

Panel 3.3 Abstracts

The Hedgehog and the Fox and the Lion: An Essay on Machiavelli's View of History**Matthew Slaboch**

Denison University (United States)

Contact: slabochm@denison.edu

In one of his most acclaimed essays, "The Hedgehog and the Fox," Isaiah Berlin suggests that writers fall into one of two camps: in the first are those "who relate everything to a single central vision," and in the second are "those who pursue many ends" and whose thinking is "scattered or diffused." Drawing from a line of ancient Greek poetry, Berlin terms these two groups, respectively, the "hedgehogs" and the "foxes." Representative hedgehogs include Plato, Hegel, and Dostoevsky, while notable foxes include Aristotle, Goethe, and Pushkin. After having introduced his dichotomy and explained what it means for a writer to fall on one side of the divide or the other, Berlin presents a problem: Tolstoy, a novelist and thinker of undisputed talents, does not fit neatly on either side. Berlin spends the bulk of his essay defending the thesis that "Tolstoy was by nature a fox, but believed in being a hedgehog." In making his argument, he focuses particularly on Tolstoy's philosophy of history, investigating Tolstoy's thoughts on such questions as the roles of fate and free will in human affairs and the possibility of moral, political, and other types of progress.

Taking Berlin's famed piece as a starting point and model, my essay turns our attention from Tolstoy to Machiavelli and does three things. First, it asks whether we should consider the Florentine philosopher and historian a hedgehog whose works and life demonstrate a singular focus, or a fox with diffuse ideas and aims. Second, it summarizes and analyzes Machiavelli's philosophy of history, paying special attention to the role Machiavelli ascribes to political leaders in the shaping of events. Here I consider animal imagery that Machiavelli himself employs, namely that a ruler "should imitate both the fox and the lion" by being simultaneously crafty and forceful. The essay concludes by considering the relevance of philosophy of history generally, and the implications of Machiavelli's philosophy of history in particular, for present-day politicians and policymakers and citizens and subjects alike.

Panel 3.3 Abstracts

History, political science, and trade. The original Machiavelli of David Hume**Spartaco Pupo**

University of Calabria (Italy)

Contact: spartaco.pupo@unical.it

My paper aims to revisit the articulate and differentiated positions of the contemporary scholars who have dealt with the influence of Niccolò Machiavelli on David Hume, such as F. G. Whelan, G. Giarrizzo, J. Maček, and D. F. Norton. From a careful comparison of Hume as a political thinker and statesman, rather than as an epistemologist and metaphysician, to Machiavelli and the tradition of “Machiavellism”, a series of facets brings out, which are explainable thanks to the intellectual esteem of the Scottish author for the Florentine secretary. It is within the framework of political reflections that we can identify the main interconnections between the two thinkers’ perspectives: from the realistic view of the genesis of “dishonesty” to the emphasis on passions and their limiting power of reason; from the common interest for the importance of the study of history to the conception of political science as requiring the regularity of the configurations of experience. But there are also considerable differences to be examined, such as the opportunity to transpose the experience of the Roman empire into modern Europe and the judgment on what really determines the “glory” of the states in foreign policy. Finally, I propose to examine the striking note that emerges from Hume’s Memoranda, which has not yet been explored in depth by scholars: “There is not a word of trade – Hume writes in this collection of youthful notes – in all Matchiavel, which is strange considering that Florence rose only by trade”. Is this a superficial reading of Hume, or what the Scotsman said corresponds to reality? Answering this question is important because it allows us to understand, from a historical point of view, that Hume, while underlining the flaw of Machiavelli, nevertheless does not adhere to the position of Mandeville, who insisted that the health of a nation was intimately linked to the prosperity of its trade. In the conclusions I dwell on the original and courageous Machiavelli historicization process initiated by Hume himself.

Panel 3.3 Abstracts

Reflections on Machiavelli's Contribution to Management, Marketing and Public Affairs**Phil Harris**

University of Chester (United Kingdom)

Contact: P.harris@chester.ac.uk

It is 550 years since Niccolo Machiavelli was born in Florence in 1469 of a very old Tuscan family. The young Machiavelli had a vigorous humanist education, was taught Latin by good teachers and had access to the best of classical history and ideas. Little is known about the rest of his life until at the surprisingly young age of twenty-nine in 1498, he was recognised by the Signory for his administrative talents, and was elected to the responsible post of Chancellor of the Second Chancery. He is also given duties in the Council of the Ten of Liberty and Peace (formerly Ten of War), which dealt with Florentine foreign affairs.

During his time in office, his journeys included missions to Louis XII and to the Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian in Austria; he was with Cesare Borgia in the Romagna; and after watching the Papal election of 1503, he accompanied the newly elected Pope, Julius II on his first campaign of conquest against Perugia and Bologna. In 1507, as a Chancellor of the recently appointed Nove di Milizia, he organised an infantry force which fought at the capture of Pisa in 1509. Three years later this force was defeated by the Holy League at Prato and the Medici returned to power in Florence. Machiavelli was almost immediately excluded from public life as a previous holder of high office under the former republican regime, where he had built up a number of powerful enemies who were determined he should not retain his post.

After being falsely implicated in a plot against the Medici he is imprisoned in the Bargello and hideously tortured. He maintains his innocence and is eventually granted an amnesty on the election of the new pope, Leo X, (Cardinal dei Medici) and retires to his farm six miles away from Florence just outside San Casiano, where he lives with his wife and six children and concentrates on study and writing. For much of the rest of his life his movements are restricted by one regime or another because of his past. He desperately wants to return to government service to serve Florence and his countrymen, "If only to roll stones" (Letters to Vettori) but never regains public office. At forty-three, Machiavelli's public career had ended, but his work as a writer, for which he is celebrated, was just beginning.

He wrote *The Prince* in just a few months in 1513. In which he attacks "the writers" whose inconsistent moralism allows them to admire great deeds but not the cruel acts necessary to accomplish them. *The Prince* was never published during its author's lifetime, and although circulating quite widely in manuscript form, it seems to have caused little if any controversy during Machiavelli's life. In 1532, five years after Machiavelli's death it was published in Rome. In 1559 all of Machiavelli's works are condemned and placed on the Papal Index.

It is his continuing reputation and the influence of *The Prince* which has resulted in the use of the Machiavellian theme by Management commentators such as Jay (1967), Calhoun (1969), Shea (1988), Curry (1995), McAlpine (1992 and 1997), Harris, Lock and Rees (2000) and Harris (2013).

Panel 3.3 Abstracts

Time, Virtù and the State of Exception: A Machiavellian Approach to Emergency Powers**Theodore Lai**

University of Chicago (United States)

Contact: theodorelai360@gmail.com

In the third chapter of *Il Principe*, Machiavelli advises the reader to pay due consideration to time, “for time sweeps everything before it and can bring with it good as well as evil and evil as well as good”. This adage suggests that a significant aspect of Machiavelli’s strategic thought is concerned with temporal considerations: to determine whether one should act, or temporarily refrain from acting, within the flow of time. What a wise prince does is inextricably bound up with when he should do it. Yet Machiavelli’s considerations of time do not simply lie in discerning what time brings, but in one’s ability to change to suit the times. The prince who fails to break from habit as his situation demands will come to ruin. Although practicing keen foresight carries the potential to bring security and advancement, Machiavelli remains adamant that most men are rarely successful in altering their actions, since they remain prone to habit. This tension reflects Machiavelli’s famed account of *virtù*. Prudent judgment is a matter of discerning the appropriate moment to deploy one’s actions, while foolishness lies in the inability of men to break from habit when the moment demands. Against the medieval tradition of his time, Machiavelli argues that fortune can be contested through the autonomy of virtuous men to change as the times demand. The degree to which princes or citizens are able to spot nascent troubles and respond adequately constitutes their possession of princely *virtù*.

Recent scholarship invoking Machiavelli on emergency powers in liberal democratic states claim norm and exception as the conceptual structure within which prudent action should be deployed. These scholars defend the primacy of a state of exception by arguing that founding or preserving a state warrants the suspension of law. Necessity is taken as a suitable context for laws to be relaxed in order to maintain the existence of the state or enforce its advancement. Yet does exception constitute the demand to change a law, or an opportunity to alter one’s mode - practices, habits and institutions - to suit the changing times, given what the law demands? Does remaining an adherent to deeply established laws in the face of pressure to relax them in fact fulfill the very spirit of necessity that states of exception are meant to convey?

This essay seeks to revive problems in recent scholarship and tackle the issue of emergency powers by performing a reading of *Il Principe* with time and *virtù* as its central themes. In doing so, it argues that Machiavelli’s *virtù* is not a matter of making exceptions to the norm of law, but of remaining true to law by altering one’s mode as necessary to suit the times.