

Panel 2.3 Abstracts

A Man in Politics: From Machiavelli's definitions of power, freedom and valour through Max Weber theory of management and charisma understanding to practical politics of T. G. Masaryk
Elizaveta Eliseeva

Charles University (Russia)

Contact: eliseevaes84@gmail.com

The subject of this conference which is dedicated to the ideas of medieval Italian thinker enables to prove relevance and modernity of Machiavelli ideas by comparison of them with charismatic authority ideas of modern scientific thinker Max Weber on the basis of T. G. Masaryk management the first Czechoslovak Republic president real example.

The similarity between ideas of Italian thinker of the XVI century and ideas of the XX century turn researcher Max Weber, especially his understanding of power and charisma which are developed by consideration and description of authority types is observed when we read Machiavelli treatise "The Prince".

"The Prince" by Machiavelli can be taken as methodological guide to action and practical politics manual. Machiavelli teaches the ruler to be "an artist", "a professional". He teaches him "valor" (or "virtuosity") – virtù, as he says. Valor or virtù by Machiavelli can be compared with charisma by Weber and it is possible to distinguish some common attributes.

1. It is necessary to have historical or crisis situation in society for charisma development and charismatic leader detection in particular society. As Machiavelli says about great state princes Moses, Cyrus, Theseus and such like they are in chapter VI of "The Prince", "and examining their actions and lives one cannot see that the owed anything to fortune beyond the opportunity, which brought them the material to mould into the form which seemed best to them. Without that opportunity their powers of mind would have been extinguished, and without those powers the opportunity would have come in vain".
2. The significance of virtù and charisma is estimated by recognition of society and inferiors. If the prince does not have social recognition, his power will not be legitimate.
3. Conditions of charismatic governing stability. "Those who by valorous ways become princes, like these men, acquire a principality with difficulty, but they keep it with ease. The difficulties they have in acquiring it rise in part from the new rules and methods which they are forced to introduce to establish their government and its security".
4. The prince and his environment. The definition of "staff" by Weber.

Charisma is one of the most important revolutionary forces of social world and thus, a charismatic prince appearance changes human thinking and actions. Charisma is a specific creative, revolutionary force in history. Machiavelli says about great state princes Moses, Cyrus, Theseus and such like they are in chapter VI of "The Prince" which are charismatic princes from Max Weber's point of view: "Therefore such as these have great difficulties in consummating their enterprise, for all their dangers are in the ascent, yet with ability they will overcome them; but when these are overcome, and those who envied them their success are exterminated, they will begin to be respected, and they will continue afterwards powerful, secure, honoured, and happy".

These Machiavelli words suit the first president of Czechoslovakia T. G. Masaryk greatly. Masaryk is the only professional philosopher who has not only created his state ideal, but also has turned it into a reality. Masaryk interpreted politics as one of science branches, as practical application of sociology. State and church were the main subjects in politics till the end of XVIII century, on the turn of XIX-XX centuries the nation becomes such subject. Constructive fractional work for society which

Panel 2.3 Abstracts

positivity should connect with humanity and moral in was Masaryk's politics core. The idea of "fractional work" included raising of universal education, inner perfection of civil society, cultivation of responsibility skills before the society. Moral, cultural and economic maturity only can give Czechs political independence according to Masaryk.

In conclusion T. G. Masaryk can be considered as charismatic prince and his seventeen-year presidency in the first Czechoslovak Republic can be considered as the period of charismatic governing. The confirmations of this are Machiavelli's words from chapter XXI "and a prince ought, above all things, always endeavor in every action to gain for himself the reputation of being a great and remarkable man". T. G. Masaryk has managed it.

Panel 2.3 Abstracts

Michel Foucault, France's Machiavellian Moment and the Uses of History in Political Thought**Luke Illott**

University of Cambridge (United Kingdom)

Contact: lai23@cam.ac.uk

Michel Foucault worked in the midst of what Serge Audier has called the 'French Machiavellian moment'. From the 1950s to the 1980s, thinkers including Raymond Aron, Claude Lefort and Maurice Merleau-Ponty turned to Machiavelli as a model for shifting political thinking away from Hegelian Marxism and from the temptations of totalitarianism. Their Machiavelli – a theorist of tumults and social conflict – was intended to help theorise a democratic politics that would be conscious of social struggle, but sceptical about its final resolution in some pacified end of history. Louis Althusser, Foucault's most important interlocutor in the early 1970s, also saw in Machiavelli a way to think about contingency and political agency relative to the structures of the economy. It is in the context of a renewed French interest in the Florentine that we ought to situate Foucault's lecture courses 'Society Must be Defended' (1976) and *Security, Territory, Population* (1978), both of which comment on Machiavelli's place in the history of political thought.

On first reading, Foucault's treatment of Machiavelli in his Collège lectures is one of abrupt dismissal. Foucault's Machiavelli is not a theorist of conflict in society; nor is he a profound historical thinker. But the implications of Foucault's lectures go beyond his direct assessment of Machiavelli himself. I will argue that the broader historical narrative, the genealogy, which frames this discussion of Machiavelli constitutes a more profound polemical intervention in France's Machiavellian moment. Foucault does not merely criticise characterisations of Machiavelli as a theorist of social conflict or of the autonomy of politics. His periodisation entails that trying to use Machiavelli to think about contemporary politics is historically misguided. It was the theorists of government of the seventeenth century, Foucault argues, who consciously tried to mingle economy and politics, and they did so in explicit reaction against Machiavelli. Turning back to Machiavelli to think about the autonomy of the political in the twentieth century means overlooking the crucial historical moment we need to understand, where economy and politics became entangled in the first place.

Foucault's treatment of Machiavelli raises broader questions about the use of history for contemporary political thought. As he warned in a late interview, 'you can't find the solution of a problem in the solution of another problem raised at another moment by other people. You see, what I want to do is not the history of solutions... I would like to do genealogy of problems'. It will always be worth carefully reading Machiavelli. But must we do so in order to treat him as an authority who can offer solutions to today's remote political world? Or can we remain historically sensitive and keep Machiavelli in the past without losing his relevance to the present? This latter option is the promise held out by situating Machiavelli in a genealogy of our present political conjuncture. Such a genealogy, I argue, is what some of the best recent treatments of Machiavelli (e.g. Quentin Skinner's 1978 *Foundations*) have sought to perform.

Panel 2.3 Abstracts

Althusser's New Prince, the 'Crisis of Marxism' and the Challenge of Populism**Efthimios Karayiannides**

University of Cambridge (United Kingdom)

Contact: ek468@cam.ac.uk

The most fascinating of Louis Althusser's proliferating posthumously published works remains his *Machiavelli and Us*. With the exception of some marginal corrections and additions, it was written mainly between 1972 and 1976. The text, in retrospect, can be read as a sort of theoretical experimenting ground during a period of bitter struggles, of personal and political misfortunes, and of failed attempts to adapt orthodox Marxist categories to an increasingly escaping reality. It is a book that has the same sharp and passionate style as only one or two others in Althusser's career. I will suggest that it provides a transformation of the problematic of the 'ideology and ideological state apparatuses' sketched out in his Althusser's famous essay of 1971. *Machiavelli and Us* is not only a speculation on the uncertain combinations of fortuna and virtù in the aleatory situations of history, but the idea that this "war" (whether a "war of movement" or a "war of position"—Althusser's text was, after all, as much a reading of Machiavelli as Gramsci's revolutionary appropriation of Machiavelli's thought) essentially presupposes the invention of a politics of ideology. This is linked with a presentation of the prince which makes him neither the embodiment of the State, the bearer of the monarchic or presidential function exercising leadership, nor a "Legislator" in the ancient sense. Rather, Althusser's 'new Prince' is presented as an agent who is also an actor on the historical stage. This is necessary because, according to Machiavelli as Althusser reads him, the determining element in securing "national" support for his own power and project is the capacity to change, channel, and control the opinion of the people. More precisely, what matters is the opinion of the majority of the people, which is always made of ordinary, relatively poor people (the *popolo minuto*, as opposed, the *popolo grasso*). It is the opinion or representation that the people have acquired of the person and the actions of the Prince, therefore the "figure" of the Prince as a ruler in the imagination of the people, that is decisive for the success of his own action. Returning to this text in our conjuncture just as Althusser did with *The Prince* in his own, I will suggest, sheds light on a number of theoretical conundrums which accompany the reinvigoration of radical left-wing political theory in the wake of the global financial crisis of 2008. It provides a model for the construction of 'a people' which anticipates one of the central challenges of left-wing populism i.e. how to avoid a construction of the image of 'the people' which simultaneously involves the stigmatization and exclusion of bearers of otherness and foreignness and would thus be in service of a resurgent nationalism. On the other hand, the model of historical time or historicity Althusser develops in *Machiavelli and us* will be put into conversation with the recent attempts to revivify the 'idea of communism' and debates around the transition between capitalism and communism, particularly the antithetic positions of Slavoj Žižek, on the one hand, and Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt, on the other.