Cosenza, excommunicated his work on religion. As stated by Reginald Pole's, Henry VIII became wicked and rejected monasteries due to his taking of his teaching in *The Prince* (Leonidas 2011, pp. 120-21). Machiavelli aimed at power and he was anti-Christian (Russell 1945, p. 762). According to Pedro de Rivadeneira and Claudio Clemente, Machiavelli was amoral and a marker of tyranny. For Clemente, he was blessed politics and discarded religion. He made religion subordinate to politics and thought amorality. He used religion as a means for political goal and this contradicts

with the traditional view that the state was part of the divinely order. For some thinkers like Felix Raab, Machiavelli was rejected by Christianity because he made religion subordinate to politics. Thomas Fitzherbert recognizes him as one that developed wrong perception towards religion (Leonidas 2011, pp. 121-127).

Machiavelli's view on religion, particularly on Christianity, led to the occurrence of divergent views among thinkers. Some scholars claim that Machiavelli was a true Christian in his personal life. However, he believed that both political and religious lives are two different things as a result politics should have its own law and morality. For example, Roberto Ridolfi, in his book *The Life of Niccolò Machiavelli*, said that his frank expression and impolite writing gave him wrong reputation and named as an enemy of Christianity. This shows that Christianity used for political ends. For Sebastian de Grazia, Machiavelli desired to shift the role of the prince from saints to heroes since God care for those who defend their country (Korvela 2006, p. 44).

Then again, others argued that he was an atheist who wanted to demolish Christianity totally. According to Leo Strauss, Machiavelli was an atheist and the "teacher of evil" (Drury 2005, p. 117). Strauss (1957) suggested that Machiavelli made the church responsible for the deterioration of Italy and the loss of its political virtue. But for Korvela, there is no any evidence that affirms this view. For Germino, Machiavelli was purposely seeking to destroy Christianity and his motivation was simply earthly (Korvela 2006, p. 44). According to Korvela (2006, p. 10), his text is totally against the views of Christianity but this does not make him an atheist.

Therefore, for Korvela (2006, p. 48), Machiavelli did not assert that religion should be eliminated at all rather it should be used as a tool for politics. Religion is vital for political mobilization and to protect the state from foreign enemies. According to King (2007, p. 196), Machiavelli gave instrumental value for religion since he used it for his program. For

Machiavelli, religion should be used like that of the ancient Romans since the ancient Romans used religion “according to virtue”¹² (Hornqvist 2004, p. 83). In chapter 18, Machiavelli (1903, p. 70) described the value of religion in making citizens obedient and it is crucial to seem religious for the rulers. Therefore, for Korvela, Machiavelli uses Christianity as tool for the realization of his goal.

Thus, Korvela (2004, pp. 38 & 150) argued that Fredrick Nietzsche, Niccolò Machiavelli and Marquis de Sade¹³ were responsible for the ruin of Christian morality since they used it for their own purpose. Marquis de Sade rejected prescriptive moral framework in sexual behaviors. For de Sade, ‘sexual pleasure obtained by inflicting harm on others’ called “sadism”. Likewise, Machiavelli rejected any limitations in politics rather it should be used as a tool but for Marx, Durkheim, and Weber, modernity results following the decline of religion. Thus, for them, Machiavelli paved the way for modernity because he used Christianity as a means for his aim. Having this view, many thinkers argued that Machiavelli developed political secularism. But he used religion as a means for his political program.

Generally, Machiavelli used Christianity as a tool for his political ends. His main purpose was to establish a strong united state of Italy under a princely rule in *The Prince* and to transform it in to republican system like the Romans model through different ways like killing, deceiving, and through both moral and immoral means which are contrary to the doctrines of Christianity. He gave instrumental value for religion and morality since he followed the secret of Roman greatness. All religions including Christianity are humans and not heavenly origin (Strauss & Cropsey 1987, p. 312 & 314). However, in the doctrines of Christianity, Christian life is a preparation for the eternal life after death, John 12:25 (Korvela 2006, p. 70). It is a life of peace

¹² Which is the active participation in political life;

¹³ French soldier and writer (1740-1814);

and harmony. Accordingly, Machiavelli in *The Prince* used religion as a means for his political ends or political program.

2.3 The Role of Machiavelli's *Virtù*¹⁴ in his Political Program

There are different thinkers that grant different interpretation about the concept of Machiavelli's *virtù* (virtue) in *The Prince*. According to Matei (2011), in his article, *The Machiavellian Concept of Civic Virtues*, Machiavelli's concept of virtue is not entirely conflicting to the traditional concept of virtue. Quentin Skinner argued that Machiavelli did not define what *virtù* is; but he used it consistently. It is the quality which enables a prince to winning honour and glory for himself and the security of his government. Skinner said that *virtù* has a clear and consistent meaning if its definition is inline with *Fortuna*¹⁵ (Leonidas 2011, pp. 5-6). However, for George Bull,¹⁶ Machiavelli used the term *virtù* 'openly, nearly always in antithesis to *Fortuna*, at times with the sense of willpower, efficiency, and virtue'. For Bull, fortune is prowess¹⁷ (Machiavelli 1981, p. 25). On the other hand, according to Timo Airaksinen, the meaning of *virtù* is open like that of the meaning of fortune. Fortune for him is resource, lack or destiny, chance and uncertainty (Leonidas 2011, p. 6). For Korvela (2006, p. 19), Machiavelli's *virtù* is simply the moral flexibility of the action and the ability to discard moral rules when it is necessary. It is the tool that human controls the world. In the view of Pocock (2003, p. 156), the dilemma of fortune is the dilemma of virtue. For Thomas Hobbes, moral virtue and the fear of God are unnecessary for the creation of a good political order. Selfishness is the right foundation of political system. But for the ancients morally virtuous man is ready to

¹⁴ The Italian term *virtù* refers to the English term virtue or they can be used interchangeably.

¹⁵ This term has different meanings for Machiavelli; but it is the 'Roman *mythology* the goddess of fortune and good luck counterpart of Greek *Tyche*'; it brings both destruction and creation. See *The Prince* and *the Discourses*.

¹⁶ Who translates Machiavelli's book *The Prince* in 1981.

¹⁷ One's ability to defeat one's enemies and reach one's goal;

sacrifice himself for the interests of the society (Drury 2005, pp. 142-146). At this juncture, one should understand that *The Prince* is a guide book for politics; as a result, rulers used it differently in their understanding of *virtù* and *Fortuna*. This makes the system of politics problematic.

If I explore the views of different thinkers about the concept of Machiavelli's *virtù* in *The Prince* this much; then, now I try to scrutinize the roles of his concept of virtue for his program. I argue that his concept of *virtù* is one means for his program and it is incompatible with the traditional concept of virtue since Machiavelli (1998, p. 56) said that virtue is whatsoever was best for the state and related with power. His concepts of *virtù* have different meanings with the traditional concept of virtue since he used the word *virtù* in relation with power rather than having or developing good qualities because *virtù* for him is related with political success. How political success could be brought about? To give an answer for this question, Machiavelli wrote *The Prince*. For him, civic virtue is based on individual virtue. The virtue of individuals is imperative to maintain the order of the state (Wagner 2006, p. 61). Therefore, *virtù* refers ability, skill, energy, strength, and the like to solve troubles. Machiavelli (1903, p. 57) argued that the above qualities enable a prince to acquire reputation. This idea is found in *The Prince* and reads as follows:

A prince should therefore have no other aim, nor take up any other thing for his study, but war and its order and discipline, for that is the only art that is necessary to one who command, and it is of such virtue that it not only maintains those who are born princes but often enables men of private fortune to attain to that rank.

His concept of virtue is related with politics because in chapter 8, Machiavelli (1998, p. 34) suggested that Agathocles 'always kept to a life of crime at every rank of his career, nevertheless, his crimes were accompanied by such virtue of spirit and body.' In this expression, Machiavelli talks about individual virtue of Agathocles and *virtù* does not mean that of having

virtuous character (Leonidas 2011, p. 62). The usage of the word *virtù* for him in these two examples above indicates the force and abilities of the prince rather than having good qualities. Machiavelli (1998, p. 22) employed the word strength and virtue interchangeably. Virtue, for him, is the ability to use one's power over his subjects to maintain power and preserve the state. According to Juhana Lemetti, virtues are moral traits and to do with excellence. A virtuous person and action has an element of moral excellence. In addition to this, for Aristotle, virtue is any actions that contribute to the furthest aim of humanity like peace. But for Machiavelli, virtue is to do whatever is necessary for the preservation of one's state and it is political and has amoral characteristics. Morality and rationality are not necessary for a prince even if the action of the prince is prohibited and evil (Leonidas 2011, pp. 79-81). So, his thought of *virtù* is related with political game. For Giuseppe Prezzolini,¹⁸ Machiavelli's notion of virtue is not fit to the traditional concept of virtue. However, Plato's notion of virtue is the fundamental pillars of Christianity (Korvela 2006, p. 45). Machiavelli used both virtue and vice depending on the necessities of circumstances. Goodness is vital for citizens engaged in peaceful occupations while, *virtù* required for princes and soldiers to preserve the state and to maintain power (Strauss & Cropsey 1987, p. 301).

In chapter 6 of *The Prince*, Machiavelli (1998, p. 22-23) argued that *virtù* is related with political agents. Political agents are individuals, groups, states, and the like. Individual *virtù* is individual physical and mental power like courage, prudence, and so on. The virtues of Romulus, Agathocles, Cyrus, Thesus and others are examples of individual virtue. Virtue is the only means to acquire political success. Machiavelli (1903, p. 105) used the term *virtù* to express groups and the power of the state. In *The Prince*, he asserted that there is great virtue in the Italians to be superior in strength. In book 1, Machiavelli (1996, p. 27 & 53) also argued that, "virtue of the

¹⁸ One of the leading historians of Italian culture and Machiavelli's biographer;

army” and “virtue of the Romans”. According to Machiavelli (1903, p. 57), virtue of the army is imperative to maintain the security of the state. In this part, he discussed the significance of individual virtue to be successful in political affairs. For example, Machiavelli (1903, p. 77) considered the virtue of Marcus in *The Prince* as a good case as follows:

Marcus alone lived and died in honor, because he succeeded to the empire by hereditary right and did not owe it to the soldiers or to the people; besides which, possessing many virtues which made him revered, he kept both parties in their place as long as he lived and was never either hated or despised.

In spite of its different uses, virtue for him is simply the abilities of political agents to be successful in politics. He did not preach the value of virtue in itself but its use for his program (Stokes 2006, p. 59).

Besides this, his virtue is related with conditions or opportunities¹⁹. This thought is found in chapter 5 of *The Prince*. In this chapter, he considered the case of Moses, Cyrus, Romulus and Theseus. These rulers were with great virtue but they could not do anything without the opportunity which made them successful. Machiavelli (1998, p. 23) portrayed this as follows:

Moses found the people of Israel enslaved by the Egyptians, Romulus found himself exposed at birth, Cyrus found the Persians discontented with the empire of the Medes, and Theseus found the Athenians dispersed.

Thus, *virtù* (virtue) is related with opportunities since all the above great leaders will not be successful only through their virtues if they did not found the opportunity to be great leaders. *Virtù* for Machiavelli (1998, pp. 26-27), is related with fortune. In chapter 7, he declared that:

Francesco became duke of Milan from private individual by proper means and with a great virtue of his own...On the other hand Cesare Borgia, called Duke Valentino by the vulgar, acquired his state through the fortune of his father and lost it through the same.

He criticized the Italian political system because he said that Italy lost its former *virtù*. Virtue, for Machiavelli, is increasing prudence for the necessity of security at the expense of

¹⁹ In this context this term refers to a possibility due to a favorable combination of circumstances.

morality. Being virtuous²⁰ for a ruler leads to devastation while acting brutally will often bring safety (King 2007, p. 157). Machiavelli (1560, p. 14) in his book *The Art of war* said that virtue is ability, political genius, and prowess. Therefore, his notion of *virtù* (virtue) is a means to maintain power and preserve the state.

Accordingly, for Machiavelli to establish a republican system in *the Discourses* like the Romans model *The Prince* should be used as a means. Because Machiavelli believed that democratic system is possible after tyrannical beginning. In this tyrannical system everything is possible to maintain power and to establish a strong and united state of Italy under a princely rule. Morality, immoralities, Christianity, virtue, cunning, deceptions, killings, and any other evil and good things are used for the purpose of his political program.

²⁰ Having good manner or being morally excellent.

Chapter 3: Machiavelli's Political Program and Reason of State in *The Prince*

3.1 The Concept of Reason of State

Every state has its own reason of survival whether it is democratic or undemocratic, constitutional or unconstitutional, tyrannical or republican. Thus, the meaning and concept of reason of state depends on the nature of the state. Reason of state in a democratic state is different from that of undemocratic state. In this chapter, I am going to explore the notion of reason of state in general and Machiavelli's reason of state in *The Prince* in particular and I argue that his reason of state in *The Prince* is tyrannical in its character and used as a means to establish a strong state of Italy. The writings of Machiavelli in *the Discourses*, most of the time, promotes constitutional reason of state and there are different thinkers that make him as an advocates of constitutional reason of state from his writings in *the Discourses*. This section is not my intent in this thesis. Accordingly, I am going to explore the roles of his reason of state in *The Prince* for the success of his program. Before I proceed to this idea it is better to clear what is the concept of reason of state and how and when the notion of reason of state began. Since this will strength my argument in a better way.

There is no common consensus among thinkers when the idea of reason of state commences. For some thinkers, the notion of reason of state begins around the end of the 16th century in the writings of Machiavelli (Viroli 1992, p. 238). However, according to Peter Burke, the idea of reason of state goes back to the 12th and 13th century. This view is supported by Maurizio Viroli and for him; the notion of reason of state was initiated in ancient Roman, mainly in the writings of Tacitus²¹ and Cicero²². The works of Cicero preaches the idea of reason of state since for him, as Fischer portrays, reason of state commands people to do what is necessary even

²¹He was the Roman historian who wrote major works on the history of the Roman Empire from 56 to 120 B.C. See *the Discourses on Livy*.

²²One of the well known Roman state man and orator lived between 106-43 B.C. See Machiavelli's *Florentines History*.

if it may contradict with morality if there is no any means to protect the welfare of the people. However, Cicero discarded breaching of laws for the sake of private interest in the names of the common good. Due to this reason, many thinkers believe that Romans were the first people who bring the theory of reason of state. For some writers, the term reason of state was first employed by Giovanni della Casa in 1547, a speech composed to the emperor Charles V, since the speech have the idea of reason of state. However, for Peter Burke, reason of state becomes popular in the works of Giovanni Botero (Korvela 2006, pp. 116-117). This view is also supported by Fredrick (1957, p. 25) by saying Giovanni Botero is one who invented the term reason of state. According to Federico Bonaventura, in the writings of Plato, the idea of reason of state was found since Plato's art of ruling the republic is upholding the thought of reason of state. Different writers describe Machiavelli as the first man that invented the term reason of state in his political writings (Viroli 1992, p. 271). However, others believe that Machiavelli did not invent the term reason of state; instead, the idea goes back to ancient Roman and Greek. Of course, he did not use the term reason of state in his political thoughts. But his writing in *The Prince* advocates tyrannical reason of state. However, he considered as the first modern writer who explained the principles of reason of state. According to Frederick (1957, p. 5), the Athenians were the pioneer of the doctrine of reason of state in their discussion with the Melians by saying "might makes right" and power is an imperative instrument to rule.

Accordingly, there is no common understanding among thinkers when and how the idea of reason of state began. However, it is certain for one thing that Machiavelli was the one that promoted the idea of reason of state both in *The Prince* and *the Discourses on Tatius Livy*. His reason of state in *The Prince* (tyrannical reason of state) is a means for his reason of state in *the Discourses* (constitutional reason of state) since he argued that republican system is possible

after tyrannical beginning. His constitutional reason of state rests on his tyrannical reason of state. Therefore, Machiavelli's reason of state in *The Prince* served as a means in *the Discourses*.

Different thinkers define reason of state differently on the nature of the state and other factors. Thus, there is no clear understanding among thinkers about the term reason of state.

According to Scipione Ammirato, reason of state is defined as:

If a state is nothing more than domination, or rule, or reign, or empire, or any other name one might like to give it; reason of state will be nothing more than, reason of domination, of rule, of empire, of reign, or anything else. (Lerch 2011, p. 19)

Ammirato declared that reason of state can be good or bad. Good reason of state is the derogation of law for the interests of the people while bad reason of state is the derogation of the law for the interests of individual. Even if reasons of state violate civil laws they should respect the law of God and natural laws (Viroli 1992, p. 273). But Machiavelli's reason of state in *The Prince* did not make any distinction between good and bad reason of state rather the prince uses any means to maintain his power and the state. Natural laws and the law of God are irrelevant for Machiavelli unless they contribute for his program.

According to Quentin Skinner, in reason of state, there is political pessimism since its aim is to bring stability within the state. Therefore, reason of state is allied with the interest of the state. However, for Sheldon Wolin, the interests of the people and the state were not necessarily alike since princes could disregard recognized norms. In a tyrannical system, rulers may give priority for their own interest to the interest of their subjects. Thus, for those who advocate the political thought of Aristotle, reason of state is taken as a danger for reasonable state, morality, and religion. It makes religion instrument for the state. Therefore, Machiavelli's reason of state in *The Prince* is a challenge for reasonable idea of politics. His advice is apt for tyrants and the system of tyranny. Accordingly, his reason of state in *The Prince* eliminated any religious confines on politics and made the state superior (Korvela 2006, p. 118). Therefore, reason of

state is the notion that the good and the stability of the state is utmost and the roles of the government should be for the triumph of this goal by using any means whether it legal or illegal, just or unjust. To protect the security and the well-being of the state, the well-being of the subject will be violated and individuals will be sacrificed. Machiavelli's reasons of state in *The Prince* used liberty, equality, and right of the subjects as a means since he advises the prince to protect and maintain the security of the state and his power at any cost. His power politics in *The Prince* is reason of state of tyranny since he claims that through strong power, the security and orders of the state is maintained.

Brunetto Latini defined reason of state as the means of preserving supremacy over the people through different means (Korvela 2006, p. 2). Machiavelli and Francesco Guicciardini were responsible for the shift of politics to reason of state since Machiavelli rejected politics as the art of republic and promoted the notion of tyrannical reason of state. The end of politics is the quest of power and the prince should not be good man like that of the ancients. Like Machiavelli, Guicciardini argued that to maintain the state, the prince should reject moral values, religion, reasonable thinking, and the values of the society (Viroli 1992, p. 126 & 194). He shifted the intent of politics purposefully away from "civil philosophy"²³ to the art of the state. Both of them rejected the values of natural law and morality to rule the state. As said by Peter Burke, reason of state is defined as the view that "national interests override moral laws" (Armitag 2000). According to Viroli (1992, p. 252 & 267), for Giovanni Botero, reason of state means 'the knowledge of the means to establish, maintain and enlarge a state through domination' and "reason of state is little else than reason of interest". It is the universal art of ruling and offered "prudence" as the key ingredient of the art of rule. Like Machiavelli and Guicciardini, Botero

²³ The notion of "civil philosophy" that the writer used in this context is to mean ethics and law. See the book of Viroli *from Politics to Reason of State*.

discarded natural law and he also used morality, justice, and religion as a means for his aim. His idea of reason of state applies for both legitimate and illegitimate states. Therefore, reason of state is the art of preserving any state by any means.

Some writers define reason of state in relation to politics. For example, as said by Trajano Boccalini, politics is the art of safeguarding and expanding a state and reason of state is part of politics (Viroli 1992, p. 261). Tommaso Campanella²⁴ said that ‘reason of state is an invention of tyranny; that justifies the violations of civil, natural, and divine laws in the interests of whoever is in power.’ Reason of state which is an evil notion substitutes the right concept of politics. Machiavelli’s power politics in *The Prince* is a corrupt art and an evil one for him. Machiavelli’s reason of state in *The Prince* used ethics, morality and religion as a means. Ludovico Zuccolo, the Venetian²⁵ writer, argued that reasons of state focus on the interest of the ruler. According to Filippo Maria Bonini, reason of state is the way of using any means whether just or unjust which is suitable to preserve any state and it is the art of tyranny (Viroli 1992, pp. 267-269). Conversely, others said that reason of state is the correct way of ruling a state within and outside the state according to the constitution of the state and the power of other nations (Armitag 2000). For Alberto Fabri, the notion of reason of state was derived from government since the presence of government led to the existence of reason of state (Viroli 1992, p. 271). For Frederick (1957, pp. 2-4), all states have their own reasons of survival to defend themselves from internal and external enemies; and it is the doctrine that whatsoever is crucial to insure the survival of the state in any means.

The rule that determines the conduct of state is different from the rule that determines private conduct. Reason of state is a set of rules concerning the conducts of the state. The

²⁴ Who was an Italian writer on reason of state;

²⁵ A resident of Venice;

morality of the state is different from the morality of private individual. What is needed in private life may be unnecessary for the state. The virtue of private life may be in contradiction with the virtue of the state (Korvela 2006, p. 115). During the medieval period, reason of state was used in a right way unlike the modern notion of reason of state for some thinkers since in the medieval period, the right means were used in order to protect the state and it was according to the law of nature and subordinate to higher reason of state. However, in the modern era, the idea of reason of state was considered as the reverse of ruling the state in justice (Viroli 1992, pp. 272-273). Therefore, there are right and wrong reasons of state. Reason of state is right when it focuses on the common interest and is limited by justice while it becomes wrong, when it focuses on self interest and evil acts. However, the prince is expected to recognize the bad means since in times of chaos, the ruler must save the state. In *The Prince*, Machiavelli (1998, p. 69) argued that ‘a prudent lord, therefore, cannot, observe faith, nor should he, when such observance turns against him and the causes that made him promise have been eliminated.’ This expression shows that his advice for the princes promotes bad reason of state since he advises his compatriots to do evil and wicked activities to preserve and maintain the security of the state.

According to Papzzo there are good and bad reason of state. Good reason of state is the ancient thought of politics like justice, prudence, virtue and aims at the preservation of people. Bad reason of state is the art of state and aims at demolishing humanity and used it as a means for their purpose (Viroli 1992, p. 276). So, Machiavelli’s reason of state is incompatible with Papzzo’s definition since it is the arts of the state and it used anything to maintain power. Machiavelli supports murder if it is necessary for his program.

The principle of reason of state permits the state to take proper measures to maintain the security of the state. Constitutional reason of state allows the state to take measures to save the

constitutional order. Many thinkers argued that reason of state is the art of government and aims at maintaining, and extending the state. Others advanced the view that reason of state is the game behind government deed. For Viroli (1992, p. 262), reason of state focuses on the interests of the ruler not the good of the people. It is the reason of the rulers at least acting out of the values of the state and perhaps out of their sovereign capacities. For Meinecke, reason of state is the rule of politics and the law of motion of the state. It orders the ruler what he must do in order to maintain the common good. The notion of reason of state answers the assertions of the highest value or the life of the political community. If we discard this notion and desire to assert another highest value, then we are rejecting the state (Fredrick 1957, p. 123 & 127).

There are many thinkers that advocate constitutional reason of state like Harrington, Spinoza, and Montesquieu. Constitutional reason of state protects the freedom, justice, rights and the well-beings of the people. According to Harrington and Montesquieu, each state has its own reason of state. Reason of state, for Harrington, is “the administration of government” it is concerned with growth and perfection. Depending on the nature of the state, Harrington grouped reason of state as good and bad (Fredrick 1957, p. 37).

As C.J. Frederick, cited Spinoza, in his book *Constitutional Reason of State*, freedom is ‘even necessary for the preservation of the government... the safest way for a *civitas*...is...that every man should think what he likes and say what he thinks.’ Therefore, for Spinoza, the preservation of freedom is the true constitutional reason of state. However, Machiavelli’s reason of state is whatsoever the prince thinks is needed for the security and survival of the state. Spinoza advocates governments of laws and not of men. He said that ‘it is much better for us to live according to the laws and assured dictates of reason’ (Fredrick 1957, p. 24). The state which forbids freedom of thought causes its own destruction since “the true aim of government is

liberty” (Fredrick 1957, pp. 45-46). However, the issue of freedom in Machiavelli’s reason of state is unthinkable because his purpose was to make a strong national state of Italy that defends itself from foreign enemies.

For Montesquieu, the only remedy of the protection of the state is through the establishment of “federative system” power should be shared between the legislative, the executive, and the judiciary bodies (Fredrick 1957, p. 51). But for Machiavelli, all power of the state should be concentrated in the hand of the prince to maintain the security of the state because his aim in *The Prince* was to establish a strong national state of Italy and to transform it into republican system like the Romans. Therefore, Machiavelli’s political thought in *The Prince* promotes the tyranny of reason of system.

3.2 The Role of Machiavelli’s Reason of State in his Political Program

Machiavelli did not use the term reason of state in his political writings. However, implicitly his political thoughts, in *The Prince* and in *the Discourses*, promote tyrannical and constitutional reason of state respectively. For him, constitutional reason of state, in *the Discourses*, is possible after tyrannical reason of state, in *The Prince*, since he argued that “the end justifies the means”. Therefore, *The Prince* and *the Discourses* are related to each other according to his program since his republican system would not be effective without tyrannical beginning.

Different thinkers and writers show how Machiavelli’s reason of state in *The Prince* is useful for his program. According to Friedrich Meinecke, Machiavelli was the first person who “thought through” the true nature and essence of reason of state and who renovated the notion of reason of state. Ancient writers never understood the problem in its right way since the ancient Greeks and Romans considered morality and political morality “coincided”. But Machiavelli

made a clear distinction between morality and political morality. For Fredrick, the talk held between the Athenians and the Melians brings the notions of reason of state since the Athenians believed that “might makes right” and state should be ruled by force. Machiavelli also believed that it is through crimes that republican system is possible. The Romans founded their republican system through crimes. For Korvela (2006, p. 33), following the emergence of absolute states, the notion of reason of state begins. Since the comings of different absolute states around the world, different states need the theory of the state to rule.

George L. Mosse asserts, in the works of Machiavelli, the modern idea of reason of state was found since Machiavelli gave autonomous power and its own morality for the state. Indeed, the notion of reason of state in the modern time is usually linked with Machiavellianism since Machiavelli made religion subordinate to politics. However, the term reason of state became popular by Botero in 1589. It is after this time that reason of state denotes the political doctrines of Machiavelli. Therefore, for him, the state has its own morality and Christian morality did not function in the state (Korvela 2006, pp. 113-114). Accordingly, Machiavelli’s reason of state used Christian morality for the purpose of his political program.

Christopher Marlowe, in his Play *The Jew of Malta*, maintained that Machiavelli made conventional morality subordinate and a means to the state. The making and preserving of the state by any means is the first thing for him (Fredrick, 1957, p. 1). According to James Harrington, Machiavelli was writing in his famous book, *The Prince*, the notion of reason of state of tyranny. Every state has its own reason of survival to defend itself from external and internal enemies (Fredrick 1957, p. 36). Therefore, all the above thoughts show that Machiavelli used his reason of state in *The Prince* as a means for his political program.

In *The Prince*, Machiavelli (1981) argued that any actions and policies that promote the security of the state are justified since the preservation of the state is given priority over the welfare of its people. To maintain and safeguard the state, all means are justified. In politics, one is guided by the cruel realities of political life. Therefore, the action of the state must be judged on the bases of its result. This is what reason of state for Machiavelli. In *The Prince*, Machiavelli (1903, p. 61) said that ‘he must not mind incurring the disgrace of those vices, without which it would be difficult to save the state.’ The primary activities of any prince should focus on power. The issue of morality and religion is different and cannot be combined with the system of the state. For him, the power of the prince is imperative since it is used to preserve the state from external as well as internal enemies. As Machiavelli (1981, p. 62) described, the state is not a moral being rather it is superior to religion. It is through this way that the Roman republic in the then period was feasible.

According to Machiavelli (1998, p. 67), the independence of the state in different spheres is crucial. The state should be founded on its own army and should have a strong and unified government. Power is a foundation of government and to establish a government, considering all men as wicked is essential. As he declared, the most powerful and great states in the world like the Romans was founded and maintained only by crime. He ignored the idea of humanity since the state was the absolute good of human existence and it had been served at any cost. For the good of the state, justice, freedom, and rights might be violated. Therefore, Machiavelli’s reason of state, in *The Prince*, rejects rights, dignity, human liberty, and justice. For him, the morality of the state and the morality of individuals are different. This implies that the state cannot function in the morality of Christianity since the morality of the Christian is harmful for the state by itself unless it is used as a means systematically by a wise prince (Korvela 2006, p. 26). In chapter 8,

Machiavelli (1998, p. 34) described sometimes ruling becomes triumphant through crimes. State is the supreme good over any other things. To maintain and secure the state, any measure is justified since he advises his compatriots to take any measure which is necessary to the state regardless of its rightness or wrongness, just or unjust. Machiavelli (1981, p.101) declared the above thought as follows:

[t]he ruler must prepare to vary his conduct as the winds of fortune and changing circumstances constrain him, and not deviate from right conduct, but be capable of entering up on the path of the wrong doing when this becomes necessary.

Therefore, for him, reason of state is the survival of the state by any means. Justice, freedom, right, morality and religion are irrelevant in themselves unless they contribute for his program. In *The Prince*, Machiavelli (1903) argued that the morality of the state and the morality of individuals are the two different things. For him, what was not acceptable in private life was sometimes necessary in political life and the virtue of individual will be harmful for political life. Therefore, reason of state is a set of rules concerning on the conduct of the government and differ greatly from private moralities and virtues. Therefore, his reason of state plays a key role for the success of his program.

In *The Prince*, Machiavelli (1998, p. 29) stated that ‘the action of any ruler is justifiable if it contributes to the peace, prosperity, and stability of the state’. He acknowledges murder, violence and any forms of cruelty to protect the interests of the state since he appreciates the cruelty of Cesare Borgia in subduing the Romagna since it brings order and unity to the earlier unruly region. Thus, Machiavelli believed that through cruelty and murder, the security and the order of any state can be preserved and this thought of Machiavelli is the reason of state of tyranny. Some writers consider him as the one that laid a foundation for the nation state and its central Philosophy of “reason of state” (Seaman 2007, p. 296).

His concept of *virtù* is an essential part of his reason of state of tyranny in *The Prince* since the notion of *virtù* is crucial for the security and survival of the state. According to Machiavelli (1981, p. 22), depending on one's own *virtù* is the basis to found a state. The cases of Romulus, Theseus and Cyrus were good examples to this. Machiavelli (1998, p. 56) also said that *virtù* is whatever is best for the state and related with power. In *the Discourses*, Machiavelli (1996, p. 27) expressed *virtù* as the Romans' *virtù* which was the basis for the foundations of Roman Empire or Romans' reason of state. *Virtù* include courage, prowess and the willingness to fight for and the sacrifice oneself for the *Patria*²⁶. The notions of *virtù*, *Fortuna*, and necessity are useful for his reason of state. For him, necessity is beyond the law. Political life is ruled by the "laws of necessity". According to Thomas Aquinas, "necessity is not subjected to law" (Fredrick 1957, pp. 19, 21 & 37) like Machiavelli. Machiavelli's reason of state, in *The Prince*, is the government of men not government of laws because the state is the majestic good over anything. The security and survival of the state is "*hors de discussion*"; that is, it is self-justifying as any absolute value (Fredrick 1957, p. 23). Consequently, for him, reason of state is how to maintain, and preserve the power of the prince and the security of the state by any means.

Generally, Machiavelli had a political program of establishing republican system in Italy after tyrannical beginning. To do this, Machiavelli developed his agenda in *The Prince* that served as a starting point. This starting point (*The Prince*) is tyrannical in its nature since he believed that it is through this way that the Romans' republic was possible. This tyrannical system is reason of state of tyranny. This reason of state supported his program to be successful since reason of state for him is the survival of the state by any means. It is after the survival of tyrannical state that republican state is possible for him. Therefore, establishing a strong and

²⁶ It refers to the state or the "fatherland" for Machiavelli. For further understanding please see Machiavelli's books *The Prince* and *the Discourses on Titus Livy*.

united state of Italy under the princely rule is the first thing to realize his aim. How it is possible to build a strong united state in Italy? For him all the advices and the guiding principles that set in *The Prince* are means to succeed the first step and to established republican system in Italy. *The Prince* is guidebook that focuses on how to gain power, how to keep power, how to run a state through power, and how to form a strong united state of Italy through power. Therefore, Machiavelli used *The Prince* as a means for his political program in *the Discourses*.

According to Machiavelli, to protect the security of the state any actions that is taken by the prince is proper and reasonable. This thought of Machiavelli also supported by Milton. For Milton, through forceful ways the security and survival of the state could be maintained. It is for freedom that the state should take forceful measures on its subjects. Reason of state was built on governments' view with the general interest (Fredrick 1957 p. 76). Like Milton, Machiavelli also believed that it is for the purpose of establishing republican system in Italy that the survivals of the tyrannical state in *The Prince* become mandatory. Therefore, Machiavelli's reason of state in *The Prince* is one means of succeeding his political program.

3.3 The Shifting Points of Machiavelli's Program from *The Prince* to *the Discourses*

Machiavelli's program shifts from *The Prince* to *the Discourses* when the state is already stabilized, secured, united, and defend itself from internal and external enemies. Therefore, the next task that the prince expected is to establish republican system that ensures free way of life for its people. There are different indicators that imply the shift of his program from *The Prince* to *the Discourses*. As I already said in the above, the triumph of his program in *The Prince* or the stability of the state and its unity under princely rule are the turning points. For example, in *the Discourse*, Machiavelli (1996, p. 29) argued that:

... if one individual is capable of ordering a government, the thing itself is ordered to last long not if it remains on the shoulders of one individual but rather if it remains in the care of many and its maintenance stays with many. For as many are not capable of ordering a thing because they don't know it's good, which is because of the diverse opinions among them...when they have come to know it, they don't agree to abandon it. Romulus killed his brother for the common good, not for his ambition. For example, Moses, Solon, Lycurgus, and other founders of kingdom[principality] and republics who were able to form laws for the purpose of the common good because they have one authority attributed.

The above paragraph indicates the shift of his program. He also said that to be successful in the establishment of republican system, the state must go forward a compulsory run from principality to republic and republics must continue to enlarge itself.

Different people may raise the question that the prince may not need or allow his state to change into republican system after succeeding his program in *The Prince*. However, for Machiavelli, there is no any factor that hinders the shift of his program. For him, the prince cannot control this change because politics moves a compulsory run in a circular manner. The change may be slower or faster but it is obligatory. The change in the system of principality is much faster than in republics. For him, a prince can establish a system of tyranny for a short period of time only. But in republican system due to the presence of check and balance the life of the government is much longer. Therefore, princes prefer to stay in power in stable and convenient form of government. In chapter II, of *the Discourses*, Machiavelli (1996, p. 12) argued that following destructions, disorder, and instability there is prosperity; through revolution princely government is followed by tyranny, again through revolution tyrannical government shifts into oligarchy, again through revolution it changes into popular state and finally the republic collapses into anarchy. This shows the cycle of governments from one form to the other. For him all forms of government are in change. Therefore, tyrannical forms government transform into republican form.

Besides this, for Machiavelli (1996, p. 13), the absolute power of the prince did not prevent the transformation of tyrannical system into republicanism. Because history show how tyrannical

rulers, those who were given absolute power, established laws that protected the interest of the common good. For example, Romulus of Rome, and Solon of Athens was the most important figures in history. Those tyrannical rulers can do for the interests of the common good. Therefore, his program in *The Prince* can shift into republican system through this way.

Chapter 4: Machiavelli's Political Program in *the Discourses on Livy*²⁷

4.1 Indicators of his Political Program in *the Discourses*

In chapter one of this thesis, I explored Machiavelli's program in *The Prince*. As I scrutinize in chapter one, his program in *The Prince* was to form a strong and united national state of Italy under a princely rule and to transform it into republican system by considering the Roman republic as a model. To do this, he used the wicked means (*The Prince*) which is tyrannical in its nature. For him, establishing a strong and united state is the first step to succeed his program. In this section, I am going to explore his political program and different indicators in *the Discourses*. Understanding different indicators in *the Discourses* about his program answer the questions of inconsistencies between *The Prince* and *the Discourses* that pose by different thinkers. In *the Discourses* there are many indicators of his program or his aim of establishing republican system in Italy by considering *The Prince* as a means.

The thoughts of different thinkers also show his political program in *The Prince* and *the Discourses*. For example, according to Skinner, Machiavelli's book, *the Discourses*, as a notable work for the development of republican system since, in this book, he explored how the Roman constitution is developed, and how the Roman empires and rulers became great (Seaman 2007, pp. 281-282). The establishment of the Romans republic was through fratricide; that is, Romans republic is possible after tyrannical beginning. Machiavelli also follows the same procedures like the Romans to established republican system in Italy.

Many thinkers consider Machiavelli as a promoter of good way of life since they believe that his thoughts are republican in their contents. Of course, Machiavelli is a promoter of free way of life in *the Discourses* but he used tyrannical system (*The Prince*) as a means. It is undeniable that he used tyrannical systems in *The Prince* to bring republican systems in *the*

²⁷ For this thesis in this chapter I use Machiavelli's book *the Discourses* as the main reference material which is translated by Harvey C. Mansfield and Nathan Tarcov in 1996.

Discourses. The tyrannical system that he developed in *The Prince* is wicked. Even some ideas of *the Discourses* are found in *The Prince* and vice versa. *The Prince* is tyrannical in its character while *the Discourses* republican. But he used this tyrannical system as a means to form republican system. Republican ends depend on tyrannical means and this republican ends are possible through the use of power.

Machiavelli (1998, p. 67), in *The Prince* and *the Discourses*, states that to found a state considering all men as wicked is the first conditions since everyone wants to show his/her bad nature. Hence, a wise prince should understand the wicked nature of men. His republican system, in *the Discourses*, was based on immoral principles and wicked nature of men. So, a well-ordered republic came in to existence through different dangerous. The Roman republic was built through crimes because Romulus killed his brother Remus, and various injustices were done on the peoples of Rome. Machiavelli also wants to form Roman republic of Italy by following the experiences of the Romans republic. Machiavelli (1996, p. 29) affirmed this fact in book I, of *the Discourses*, by stating as follows:

...many will perhaps judge it as a bad example that a founder of a civil way of life, as was Romulus, should first have killed his brother, and then consented to the death of Titus Tatius the Sabine, chosen by him as partner in the kingdom... that opinion would be true if one did not consider what end had induced him to commit such a homicide.

This paragraph shows Machiavelli's program in his writings. In book I, Machiavelli (1996, p. 83) also declared that:

... irresolute republics never take up good policies unless by force; because their weakness never allows them to decide where there is any doubt; and if that doubt not suppressed by violence that drives them on, they always remain in suspense.

Therefore, according to Machiavelli force is imperative to form a well ordered republic. It is through force that the republican system is possible and corrupted forms of government are changed into well-ordered republican system.

Machiavelli (1996, p. 191), in *the Discourses*, advises his contemporaries about the uselessness of mercenary troops. Besides this, he also preached about the uselessness of mercenary troops in *The Prince*, and *the Art of War*. This shows his program of establishing a republican system by forming a strong state that defends itself from foreign enemies. This also indicates the consistency between *The Prince* and *the Discourses*.

Besides this, the following expression also shows his program in *the Discourses*. In book II, Machiavelli (1996, p. 155) said that 'what princes are necessitated to do at the beginnings of their increase, republics also are necessitated to do until they have become powerful and force alone is enough.' In this quote Machiavelli expressed the importance of force to form a well-ordered republic. Even within the republican system force is significant for him to maintain a free way of life. Therefore, *The Prince* for him is a tool to establish a republican system.

According to Machiavelli (1996, p. 13), there were many individuals in history that were given absolute power but established laws that protected the interests of the common such as Romulus of Rome, Solon of Athens, and Lycurgus of Sparta. For him, the absolute power of the prince did not prevent the transformation of a tyrannical system into republicanism. Therefore, the tyrannical system (*The Prince*) can change into a republican system (*the Discourses*). His political program also follows the same procedures.

For Machiavelli (1996 p. 15), to succeed the greatness of the republic, the state must go through a forceful run from principality to republic and republics must persist to enlarge after it is established and power is vital to protect the republic. For example, Brutus killed his sons to defend the republic and to expand his power. Therefore, establishing a republican system by using a tyrannical system is acceptable. Even within the republic force is significant to make a good way of life.

There is also another indicator that shows his program of establishing Roman republic of Italy in *the Discourses*. In book I, of the *Discourses*, Machiavelli (1996, p. 23) argued that:

It is necessary to follow the Roman order and not that of the other republics. I don't believe one can find a model between the one and the other; and to tolerate the enmities that arises between the people and the senate, taking them as an inconvenience necessary to arrive at Roman greatness.

This shows Machiavelli's program of establishing republican system in Italy by considering *The Prince* as a means. Machiavelli (1996, p. 30), in book I, also argued that 'Romulus who was the founder of Rome killed his brother Remus so as to take power.' For him, rulers should learn and study the history of Romans but the existence of the Romans republic was not in a peaceful way. This implies that republican system is possible after tyrannical beginning. Machiavelli (1996, p. 27) also said that, in *the Discourses*, *virtù* as the Romans *virtù* which was the basis for the foundations of Roman Empire. This thought also reveals his political program.

Besides this, there are also additional indicators of his program in *the Discourses*. In book 1, of *the Discourses*, Machiavelli (1996, p. 116) said that 'the multitude is wiser and more constant than the prince.' this implies that Machiavelli had a program of establishing republican system. It is through republican system that the common good is observed. According to Machiavelli (1996), republics keep their promise better than principalities and the common good is only found in republics.

Generally, all the above different thoughts that I discussed reveal the consistency between *The Prince* and *the Discourses* and his program of establishing republican system in Italy like the Romans. Now I am going to discuss the aims of his political program in *the Discourses* as follows.

4.2 The Aim of Machiavelli's Political Program in *the Discourses*

The final aim of Machiavelli, in *the Discourses*, was to establish a republican system in Italy like the Roman model. In a republican system, people enjoys a free way of life. There are different indicators in *the Discourses* that show his republican system as I discussed in the above section. In this section, I am going to discuss how Machiavelli's book, *the Discourses*, preaches a republican system and a free way of life since his aim of establishing a republican system was to guarantee and maintain a free way of life for the people.

The Discourses on Titus Livy is a book composed by Niccolò Machiavelli in the early 16th century in 1517; however, it was published in 1531 after five years from the death of Machiavelli. It is a commentary on the works of the Roman historian Titus Livy on the history of Rome. It explores how Roman greatness is possible, and how it prevents corruption for so long. *The Discourses* consists of a dedication letter and three books with a total of 142 chapters and this book was dedicated to his young friends Zanobi Buondelmonti and Cosimo Rucellai²⁸ since they deserve to be princes'. Due to this reason, many writers considered *the Discourses* an idealistic work unlike *The Prince*. Machiavelli used *the Discourses* to teach future republican rulers and takes the Roman republic as the source of lessons for contemporary states since it brings a life of political liberty after a tyrannical beginning. The primary aim of a republic is to succeed in civic greatness and a free way of life since in *the Discourses* in book 1, Machiavelli (1996, p. 117) said that 'people are more prudent, more stable, and of better judgment than the prince... and governments by the people are better than government by princes.' So, *the Discourses* advise government to bring order from the disordered world and show the political processes from this anarchy to principality and to republics. Accordingly, he preached a free way of life since he affirmed that government should depend on the consent of the people.

²⁸ These two friends of Machiavelli appear in Machiavelli's *Art of War*. See Machiavelli's *Art of War*.

Machiavelli considered the Romans and the ancient people as models for modern states. Citizens enjoy good way of life in republican system since in book 1, Machiavelli (1996, p. 116) said that ‘the multitude is wiser and more constant than the prince.’ According to Machiavelli (1996), republics keep their promise better than principalities and the common good is only found in republics. Consequently, good way of life is possible through the establishment of republican system like that of the Romans model since Romans enjoy a free way of life.

For him, Roman republic was a model for other republics and it was a source of free way of life. In Roman republics, there were political liberty, devotion to the common good, equality under just laws, mixed government, the active participation of people, open opportunities to compete for civic honors, and the avoidance of tyranny, and corruption. The Roman republican system brings enduring freedom for its citizens. Thus, Machiavelli’s aim in *the Discourses* was to bring good way of life like that of the Romans by following their experiences. The Romans experience is a best lesson to understand human behaviors since a free and independent republic like that of the Roman model should be the goal of political activity (Seaman 2007, p. 71 & 73). All the above notions of Machiavelli show how the Romans republic is possible through fratricide. Therefore, like the Romans he also desired to establish republican government in Italy after tyrannical beginning.

Machiavelli (1998), in *The Prince*, deal about the process of acquiring power since for him all politics is power politics. The power of the prince should be maintained at any cost by any means. In his time, there were political turmoil in Italy and he was looking for power based solution for this chaos. The aims of the state should be at the increasing of power and a prince should understand that every success is due to power. Thus, any prince gives priority to power because it is through power that the security of the state is maintained and the state protects its

people from internal and external enemies. His political thought in the prince is tyrannical in its nature. But in *the Discourses*, Machiavelli (1996) used the concept of power to make republican systems like the Romans model and finally to preserve the common good and free way of life. The aim of power politics for Machiavelli in a well-ordered republic in *the Discourses* is to maintain a free way of life. *The Discourses* focuses on in the establishment and prevalence of free way of life. Therefore, there is consistency between *The Prince* and *the Discourses*. Machiavelli, in *the Discourses*, discussed how republican system like the Romans model is possible to maintain a free way of life.

According to Machiavelli, class conflict, mixed government, virtù and fortune, institutions, laws, and native strong military are essential elements to make republican system and to maintain a free way of life. Now, I am going to discuss one by one how they serve as basic rudiments to build republican system and sources of free way of life.

The notion of class conflict is a vital component for the establishment of republican system since for Machiavelli (1996, p. 15), Roman republic came in to being as a result of class conflicts between the nobles and the plebeians. In every state, the nobles and the plebeians were enemies to each other since the nobles wanted to rule the plebeians while the plebs only wanted not to be oppressed. Machiavelli, in *the Discourses*, claimed that in Romans, the plebes had a share of power in the seats of the tribunes to “prevent the insolence of the nobles”. According to Machiavelli (1996, pp. 17-20), the conflicts between the two classes brought the emergence of laws that prevented the domination of one class over the other. He admired the military organizations of the Romans in which the people had a share of power. For the expansion and the liberty of the Romans, the roles of the plebs were paramount. Unlike, Roman empires, the republic of Venice failed in expansion since it excluded the plebs from political power and

military. Thus, laws and institutions in Roman republic were the results of the quarrel between the nobles and the plebs. In book 1, Machiavelli (1996, p. 16) affirmed that ‘...in every republic are two diverse humors, that of the people and that of the great, and that all the laws that are made in favor of freedom arise from their disunion, as can easily be seen to have occurred in Rome.’ This implies that the stability and orders of the Romans was the results of class conflicts and this quarrel brought institutions and laws. Machiavelli (1996, p. 23) added ‘it is necessary to follow the Roman order and not that of the others; and to tolerate the enmities that arise between the people and the Senate, taking them as an inconvenience to arrive at Roman greatness.’ He recognized the value of free speech and debate to settle conflicts peacefully and to bring laws and institutions which are the sources of free way of life.

Machiavelli (1996) admired the role of people in the area of military and the tribunes to bring freedom by considering the Romans as a model unlike the Venice. The presence of the plebs in the tribunes prevented the prince to do wrong things on the state and the plebs was the source of freedom and justice. Law developed due to the representations of the plebs in the senate and this law governs all equally without bias and it paves the way for free way of life.

The prevalence of disorder in the natural state leads to the establishment of the state to protect people from this anarchy for Machiavelli. Romans used mixed government as a best method to avoid corruption and to maintain a free way of life. Machiavelli (1996, p.35) advocates republics and reject principality; since in book1 he claimed that:

[p]rinces are of short life; it must be that of the kingdom will fail soon, as his virtue fails. Thus, it is the safest of a republic to have not one prince who governs prudently while he lives, but one individual who orders it so that it is also maintained when he dies.

For Julia Conaway Bondanella, Machiavelli admired the Roman republic since people involved in governments unlike those of the Sparta and Venice (Seaman 2007, p. 82). As Machiavelli (1996, pp. 12-13) expressed, elective government is the best kind. His republic

included representatives from the plebes and the nobles since it is through this way that good way of life are possible. There is an inevitable alteration in the world and that all forms of governments pass through this alteration. The good forms of government become corrupt since human beings make the common good subordinate to their private interest. Therefore, Machiavelli aimed to form good forms of government that promoted the interests of the common people.

Machiavelli (1996, p.14) identified six types of governments which were taken from Aristotle three of them were good²⁹ like principality, aristocracy, and democracy and the other three were bad³⁰ like tyranny, oligarchy, and anarchy. The good forms of government were continued by those who worked for the common good, and the bad forms of government were preserved by those that were seeking their own private interest only. The shift from good to bad form of government was caused by the poor memory of men and the reverse change is possible through mass revolution against the corrupt prince.

Therefore, as Machiavelli (1996, pp. 11-13) portrayed, to avoid corruption, the establishment of mixed type of government that included different representatives was essential since the idea of check and balance would exist. He considered three cases that show the system of mixed government; for instance, Lycurgus of Sparta established mixed government by combining three good types of government. In Venice, there was also mixed type of government that ensured the liberty of the state for long period of time. Machiavelli (1996, p.18) believed that the plebes were the owners of liberty because they “have less appetite for usurping it”. In Romans, there was mixed governments as well. Romulus established a system of sharing power

²⁹ Principality is the virtuous rule by one man, aristocracy a virtuous rule by the upper classes, and democracy a virtuous rule by the masses.

³⁰ Tyranny is a corrupt monarchy leading to a loss of freedom, oligarchy a corrupted aristocracy leading to oppression, and anarchy a corrupted democracy leading to a destruction of the state.

with the senate and laws that prevented the Romans from corruption and that allowed for change. The clash between the plebeians and the senate brought change in Roman republic (Seaman 2007, p. 84). The intention that Machiavelli desired to form mixed forms of government was mainly to prevent corruption which is the enemies of free way of life. It is through this system that people enjoy good way of life.

Machiavelli (1996, pp.11, 13 & 14) asserted that the establishment of mixed government in the state enables to bring stability, security, liberty and avoids one group from suppressing the other. He rejected all forms of pure government three goods since their life is so short and three bads due to their innate evilness. So, mixed type of government gives better security for the people since its degeneration will be much slower and is strong and this brings check and balance. This brings good way of life for him.

As said by Machiavelli (1996, p. 12), all the six forms of government are in change. First, one powerful leader rules the whole state and power corrupts the institution, the upper class rebel and establish aristocracy. Power also corrupts them as well, and the mass rebel and establish democracy but democracy moves down in to anarchy. Therefore, the combinations of the three good forms of government prevent corruptions. He also said that to avoid evil deeds making laws and punishing those who are against the laws are essential. This brings the idea of justice, and check and balance which are the components of free way of life.

He used religion and other institutions as an instrument to protect a free republic from corruption. In his view, religion is a tool for the art of the state in establishing institutions. A triumphant republic values religious practices since it strengthens the republic (Seaman 2007, p. 84). Religion is an important element for the prevalence of a free way of life. In book 1, Machiavelli (1996, p. 35) expressed the value of religion in political life 'where there is religion,

arms can easily be introduced, and where there are arms and not religion, the latter can be introduced only with difficulty.’ This quote indicates the value of religion to produce good armies. As well, Machiavelli (1996, p. 34) also considered the case of Roman army that used religion effectively ‘to command armies, to animate the plebs, to keep men good, and to bring shame to the wicked.’ According to Machiavelli (1996, p. 24 & 35), Numa³¹ was a successful ruler that used religion as a means for the prevalence of peace in the republic he ‘turned to religion as a thing altogether necessary if he wished to maintain a civilization.’ Unlike Romulus, for Numa, the authority of God needed to order the senate and the military. Therefore, Machiavelli used religion as a means to protect the republic and the common good.

Military and power play a vital role to maintain a free way of life. For Machiavelli (1996, p.138), armies are essential tools in defending liberty and to establish republics. He argued that power is a way to glory and the greatness of the state is possible through territorial expansion, number of citizens, creating beneficial alliances, and preserving freedom. He admired the value of good armies and good laws for the foundations of all types of states. This notion is found in *The Prince* and in *the Discourses*. Machiavelli (1903, p. 47) said that:

The chief foundations of all states, whether new, old, or mixed are good laws and good arms. And as there can’t be good laws where there are not good arms and where there are good arms there should be good laws.

Machiavelli affirmed that the prevalence of liberty is within the hands of the people and it is true that liberty never exists without the people. People should take part in military and other areas of the republic in the maintenance of their freedom (Seaman 2007, p. 88). The participations of the people in their own affairs are manifestations of free way of life. For instance, in Venice, the people had not any role in the military rather they depended on mercenary troops and this led to the fail of Venice. Machiavelli (1996, p. 191) advised his

³¹ Romans second king between 715 to 673 B.C

contemporaries about the useless of mercenary troops. In his books like *The Prince*, the *Art of War*, and *the Discourses*, he preached about the useless of mercenary troops. Unlike Venice, in Roman republic, people engaged in the area of military. For instance, the great ruler of Roman republic Cincinnatus³² was a poor farmer but he came to power through his talents. The case of Cincinnatus shows the roles of people in the area of military to maintain their own common good. In the views of Machiavelli, troops should be within the people since they contribute the common good in times of peace and fight with courage for the common good in times of war (Seaman 2007, p. 89). The military should be commanded by one individual since many Captains will injure the military. Machiavelli (1996, p. 148), in book II, expressed the importance of good military for the republic by saying ‘good soldiers are quite sufficient to find gold... or not gold but the good soldiers are the sinew of war.’ These thoughts are useful in the art of war for modern states to protect the security of the state.

The other vital component for the prevalence of a free way of life is virtù for Machiavelli. In book II, Machiavelli (1996, p. 211) claims that Romans greatness is the product of the virtù of men. Virtù is vital for the military and the leaders for enduring freedom. In book I, he expresses the value of virtù in the establishment of a state (Machiavelli 1996). In book III, Machiavelli (1996, p. 107) also said that virtù is necessary in preserving freedom. The virtù of leaders, citizens and institutions require in upholding good way of life (Machiavelli 1996, p.107). Virtù contribute for the common good and guaranteed free way of life. Thus, for him, virtù was the qualities of individuals, institutions, people, and armies like Hannibal³³ and the greatness of republic was measured by its virtù (Seaman 2007, p. 99).

³² Roman state man(519-438)

³³ Was a general who commanded the Carthaginian army in the second Punic war (247-182)

Machiavelli (1996, p. 54) advised rulers to have an infinite virtuous succession in a republic; for example, the virtuous succession of Philip of Macedon and Alexander the great is a chief case. But Alexander had no virtuous successors. In his death, there was civil war and his empire failed. Virtù was used to prevent corruption and the egoistic nature of men the fortunes of the republic depend on the virtù of their founder and the founder requires special virtù. To overcome corruption in a republic, virtù is vital. Virtù can be developed through incentives, rewards, education, and military training (Seaman 2007, p. 52 & 56).

For Machiavelli (1996, p. 10), the tasks of founding a state, making laws and institutions should be given for one individual since different individuals are not able to come to an agreement on anything due to the diverse opinions. *The Discourses* declares that the authority of law making should be given only for one individual. For Machiavelli (1996, p. 3) ‘to order a republic it is necessary to be alone; and for the death of Remus and Titus Tatius, Romulus deserves excuse and not blame.’ Machiavelli (1996, p. 29) also said that:

[i]t is never happens that any republic is ordered well from the beginning or reformed all together a new outside its old order unless it is ordered by one individual. So a prudent orderer of a republic, who has the intent to wish to help not himself but the common good, not for his own succession but for the common father land not for any extra ordinary things...when the deed accuses him, the effect excuses him; and when the effect is good, as was that of Romulus, it will always excuses the deed; for he who is violent to spoil, not he who is violent to mend, should be reprovved prince should be prudent and virtuous since men are more prone to evil than to good... if one individual is capable of ordering, the thing itself is ordered to last long not if it remains on the shoulders of one individual but rather if it remains in the care of many and its maintenance stays with many. For as many are not capable of ordering a thing because they don't know it's good, which is because of the diverse opinions among them...when they have come to know it, they don't agree to abandon it. Romulus killed his brother for the common good, not for his ambition. For example, Moses, Solon, Lycurgus, and other founders of kingdom and republics who were able to form laws for the purpose of the common good because they have one authority attributed.

Besides this, he assured that ‘princes are superior to populace in drawing up laws, codes of civic life, statutes and new institutions, the populace is superior in sustain what has been instituted’ (Cohen 2001, p. 44). As Machiavelli (1996, p. 13) described, there were many

individuals in history that were given absolute power but established laws that protected the interest of the common such as Romulus of Rome, and Solon of Athens. Therefore, the role of the prince is making laws and institutions and this should be cultivated by the people. In book I, Machiavelli (1996, p. 49) added in Rome ‘the order of the state was the authority of the people, of the senate, of the tribunes, of the consuls; and the mode of making the laws.’ These prove that the active participations of the people and the joint effort are crucial for the enforcements of laws.

In book I, Machiavelli (1996, p.71) discussed the roles of institutions, government, laws and religion in the prevalence of a free way of life. The term *ordini*³⁴ was useful for him for free way of life since he asserted that laws is the “nerve and the life of a free way of life”. Good laws and good customs are the ground for a republic because, in book I, Machiavelli (1996, p. 49) claimed that ‘just as customs require laws in order to maintained, so laws require good customs in order to be observed.’ Machiavelli (1996, p. 15) also declared the value of laws for good way of life since he said that ‘men never work any good unless through necessity... therefore, it is said hunger and poverty make men industrious, and the laws make them good.’ Law protects people from tyranny and promotes the common good. According to Machiavelli (1996, p.16), the laws of the Romans play a vital role for it greatness:

Nor can one in any mode, with reason, call a republic disordered where there are so many examples of virtue; for good examples arise from good education, good education from good laws, and good laws from those tumults that many inconsiderably damn.

Machiavelli (1996, p. 33) talked about the impartial implementation of the law regardless of any artificial grounds and all citizens should be under the law in a well ordered republic. For Machiavelli (1996, p. 963), law should be above everything this notion is expressed as:

for I do not believe there is a thing that sets a more wicked example in a republic than to make a law and not observe it, so much the more as it is not observed by him who made it.

³⁴ It refers to laws and institutions in this context.

Accordingly, Machiavelli (1996, p. 60) preached that the law should be respected and applied equally without any discrimination. For instance, Horatius murdered his sister, Curiatii, to Save the Romans; but he put on trial for his life. Therefore, in uncorrupted republic, all are treated equally under the law. The enforcement of the law should be strict since Brutus's cruelty in murdering his son was necessary to preserve the liberty of Roman since Machiavelli (1996, p. 214) said that 'it is necessary to kill the sons of Brutus if one wishes to maintain a newly acquired freedom.' Therefore, punishments like privileges should be imposed fairly regardless of anything for Machiavelli. The impartial enforcements of law regardless of any artificial grounds were essential lessons of Machiavelli. In *the Discourses* Machiavelli (1996, p. 118) also discussed about the value of law for free way of life:

The states of the princes have lasted very long, the states of the republic have lasted very long, and both have had need of being regulated by laws. For a prince who can do what he wishes is crazy; a people that can do what it wishes are not wise. If, thus, one is reasoning about a prince obligated to the laws and about a people fettered by him, more virtue will always be seen in the people than in the prince; if one reasons about both as unshackled, few errors will be seen in the people than in the prince- and those lesser and having greater remedies and because of this can be trusted than the prince.

Machiavelli (1996, p. 15) added that 'law makes the state good like hunger and poverty that makes people productive.' Thus, to succeed its greatness, the state must go a unavoidable run from principality to republic and republics must persist to enlarge itself. For example, Brutus killed his sons to defend the republic and to expand his power. The punishment of enemies, the makings of law, and religious observance are key elements for a republic. Thus, Machiavelli declared the rule of the law in *the Discourses* which is a central aspect of free way of life since the above paragraph portrays this fact. For him, both the people and the prince should be under the law to maintain a good way of life.

In general, his power politics in *the Discourses*, promotes free way of life since within it; he advocated the rule of law, check and balance of power, liberty, and the like. All citizens have

equal opportunity to be rulers if they have the virtù. This equal opportunity of citizens to be ruler is one ingredient of free way of life. People have the right to judge rulers, to speak freely, and to give opinions on policies. He promoted the idea of freedom since people are not subjected to the need of the tyrant. His main purpose in *the Discourses* was to avoid corruption. Thus, his idea of civic virtue³⁵ is an indicator of the notion of free way of life.

Conclusion

In this thesis, I have discussed about the purposes of Machiavelli's political program in *The Prince* and *the Discourses*. Different writers have understood his political thought differently because of his arguable nature of political thought in general. Many thinkers interpreted his political thought merely with his particular work like *The Prince*, or *the Discourses on Livy*, or *The Art of War*, or *Florentine History*, and the like. But I argued that his political thought should be understood in his totality. It is through this way that his program and thought will be clear, consistent, and understandable.

For me, Machiavelli had a program of establishing republican system in Italy by considering the Roman republic as a model. To do this, he used *The Prince* as a means and *the Discourses* as an end. Both in *The Prince* and *the Discourses* he developed his program. His program, in *The Prince*, is the starting point to succeed his program in *the Discourses*. His political thought in *The Prince* is tyrannical in its nature and he used this wicked means to form republican system in *the Discourses*. Therefore, it is through his program that *The Prince* and *the Discourses* become consistent and his thought in these two works give sense.

Accordingly, Machiavelli used *The Prince* as a necessary precondition to realize his program in *the Discourses*. His program in *The Prince* was to establish a strong and united national state of Italy under a princely rule. To make his program in *The Prince* real he used

³⁵ It refers to giving priority for the common good than private interest.

different “sub-agenda” that facilitates for the effectiveness of his goal. At first, his concept of power plays a key role in this regard. There is no any political activity without power for him. Everything is possible through power. The security and order of the state is maintained through power. It is through power that republican system is possible and people enjoy free way of life. Therefore, this power should be preserved at any cost including killing, deceiving, cunning, and the like. Having an independent and strong native military is also the other essential element for the triumph of his program.

Machiavelli used morality, Christianity, and his concept of virtù for the success of his program in *The Prince*. He used morality and immorality for his end. He did not use morality for the purpose of morality, immorality for the purpose of immorality; rather he used morality and immorality for his purpose. Therefore, there are the morality and immorality thoughts in *The Prince* because of his systematic usage. Like morality, he also used Christianity as a tool. For him, Christianity should be used as a means to maintain power and to secure the state since Ferdinand of Aragon used religion as a tool and come to power through it. Therefore, he judge Christianity by its effects. Likewise, virtue is also a tool that human controls the world for him. It is through virtue that the state secured, the power of the prince maintained, and republican system in the long run will be possible. Therefore, according to him, morality, Christianity, and virtù are without objective values.

Besides this, his reason of state in *The Prince* is also another essential component for the success of his program; because reason of state for him is the survival of the state by any means. The state should be survived at any cost. To maintain and safeguard the state all means are justified. Any actions and policies that promote the security of the state are reasonable. It is after

the survival of the state that republican system is possible. This enables to do well his program effectively since it focus on the security and order of the state.

Through these and other mechanisms a strong and united state of Italy under a princely government is to be established. At this point, his first program in *The Prince* is accomplished. The remaining activity for him was to shift it into republican form. The stability, unity, order, and the capacity of the state to defend itself from internal and external enemies are the shifting points. At this point, the tyrannical state easily transform into republican state because all governments are in change or moving in a cycle. In this manner, his second program in *the Discourses* is to be possible.

In *the Discourses* his political program was to establish republican system by using his program in *The Prince* as a means. There are different indicators that show his program in *the Discourses*. His program in *the Discourses* was based on immoral principles and evil deeds; that is, *the Discourses* rest on *The Prince*. For example, in *the Discourses*, Machiavelli argued that it is necessary to follow the Roman order to establish republican system. It is clear that the Romans republic is possible after tyrannical beginning. Likewise, Machiavelli also follows this model to establish republican system in Italy. Therefore, his program in *The Prince* is a means for his program in *the Discourses* and they are consistent and related to each other.

Generally, this thesis challenges the views of different thinkers that understand Machiavelli only by considering his particular works and those who interpreted his thought as inconsistent and self-contradictory.

References

- A.D.Lindsay 1934, *Kant*, Westport, Green Wood Press.
- A.R.M.Murray 2010, *An Introduction to Political Philosophy*, New York, Routledge.
- Aquinas, S. T 1964, *Summa Theologica*, Translated by Timothy McDermott, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Armitag, D 2000, Edmund Bruke and Reason of State, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Volume Vol.61(4), pp. 617-634.
- Barcalow, E 2001, *Open questions an Introduction to Philosophy*, 3rd ed, Wadsworth, Thomson Learning.
- Cohen, M. 2001, *Political Philosophy from Plato to Mao*, London, Pluto Press.
- Drury, S. B 2005, *The Political Ideas of Leo Strauss*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fredrick, C. 1957, *Constitutional Reason of State: the Survival of Constitutional Order*, s.l.,Brom University Press.
- Herman, W. S. & Vasti, R 2008, *Nietzsche, Power and Politics:Rethinking Nietzsche's Legacy for Political Thought*, Berlin & New York, Walter de Gruyter.
- Hobbes, T, 1651. *Leviathan*, London, Green Dragon in St. Pauls Church-yard.
- Honderich, T, 2005, *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, 2nd ed, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Hornqvist, M, 2004, *Machiavelli and Empire*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- King, R 2007, *Machiavelli: Philosophy of Power*, London, Harper Collins.
- Knowles, D 2001, *Political Philosophy*, London, Routledge.
- Korvela, P-E 2006, *The Machiavellian Reformation: An Essay in Political Theory*, Jyvaskyla, University of Jyväskylä Press.
- Leonidas, D 2011, *Niccolo Machiavelli:History, Power, and Virtue*, New York, Rodopi.
- Lerch, H 2011, *Introduction to Political Philosophy*, Tokyo.
- Machiavelli, N 1560, *Machiavelli, Volume I The Art of War; and The Prince, Translated from Italy by Peter Whitehorne and Edward Dacres*, s.l.,David Nutt.
- Machiavelli, N 1903, *The Prince,Translated from Italy by Luigi Ricci*, 1st ed, London, Oxford University Press.
- Machiavelli, N 1981, *The Prince, Translated from Italy by George Bull*, New Work, Penguin.
- Machiavelli, N 1996, *Discourses on Livy, Translated from Italy by Harvey C. Mansfield &*

- Nathan Tarcov, Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press.
- Machiavelli, N 1998, *The Prince. Translated from Italy by Harvey C. Mansfield*, 2nd ed, Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press.
- Machiavelli, N 2005, *The Prince, Translated from Italy by Peter Bondanella*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Matei, O 2011, The Machiavellian Concept of Civic Virtues, *Society and Politics*, Volume Vol.5, No.1(9), pp. 107-115.
- McClelland, J 2005, *A History of Western Political Thought*, 2nd ed, New Work, Routledge.
- Parel, A 1992, *The Machiavellian Cosmos*, New Haven, Yale University press.
- Pocock, J 2003, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition*, 2nd ed, Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press.
- Raeder, L. C 2003, Augustine and the Case for Limited Government, *Humanities*, Volume Volume XVI, No. 2, pp. 94-106.
- Rahe, P. A 2008, *Against Throne and Altar Machiavelli and Political Theory under the English Republic*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Ripstein, A 2009, *Force and Freedom: Kant's Legal and Political Philosophy*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Robert, E. G 2007, *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy*, 2nd ed, Malden, Blackwell Publishing .
- Russell, B 1945, *A History of Western Philosophy*, New York, Simon and Schuster.
- Seaman, P 2007, *Seeking Real Truths: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Machiavelli*, Boston, Leiden.
- Sharp, G 2010, *From Dictatorship to Democracy: A Conceptual Framework for Liberation*, 4th ed, Boston, Albert Einstein Institution Press.
- Stokes, P 2006, *Philosophy 100 Essential Thinkers*, New York, Enchanted Lion Books.
- Strauss, L 1957, Machiavelli's Intention: The Prince, *The American Political Science Review*, Volume 51, No. 1, pp. 13-40.
- Strauss, L & Cropsey, J 1987, *History of Political Philosophy*, 3rd ed, Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press.
- Viroli, M 1992, *From Politics to Reason of State*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Wagner, H. L 2006, *Machiavelli: Renaissance Political Analyst and Author*, Philadelphia, Chelsea House .