

Machiavelli and International Relations Theory

Janice Leung

As an academic field of study, international relations seeks to understand the social, political, economical, and cultural interaction between international actors, whether they are private or public. On the political level, often scholars seek to understand the behavior of states and their domestic affairs, alongside their relations with other foreign powers. There are many scholars from the past and the present who have contributed greatly to the development of the study of international relations, and one of the most relevant scholars is Niccolo Machiavelli. As a political analyst who was writing about “the actual politics and the popular ethos of his time”¹, as opposed to adhering to a utopian “ought to” optimism towards international relations, “the whole drift of his work is toward a political realism, unknown to the formal writing of his time.”² Therefore, Machiavelli’s “The Prince” and “The Discourses” have had a tremendous impact on international relations. Machiavelli is recognized as one of the forefathers of realism, one of the most respected and venerable schools of thought. Both “The Prince” and “The Discourses” expressed his views on the manner in which a state should be run and the manner in which interstate relations should be conducted to achieve the best results for the state. For Machiavelli, the impact that domestic politics have on international relations cannot be ignored; therefore he views the state of domestic affairs as being an integral force in shaping international affairs. Machiavelli believes that *states should act in the best interest of the masses, and as such should behave in a manner, which will benefit the state. Accordingly, he expressed his view that the sovereign of the state should not allow private interests to overrun public interest. He also viewed a strong state as an organic whole, with the utmost control over its own domestic affairs as well as its foreign affairs. For Machiavelli, domestic affairs dominated the priority of the state and without domestic stability; the state could not focus on international relations.* In addition, Machiavelli, a former diplomat himself, considered *the practice of diplomacy essential for the state to maintain power and build a reputation on an international level. This aspect of international relations is a fundamental part of the survival and aggrandizement of the state, both on the political level and in terms of territorial control.* Machiavelli wrote “The Prince” and “The Discourses” during the time of the Renaissance, in the early 16th century, yet these works still retain an uncanny level of perceptive political observations valid even in our modern day. His conception of international relations reflects the political climate of his time, but remains relevant to understanding current practices in international relations. This paper examines Machiavelli’s conceptions of the state and international relations, and highlights the relevance and applicability of these conceptions to the contemporary world.

Machiavelli’s conception of the state

According to Machiavelli, states should behave and form decisions with **public interest** as the first priority in mind, and as such should act in a manner, which will benefit the state. Machiavelli firmly believed that the state had a duty to appeal to civil society and to placate the masses, instead of choosing to behave in a manner, which would merely satisfy a minority of the population. According to Machiavelli, it is imperative to have a strong

centralized government. In his view, “a sagacious legislator of the republic... whose object is to promote the public good, and not his private interests, and who prefers his country to his own successors, should concentrate all authority in himself.”³ In his conception of domestic affairs, “certainly a country can never be united and happy, except when it obeys wholly one government.”⁴ Machiavelli viewed the state as an organized force, supreme in its control of its domestic and foreign affairs. On the domestic level, states are “supreme in (their) own territory and (pursue) a conscious policy of aggrandizement in its relations with other states”⁵. However, ruler must aim at achieving the goal of “conquering and maintaining the state...(by) means (that) will always be judged honorable and praised by everyone”⁶. As a rule, therefore, according to Machiavelli, “a free city is generally influenced by two principal objects, the one is to aggrandize herself, and the other is to preserve her liberties.”⁷ To that effect, the state must insure national security and defense together with social justice and the rule of law.

The preservation of the state in an anarchical international system is one of Machiavelli's dominant preoccupation. His vision of international politics revolves around the idea of anarchy, and the lack thereof of order on the international level. For Machiavelli, the state possessed the power to establish order domestically, however the possible threat from external forces (foreign states) is a fundamental aspect of the nature of international relations. The world is in strife and states are always in a state of competition with each other in an anarchical world. As Machiavelli says,

“it is impossible for a republic to remain long in her quiet enjoyment of her freedom within her limited confines; for even if she does not molest others, others will molest her, and from being thus molested will spring the desire and necessity of conquests, and even if she has no foreign foes, she will find domestic enemies amongst her own citizens.”⁸

The only way in which, a state can protect its sovereignty is through striving to achieve security for the masses while conserving liberty for its citizens. It is the fundamental will of the state to preserve its liberty, despite the threat of foreign domination, that creates “such a determined resistance (that) may also be caused by the natural hatred between neighboring princes and republics, which arises from rivalry and the thirst of domination... This spirit of rivalry and contention will ever make it difficult for republics to subjugate each other.”⁹ It is within the power of the state to create the conditions that enable countries to defend themselves from possible threats from foreign powers.

In discussing the importance of national security and defense, Machiavelli argues strongly for the superiority of a popular armies as opposed to the use of mercenary troops. In his conception of international relations, the aspect of nationalism within a country is of fundamental importance to maintaining the defense and survival capabilities of the state. He firmly believes that loyalty and love of the country should be connected to military matters within the state. By “ask(ing) a powerful neighbor to come aid and defend one with his forces, they are termed auxiliaries and are useless as mercenaries... These forces may be good in themselves, but they are always dangerous for those who borrow them, for if they lose you are defeated, and if they conquer you remain their prisoner.”¹⁰ His solution was for the state to have a popular army, therefore linking military service to devotion and loyalty to the state. For Machiavelli, the example of France nationalizing

their army during the Renaissance was absolutely brilliant and proved to be one of the factors that led to their greatness during that time period. He advises to sovereigns who wish to

“redeem their countries, it is before all things necessary, as the true foundation of every undertaking, to provide yourself with your own forces, for you cannot have more faithful, or truer and better soldiers. And although each one of them may be good, they will united become even better when they see themselves commanded by their prince, and honored and favored by him...And these are the things which, newly introduced, give reputation and grandeur.”¹¹, adding that there is a “great ...difference ... between an army that is well disposed, and which fights for its own glory, and one that is ill disposed, and has to fight only for the ambition of another; this explains the reasons for the uselessness of mercenary troops, who have nothing to make them fight but the small stipend they receive, which is not and cannot be sufficient to make them loyal, or so devoted as to be willing to die for you. For armies that have no such affection towards him for whom they fight as to make them partisans, will never have the bravery enough to resist....And as this love and devotion can only be found in your own subjects, it is necessary for the purpose of holding a kingdom, to have an army composed of your own subjects, as well be seen to have done by all those whose armies have achieved great success.”¹²

It is through the means of establishing strong defensive measures by linking national interest and the military, as well as creating a centralized government, that “provides for their (state) security and defense...thus (enabling) enjoy(ment) of their liberty for a long time”¹³. In his view, he felt that a well-disciplined and well-equipped national army was necessary, with the force to maintain the power of the state, as well as extend the limits of the state. During Machiavelli’s time, the practice of nationalizing the army was practiced, but not nearly to the same degree that they are used currently. During the renaissance, mercenaries were still commonly used by many princes, notably in Italy. France was the main example of a country developing a nationalized army. While nationalism, as a theoretical concept, certainly did not exist in Italy during Machiavelli’s time, he nonetheless firmly believed that a unified country is the key to preserving a state from suffering from foreign domination and is vital to the preservation of the state. In Machiavelli’s view, “duty to one’s country overrides all other duties”¹⁴ and for the state, the only question it should pose is: what course of action will save the life and liberty of the country? At the same time, national unity and the preservation of life and liberty shall rest not only on strong national defense, but on domestic stability predicated on social justice.

Machiavelli, in fact, emphasizes the centrality of **economic equality** within civil society as a precondition for domestic stability. As discussed earlier, Machiavelli’s vision of the ideal, strong state focuses on civil society and, more specifically, strives toward an equilibrium among the competing interests of individuals and groups within the state. This balance of interests, on the economic and social level, is important in maintaining internal peace and stability in a state. He states, that “nothing so certainly secures to a prince the public esteem as some such remarkable action of saying dictated by his regard for the public good, showing him to be magnanimous, liberal and just.”¹⁵ Regarding the aspect of economic equality, Machiavelli criticizes inequity of wealth between citizens of the state and says that the desire to preserve power and the need to acquire more is “the cause of great troubles...For the fear to lose stirs the same passions in men as the desire to gain, as men do not believe themselves sure of what they already possess except by acquiring still

more; and moreover, these new acquisitions are so many means of strength and power for abuses.”¹⁶ This is often the cause of social instability, creating hostile conditions that inevitably could lead to civil war. As such, the gap between the poor and the wealthy grows as “the haughty manners of the rich and insolence of the nobles and the rich excite in the breasts of those who have neither birth nor wealth, not only the desire to possess them, but also the wish to revenge themselves by depriving the former of the riches and honors which they see them employ so badly.”¹⁷ For him, the examples of “those republics which have...preserved their political existence uncorrupted do not permit any of their citizens to live in the manner of gentlemen, but rather maintain amongst them a perfect equality.”¹⁸ Therefore, for Machiavelli, the state should take measures to ensure that the state possesses wealth while the masses are on relatively equal economic footing to prevent envy and social instability. It is the duty of the state to ensure that “the chief promoters of corruption and troubles”¹⁹ and the “excessive ambition and corruption of the powerful”²⁰ are not allowed the chance to flourish, otherwise “great inequality prevails...(and) governments will lack the proper proportions and have but little durability.”²¹

Another component of Machiavelli’s recipe for the ideal, strong state is the recognition that the maintenance of **law and order** is necessary to ensure social equality within civil society and to allow the people of the state to seek justice within the legal system. As he states, “No more useful and necessary authority can be given to those who are...guardians of the liberty of a state, than the faculty of accusing the citizens to the people, or to any magistrate or council, for any attempt against public liberty.”²² For without access for the people within the state to seek recourse to a problem within the judiciary system, there can be no social stability. The subsequent consequences of such an erroneous system are that, “when these ferments cannot in some way exhaust themselves, their promoters are apt to resort to some extraordinary means, that may lead to the ruin of the republic.”²³ Therefore, it is necessary to preserve social equilibrium in the state; otherwise the consequences will be severely detrimental. The result for the state will be civil unrest, with citizens feeling frustration and resentment towards another party without any legitimate source for satisfactory recourse, while the powerful and prominent members of society are able to intimidate those who are less wealthy without any threat of punishment for their actions. It is very likely that the security of the state may be threatened in such a volatile situation, from foreign powers seeking to capitalize on the instability and weakness of the state, to frustrated citizens of the state seeking aid of foreigners in their desire for justice. “Whence we may conclude that, whenever the aid of foreign powers is called in by any party of the state”²⁴ the very survival and autonomy of the state is threatened and undermined.

Machiavelli’s conceptions of international relations

In Machiavelli’s view, on the international level of interaction between states, the volatility of the conditions under which states relate with one another, is anarchical. Accordingly, Machiavelli examines the nature of the international relations, whereby domestic affairs within states must be stable in order for the international system to create equality among states, as well as providing the conditions for democracy. Therefore, while Machiavelli does consider stable domestic affairs to be the precondition to the stability of international relations, the premises and arguments that he presents for the conditions under which a

state can be strong, do not differ greatly than those for the international system. Hence the importance he attaches to the **balance of power**, including in economic and social terms, and its stabilizing effect on the anarchical international system. The fundamental need for equilibrium of interests within the state, on the social and economical level, also applies to relations between states on the international level. For Machiavelli, on the international level, there should be an economic and social balance of power that keeps equilibrium among states, and provides the conditions for democracy. The state must, of its own volition, maintain the security of the state and at all times possess the means to defend themselves in case of foreign threats. As a result, if the preconditions are met and all states are virtuous, free of corruption, the people within the states are content in a society based on equality (both economically and socially); then there would be a positive effect on international relations, or more specifically, interstate relations. As Machiavelli describes, "in the period under the good Emperors he will see the prince secure amidst the people, who are also living in security; he will see peace and justice prevail in the world...and everywhere he will see tranquility and well-being. And on the other hand, he will behold all animosity, license, corruption and noble ambition extinct. During the period of the good Emperors he will see that golden age when everyone could hold and defend whatever opinion he pleased; in fine, he will see the triumph of the world."²⁵ While on the other hand, if these preconditions are not met within individual, free states, Machiavelli believes that the consequences for international relations are disastrous. When he refers to the "good" Emperors, he is referring to Ancient Rome, but he also uses examples from the same time period, whereby the sovereign had not led the state in a positive direction, and ultimately, achieving chaos instead of stability. As Machiavelli notes, "if now he will but glance at the times under the other Emperors, he will behold the atrocities of war, discords and sedition, cruelty in peace as in war, many princes massacred, many civil and foreign wars"²⁶, and generally, discord in domestic affairs as well as increased volatility at the international level. Machiavelli firmly believes that the international system is anarchical, with no supranational power that overrides sovereignty but he does, however, believe that there is a natural equilibrium of power among states. Accordingly, he believes that it is within the nature of the international system to prevent any state from becoming too powerful. Also, Machiavelli feels that it is fundamental in the behavior of states to oppose dominant powers that threaten equilibrium in the international system, for fear of losing power, for apprehension of being too weak to fend off sinister designs from a powerful state or from envy and jealousy. In his view, diplomacy should play a key role in the preservation of the equilibrium between states.

The practice of **diplomacy**, according to Machiavelli, is essential for the state to maintain power and build reputation on an international level. It is no surprise that he advocated diplomacy as an essential practice of the state; Machiavelli worked as a diplomat for the Florence Republic. "In an age of intrigue (that) depended on skillful diplomacy for its survival"²⁷, he understood very well the diplomatic realities of international relations. According to him, the sovereign represents the state; being the physical embodiment of the power, reputation and character of the state. Therefore, the sovereign must be aware that the ability to play dual roles, depending on the situation at hand, is important for the security and the reputation of the state. He states, "a prince being thus obliged to well know how to act as a beast must imitate the fox and the lion, for the lion cannot protect

himself from traps, and the fox cannot defend himself from the wolves. One must, therefore be a fox to recognize traps, and a lion to protect himself from wolves.”²⁸ The “wolves”, of course, that he refers to are foreign states that will take advantage of every opportunity to capitalize on weaknesses (in terms of security and perceived lack of military strength) within domestic affairs. So, he proposes that in order to alleviate this problem, or at least decrease the possibility of foreign threats, the state must build relations with other powers, and form beneficial alliances. “Further, the ruler...should make himself the leader and defender of his less powerful neighbors, and endeavor to weaken the stronger ones, and take care that they are not invaded by some foreigner no less powerful than himself.”²⁹ Otherwise, if the state does not behave in this manner and allows another state to assume this role, “the rule is that when a powerful foreigner enters the province, all the less powerful inhabitants become his adherents...so much so that with regard to these minor potentates he has no trouble whatever in winning them over, for they will willingly join forces.”³⁰ Therefore, it is important for the state to assume a leadership role for less powerful foreign states, since this will increase its reputation and prominence as well as its security and defense on the international level.

According to Machiavelli, the security of the state is increased as its reputation grows throughout the world. He states: “the prince who creates such an opinion of himself gets a great reputation, and it is very difficult to conspire against one who has great reputation, and he will not easily be attacked, so long that it is known that he is capable...For a prince must have...fear (from) external (sources) as regards to foreign powers...he can defend himself with good arms and good friends...and (therefore) internal matters will always remain quiet...and even if external powers sought to attack him, if he has ruled and lived as described, he will always stand firm, (and) be able to sustain every shock.”³¹ For him, “the true means of aggrandizing a republic”³² is through the practice of diplomacy on the part of the state, in order to gain allies and therefore, eliminate the possibility of threats from the allied state. As well, in keeping with the principle of loyalty and strong relations between countries, “it well may happen that the prince of the ally of some powerful potentate, who for the moment may not be able to assist him...may, having acted as his partisan, his powerful ally will make no treaties or alliances with his enemies.”³³ By the state pursuing a policy of diplomatic relations and forming treaties with other states, there is a certain “law of nations” whereby, on the international level, a state that unjustly breaks the agreement or turns on an ally, will be seen in a negative manner by foreign states. It is also the duty of the ambassadors to represent their state in an honorable and respectful manner. The ambassador, who represents the embodiment of the ethics, character and reputation of the state, must be careful not to “disregard...justice...and violate the laws of nations, republics and themselves.”³⁴ This erroneous behavior will cause the offended state or party to respond with “indignation and resentment”³⁵ and could possibly, consequently cause damage to interstate relations for a long period of time. As well, Machiavelli believes that as the reputation of the state increases, and its fame for possessing great power, this will result in keeping the state safe from neighboring powers as well as foreign powers whose geographical location is more distant. As Machiavelli says:

“for it is certain that when a prince or people attain that degree of reputation that all the neighboring princes and peoples fear to attack him, none of them will ever venture to do it except under the force of necessity; so that it will be...at the option of the potent prince or people to make war upon neighboring

powers as may seem advantageous, while adroitly keeping the others quiet...And other powers that are more distant and have no immediate intercourse with him, will look upon this as a matter too remote for them to be concerned about."³⁶

Therefore, the factors of enhanced security and defense that is achieved through effective diplomatic policy, combined with having a "friend in these new countries who could aid them by opening the way for them to enter,"³⁷ is proof enough that alliances have their beneficial qualities.

Machiavelli recognizes the role of **treaties and alliances** in international relations. Yet, he believes that the opportunities for the state to form positive relations with foreign states are limited to certain situations. While "it is of daily occurrence that princes or republics contract leagues or friendships with each other, or that in like manner treaties and alliances are formed between a republic or that of a prince"³⁸, Machiavelli warns that "a prince ought never to make common cause with one more powerful than himself to injure another, unless necessity forces him to...for if he wins you rest in his power and princes must avoid as much as possible being under the will and pleasure of others."³⁹ Even though he stresses alliances with other states, the potential for the ruin of the states' autonomy at the hands of a supposed ally is too great. As well, Machiavelli warns that between states, "alliances are broken from consideration of interests"⁴⁰, and that it is very difficult to be sure that the party with whom the state has formed an alliance with will honor and remain loyal to the conditions of the treaty. The reasoning behind alliances is clear; in some manner both parties benefit from the agreement. However, when "promises touching public affairs...have been given under the pressure of force...(and) the force no longer exists...frequently (states) disregard equally all other promises, when the motives that induced them no longer prevail."⁴¹ This is not considered dishonorable, however, because the circumstances under which treaties are formed must be of mutual consent and of free volition. So, in extenuating circumstances where the state does not willingly make promises to a foreign power, the party that executes a treaty by force will undoubtedly see the agreements dishonored in due time. Machiavelli also focuses on the aspect of geographical proximity, and its relevance to determining the choice of which state to court as a possible ally. While neighboring alliances are certainly and fervently endorsed, those made with distant foreign states are viewed critically. Machiavelli concludes that, "the alliances made with princes who on account of their remoteness cannot conveniently come to your assistance, or who lack the power to do so from internal dissensions or from any other cause, bring more reputation than substantial help to those who rely upon them."⁴² Therefore, while a state may be reputed to possess great military power, it is of no use to a distant state that seeks to join forces and create an alliance. For one, deployments would not be able to sent as quickly or effectively from such a distant state; secondly, the state cannot be entirely sure of the power of the foreigner based on reputation alone. While a state may have a strong image, it may simply be the result of intelligent diplomatic actions by the sovereign, and in reality the foreigner may not possess the military capabilities that are claimed. Overall, Machiavelli gives a balanced view is given of the positive and negative aspects of diplomacy and alliances. While he certainly advocates the benefits that result from alliances, he also presents the negative aspects and the repercussion that may result from unwise relations and promises. It is certain, however, that the importance of these practices in international relations is highly stressed. In his view, if used effectively

and shrewdly by the sovereign and representatives of the state, these practices will enhance the reputation, the influence, the power and the security and defensive parameters of the state.

Relevance and applicability of Machiavelli's thought

Machiavelli's thoughts on international relations anticipated the future developments that took place after his death. The **sovereignty** and autonomy of the state over its domestic and foreign affairs defines the behavior of nations in modern times. Ever since the Treaty of Westphalia, sovereignty has been recognized and utilized as a constitutive principle of statehood. Also, while he did not speak of using economic factors as a means towards state domination, his idea that states seek to maintain power and strive to expand territorial control has translated into a reality. During the Renaissance, domination and foreign invasions were established through military and fraudulent diplomatic means. Since then, not much has changed; now the practices have expanded to include economic domination and, in the past, colonization, to achieve territorial expansion, greater power and reputation. Also, balance of power as a theory was a major focus in the 16th, 17th and 18th century, and the subject of many scholars, who devised schemes ranging from the dynastic principle, to the practice of territorial compensation, and in fact was recognized as a guiding principle in the Treaty of Utrecht. Although it is not as commonly practiced in current international relations, the need to prevent abuses of power still exists and is prominent in paradigm of realism. Therefore, Machiavelli's analysis of the behavior of the state, and its action and reaction in relation to other is still as relevant as it was during the time that he was writing.

Another area in which Machiavelli was ahead of his time was the perception of the significance of **nationalism**. As time progressed after Machiavelli's death, notably since the French Revolution, nationalism certainly had become one of the most important "isms", reaching its height from 1850 to World War II. Not only did nationalism fuse with Liberalism (i.e. nationalized liberalism, nationalized socialism, political nationalism) as well as other ideologies, it has always been and remains a strong force that has the power for positive developments within a state, as well as creating the conditions for the degeneration and destruction of a state. In this respect, Machiavelli was ahead of his time by emphasizing the importance of creating a feeling of patriotism and nationalism within a state. It is certainly true and has been demonstrated in many cases, that "the love of the country (has) more power...than any other sentiment."⁴³ This is merely one of the aspects of international relations in which, Machiavelli had an enormous impact on the development of the academic field of study as well as a huge impact on the behavior of states and interstate relations.

Machiavelli also anticipated the growing importance of **diplomacy** as an institutionalized practice in modern international relations. During Machiavelli's lifetime, diplomacy was not only common within the Italian city-states; it was considered essential to the survival of the state. In the 21st century, diplomacy has become even more institutionalized and is no doubt a major component of current practices. Diplomacy has become the conventional means for the state to conduct talks relating to any issue area that requires negotiations; whether the issue is bio-genetically engineered food, trade, conflict resolution, nuclear

disarmament or many other topics of contention. In fact, many countries (democratic countries) conduct negotiations with diplomatic talks in an event of a conflict, as opposed to resorting to military means. Also, the “bandwagon” approach, which Machiavelli describes as the phenomenon of the stronger power acting as the ally and defender of weaker powers, describes the behavioral norm in current international relations. One only needs to look at the United States, whose status as the world’s most powerful country grants to create the expectation, on the rest of the world, that the United States should assume the responsibility of defending and supporting weaker countries. And finally, Machiavelli’s assessment that geographical proximity plays a large role in the formation of alliances is entirely correct. The perfect example of this practice in use in modern times is with the European Union. Due to the close proximity of the European countries, this alliance makes sense; the movement of goods and services, the deployment of troops in the event of a military attack on one of the European Union Members, and the free movement of the common currency can all effectively take place due to the fact that the member states are situated so closely together. As well, Canada and the United States are natural allies due to the close proximity of the two countries. Therefore, his belief that diplomacy plays a very important role in international relations, and directly aids in aggrandizing as well as maintaining the state, not only reflect the turbulent times of the Renaissance Italy but also current practices in international relations.

Machiavelli’s thoughts and observations concerning international relations truly are timeless; not only does it reflect the political climate of his lifetime but it also remains a true reflection of practices within international relations in the 21st century. In his view, the state should behave in a manner, which benefits the public and in turn, benefits the well being of the state. For Machiavelli, the structure of the world system is anarchical, so therefore states act in the name of self-interest in order achieve the goals of maintaining security and increasing power. In such an environment, the state must maintain domestic strength, through a united nation, a central government, a sense of love and loyalty towards the country from its citizens and finally, through a nationalized army. Only in this way, can the basis for a strong, united country exist. Also, Machiavelli’s conception of the state in its ideal form is that of an organic whole with complete sovereignty over its own territories, domestic affairs as well as foreign affairs. The nature of the state is that full autonomy is essential in order to survive, as well as expand internationally. As well, in an environment of competing social, economic, and political interests of states and individuals at the domestic and international level, there must be equilibrium between these conflicting areas. In the domestic sense, equal distribution of wealth between the citizens of the state as well as judicial and political equality for all, is necessary to achieve equilibrium of interests. On the international level, economic, social and political equilibrium must be achieved between competing states, or else the preconditions for a democratic world society will not exist. In addition, Machiavelli maintains that diplomatic means of communication and negotiation with foreign powers is important for states, in order to maintain power and acquire reputation on an international level. Essentially, he feels that the sovereign or the ambassadors are the physical embodiment of the state, and must take care to behave in a manner that will aid in the acquisition of more power and influence for the state. However, while he stresses the utility of forming alliances, which are the resulting greater defense and security capabilities of the state therefore reducing the threat

of foreign attacks, he also provides conditions when alliances are not as effective. In instances whereby promises are made by the state out of force or from extenuating circumstances, where alliances are made with countries that are located too distantly or from forming alliances with powers greater than yourself. The central point of Machiavelli's argument is that, no matter what, diplomacy will have a direct impact on the power and the reputation of the state.

His two works, *The Prince* and *The Discourses* have been described as political theory as well as diplomatic literature, and therefore, it is of no coincidence that he is recognized as one of the most important scholars to the paradigm of realism. Many of the concepts that he discusses are now part of the core values and ideas found within this school of thought. Certainly, the evolution of international relations, where the concepts that were actually happening within politics were theorized and official terms were coined, displays the insight that Machiavelli had for analyzing the mechanisms of power within the state, the nature of the international system and the fundamental nature of the state. While the world's material and technological conditions may have changed in many ways since Machiavelli's life, in Renaissance Italy, it would seem that human nature, and hence the manner in which states behave in relation to one another, has not changed very much with the passing of time.

Notes

- ¹ Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Prince and The Discourses*. New York: Modern Library, 1950, p. 7.
- ² *Ibid.*
- ³ Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Discourses*, *op. cit.*, p. 138.
- ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 150.
- ⁵ Sabine, George H. *A History of political theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961, p. 351.
- ⁶ Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Prince*. *op. cit.*, p. 66.
- ⁷ Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Discourses*, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 345
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 451.
- ¹⁰ Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Prince*, *op. cit.*, p. 49.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 97.
- ¹² Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Discourses*, *op. cit.*, p. 226.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 345.
- ¹⁴ Sabine, George H. *A History*, *op. cit.*, p. 349.
- ¹⁵ Machiavelli, Nicolo *The Discourses*, *op. cit.*, p. 511.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 138.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 123.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 254.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*
- ²¹ *Ibid.*
- ²² *Ibid.*, p. 130.
- ²³ *Ibid.*
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 133.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 143.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*
- ²⁷ Lerner, Max. *The Prince and The Discourses*. New York: Modern Library, 1950, p. 7.

- ²⁸ Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Prince. op. cit.* , p. 66.
²⁹ *Ibid.* , p. 9.
³⁰ *Ibid.*
³¹ *Ibid.* , p. 67.
³² Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Discourses op. cit.*, p. 345.
³³ *Ibid.* , p. 266.
³⁴ *Ibid.* , p.378.
³⁵ *Ibid.*
³⁶ *Ibid.* , p. 279.
³⁷ *Ibid.*
³⁸ *Ibid.* , p. 266.
³⁹ Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Prince. op. cit.* , p. 83.
⁴⁰ Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Discourses op. cit.*, p. 254.
⁴¹ *Ibid.* , p. 529.
⁴² *Ibid.* , p. 312.
⁴² *Ibid.* , p. 439.

Bibliography

- Hale, J.R. *Machiavelli and Renaissance Italy.* London: The English Universities Press Ltd., 1961.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Prince and the Discourses.* New York: The Modern Library, 1950.
- Pocock, J.G.A. *The Machiavellian Moment.* New Jersey: University Press, 1975.
- Rudowski, Victor Anthony. *The Prince: A Historical Critique.* New York: Twayne Publishers, 1992.
- Sabine, George H. *A History of Political Theory.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
- Skinner, Quentin. *Great Political Thinkers.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Villari, Professor Pasquale. *The Life and Times of Machiavelli. Fourth Edition.* London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1878.
- Viotti, Paul R. & Kauppi, Mark V. *International Relations Theory. Third Edition.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1999.