



---

## Machiavelli and the Foundation of the Modern Political Thought

---

Mansour Mirahmadi<sup>1</sup>, Abozar Kousari<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Shahid Beheshti University

<sup>2</sup>Shahid Beheshti University

---

Received: 7 Jul 2011 ; Accepted: 19 Oct 2011

---

**Abstract:** The present article intends to start introduction to the political thinking of Machiavelli by passing through some key concepts in his thinking, and by placing his idea in the area of political thinking. Surveying ethics in Machiavelli's political thinking needs separate individual ethics from political (civil) one. And explaining Machiavelli's remarks about the category of ethics requires it to be evaluated from the ethical dimension. Common expedience (interest) as one of the most basic concepts in Modern political thought tried to empower its theoretical bases with the help of Niccolo Machiavelli, and made its absence in the political thinking absolutely unjustifiable. Power in the thought of Machiavelli in proportion with the type of political systems have been explainable, and its actualization has been bound to its contemporary definition and redefinition, following the changes in political time and space conditions, and finally, surveying the Realism in Machiavelli's political thinking needs to make distinction between this concept and Factualism (Superficialism). Realism, not in the sense of following the events, but creating them, and Factualism (Superficialism) is an attempt to reflect against changes, without understanding their internal reasons.

**Keywords:** Modern political thought, Ethics, Common Expedience (Common Interest), Realism, Political Power.

---

### Introduction

If we consider the objective of science as the intelligibility of reality, the science of politics becomes a subcategory of social sciences and following it, a complex of posteriori concepts. This means that before searching for the politics in the applications, we understand that they are hidden in concepts which are made in specific thinking, cultural and social time and space situations. The explanation of the science of politics as posteriori concepts indicates that political manifestations ex-

isted before the new political concepts their its new meaning developed, but concepts and categories that made their understanding possible did not exist. In philosophical meaning, the science of politics or political knowledge is an affair which is intelligible by nature, but political manifestations are accidentally unknown affairs. With these definitions a major section of the background of the science of politics in the new concepts and meaning is in debt of the political thinker of the Renaissance period, i.e. Niccolo, Machiavelli. In this article it is attempted to explore our purpose of poli-

tics in its new concept, with a general definition of politics as a science which is generalizable to other fields of social science. The concepts which are chosen, here, to explain the thinking of Machiavelli, are inseparably inter connected and interwoven, as each of their definition and explanation needs to turn back to other concepts and in interaction with them, it an acquired meaning. For instance ethics, without consideration of common interest and, also, the same concept cannot be explained without realism which is an inseparable part of the political power of governments. Definition and explanation of each concept even, except those which are supposed to be defined, here, cannot be done without considering their interconnection, and will have an abstract and immaterial position. Thus, in this opportunity, we try to find different examples to confirm our explanations derived from the above concepts, and, of course, their examples, in of these concepts are generalizable. It means that any example from Machiavelli's quotations brought here could be meanings to understand all concepts mentioned above.

### **Ethics**

From among the most important characteristics of Modern political thought based on Machiavelli is the separation of individual ethics from the field of politics. It means that ethics in the domain of politics and society, is not, necessarily the same concept present in the domains of individual relations. In fact, it can be stated that Machiavelli is not a thinker who theorizes about ethics, but his discussion in ethics is investigated as a necessary discussion of power. Therefore, any discussion of ethics in the thinking of Machiavelli should necessarily be investigated in an exact relation with power. This means that, it is not possible to investigate ethics separately, in the thinking of Machiavelli and not to fall into abstraction.

To clarify this discussion in a better way, it is necessary to survey on ethics in two separate individual and social fields. If an ethical or humanita-

rian action has a meaning in a boundary of human life, i.e. the field of human relations, it cannot, necessarily have the same application in the general field of society, and sometimes, perhaps in some conditions, these two actions have contradictory applications. Since the domain of society is separate from the domain of the individual, and its logic and necessities are not of the same nature, consequently, an ethical humanitarian unit of action cannot be prescribed for the two domains in a similar way. In the field of society, any action, such as ethical ones, should be applied considering the condition in which we are placed. This means that individual ethics can be applicable without considering the conditions of time and space, but ethics in the domain of society or civil ethics can be practical only by including the society and the city. Ethics in the domain of individual is of essential type, i.e. the value of each action depends on the one which is conducted, while the civil ethics is consequential, prospective, and accountable.

Machiavelli's ideas in the field on ethics can, also, be investigated from the perspective of civil ethics, because judgment in his thought would add to the complexities and misunderstandings, from the position of individual ethics.

If following a series of ethical principles during the renaissance period, after the ancient Roman thinkers caused pride, dignity and services to the country, and in one word, led to acquiring virtue, what Machiavelli opposed, without posing disputes in the mentioned objectives, were principles and criteria that could not provide virtual consequences, considering its nature, in the modern period. The reason is that the modern period required founding new principles which were not necessarily in the same direction with ethical and religious criteria and considerations. Machiavelli, in chapter fifteen of the treatise of "king" (Shahriar) in relation to the lack of conformity of these principles with the objectives of virtuousness says, "because, if we look well there are other habits that seem to be rascality, but produce security and happi-

ness"(Machiavelli, 1997: 103). Machiavelli following this discussion and in chapter seventeen states, "then whenever, there is the turn of uniqueness, and obedience of peasants, the king should not worry to be called stonehearted, because he will show, by some hash, that he is kinder than those present kindness to the extent that crisis happens and the situation leads to blood shedding and plundering" (Ibid: 107).

In different places of the treatise "king" the contradiction between individual ethics or ethics in common usage can be observed in combination with the nature of power and governance. With more quotations it is possible to have clearer understanding from Machiavelli's thinking. Where Machiavelli makes contradictions between the mercifulness of the king which is sometimes applied in a public interest and ethics, and the other with the application of logic, when criticizing the king who has chosen the first approach, states, the king who performs in this way will have an empty treasury and will ultimately put more burden on the shoulders of people and collect more taxes to compensate for his liberality to access more money", but when appreciating the second approach, he states," if it is supposed that the king not to plunder the people's property and be able to defend him/herself and not to fall in poverty, he shouldn't fear from being called mean and stingy"(Ibid:104-105).

Overlooking ethics, by Machiavelli, is Justifiable, only when it leads to the good for public, which if followed would make it impossible to achieve the goodness and also when its consequences would be damaging for the country. In a sense, the point that separates the civil ethics from the individual interests and ambitions, is where the king applies or does not apply national and public interests and goodness in his/her performance. Overlooking the public ethics from the side of the dictator (king) who does not consider anything but his own interests is reproachable. Killing the citizens, fooling friends, lack of loyalty, stone hear-

tedness, and faithlessness cannot be called art (virtue). Following these approaches would help one to gain the power of kingdom, but will not help him reach magnificence (Ibid: 74).

In Machiavelli's thinking, following the eternal goodness makes a king not to deal with short term interests and harms. If suggestions of Machiavelli to kings, as some of his thought interpreters say, is toward superficial civility and demagogues, the king should perform what is more interesting among all and not as it is mentioned above, to follow actions which lead to his mercilessness, meanness and maliciousness. The action of a capable king when it can be contrary to ethics and religion in a suitable time, at the first glance seems a mean action contrary to humanitarian feelings, but in reality it leads to honor, virtue and interests of a governmental which has to include the people's goodness as an influential policy in the power. Of course, somewhere else, Machiavelli in his treatise of shahriar (king) "states that satisfying the public and depending on people is not a dependable support for the king, and says that"any king who depends on people, is in vain"(Ibid: 80). What he says here, which might seem in contrast to what he said before, could be explained in this way that in the treatise of "king" he takes in to consideration the satisfaction and the role of people in the power equations from a negative point of view, and when he talks about the affirmative view of people's role in the body of preserving institutions, and laws, he puts emphasis on it in his treatise of "speeches" and he considers it as the foundation of the treatise.

Machiavelli does not consider any action instinctively right or wrong, because our actions are justifiable only depending on time and conditions, and any action is specific for a special situation and the only criteria is that of the condition of the action alongside the public interest. Following these definitions it seems that this understanding from Machiavelli's thinking that goal justifies the means is not scratch able. This means that the proposition can be justified; only when, the goal and the means

are separable from each other, i.e. means is different from the goal, and the goal is not guaranteed by the means. While in the political thinking of Machiavelli, means is interwoven in the objective and they cannot be separated either on the surface, or in depth and nature. What was mentioned means that if it was supposed for something to be scapegoat, it is for the sake of the thing itself and not for anything else. For example, the public interest should never be scapegoat for any other problem beyond it. It might seem difficult to interpret this both for a government who attempts to make army and conscript just for the sake of defending his country (which is the objective) and making an army (which is the means) and make it equal to the situation of a king who is dictator and to preserve his power (objective), and to overcome his fear of war renounces a part of his country (means), and considers both of them as having the same negative connotation.

### 2.1. Public Expedience

If there is a belief that political thinking was founded in Ancient Greek by Plato, we have no other choice, except considering the public expedience (interest) as a principle criterion in its formation, because as Plato believes, following the public expedience is the only criterion that differentiates correct political systems from incorrect ones. In this regard, it can be said that the political thinking in the west, generally, with all its pros and cons, can be detachments and attachments, and with all its numerous interpretations by different thinkers and different political systems, could not keep its main and principle axis, i.e. the concept of common expedience. So, with the foundation of political thinking in the new era, especially by Machiavelli, the concept, i.e. lacking the common interest causes the political issue be considered as useless, and decreases it to the level of sole ideology and temporary political theory. Machiavelli in the second chapter of the second part of his "Speeches" says; "the origin of the magnificence

of cities is not the well being of individuals, but the public goodness, and public goodness is only of importance in republic governments, because they provide everything to guarantee the public goodness." (Machiavelli, 1999: 199)

The core of political thinking of Machiavelli, especially in the treatise of *Speeches*, is the concept of public goodness. A virtuous king is a person whose interests and power are accessible and justifiable only in the framework of the public interest, i.e. the interest of the king and that of the government are coordinated. In this type of thinking the best support for the interests of the king is the public interest. In other words, the policy of the king is a type in which there is no contradiction between the interest of the king and the total interest of the society, rather, they are alongside each other and complementary, and the justification of each of them is in change between the interests of these two political powers: this means that sometimes the interests of people support the government and sometimes the interest of the government guarantees the benefits of the public. This is the same point which, by Machiavelli, makes difference between republic and monarchy systems. In republic systems "the states do everything to satisfy the public benefits, even if it is harmful for one or the other person, because the number of those who benefit from the public goodness is so many that makes an action possible to be conducted even if it is contrary to the will of a minority group. Opposite to this issue happens in a monarchy system. Most of the times, what is useful for the king, might be harmful for the society. And what is useful for the society might be harmful for the king. In a society where dictatorship replaces freedom, the smallest harm that is achieved because of this replacement is that the society does not improve anymore (Ibid).

Machiavelli considers the reason why there is no objection toward Romulus (1) because of killing his brother and gaining immense power and believes that these actions are along the common

good. Because Romulus tried to form the Senate when Rome was in prosperity, and tried to consult with the Senate members in important affairs. Machiavelli has an opposite view toward the actions and leadership of Cesar(2) and when opposing writers, who admire Cesar, believes that “a ruler who looks for fame should wish to control the power in a disturbed country, not like Cesar to make more disturbances, but like Romulus to preserve order, in the country”(Ibid, first manuscript, Chapter 15: 1)

Although, Machiavelli, when advising governors, considers that the best way of governing is looking for friendship, on the other side, when advising those who look for power and not for the goodness of public, and apply tyranny, gives some suggestions, although they depend on the instinct of the governments, while his ideas are, in no way, justifiable. In another word, he advises a tyrant, who does not know anything except tyranny that a dictatorial government, also, has some instincts that if the behavior and action of a tyrant is in compromise with that trait and recognition of that trait, the government can remain stable. But interesting issue is that even these governments refer to people and look for their benefits among goodness for people, when they try to gain pride and honor.

Machiavelli, in chapter thirty four of the first book, “Speeches” indicates an important point in relation to the physical appearance of governments and their inner contents, and points to this very fundamental issue that the physical appearance of any political system cannot be underestimated because of its content and vice versa, when exploring the nature of dictatorship mentioned in the constitution of the Republic Rome for emergency conditions. “What dragged Rome to slavery was not its being a dictator or its nature of dictatorship, but it was the power that some citizens who ruled and directed the army for a long time, which was restricted to themselves, contrary to the law (Ibid, first manuscript, Chapter 34:126). In the continuation he emphasizes that the instinct of dictatorship

was one of the reasons for the prosperity of the Rome Empire and indicates that ‘in a free country there should never be a necessity for law breaking and adherence to lawlessness ... because if the means of being an outlaw is, even, for sometimes useful, it is a destructive example (pattern). Whenever, there is the habit of breaking the constitution for good objectives, the same excuse can be applied for bad objectives, as well’(Ibid: 127). It has to be mentioned that this statement of Machiavelli, is; on the surface, in contradiction to what was earlier mentioned by Romulus, because, Machiavelli, had stated that nobody would insult his action, if his are useful to all, Machiavelli had admired the outstanding actions and over looked some humanistic and ethical criteria in establishing Roman Republic, proposed by Romulus. The interesting point is that Machiavelli himself was aware of the dangerous outcomes of the actions and laws which were edited in emergency conditions, and had intended to reduce them and had alerted about them. It meant that if there were other approaches, than those proposed by Romulus for establishing governments, they would have had to be chosen, and when one was obliged to proceed Romulism approach, she should look for decreasing those activities and replace them with appropriate ones, and not to leave the limitless power to his/her substitute.

## 2.2. Political power

In Machiavelli’s thinking, political power is derived from realities which are changeable, constantly. These changes in realities lead to this conception that power cannot be materialized and defined, as a stable and permanent phenomenon, but it will be presented in different shapes. He considers interstate tensions and competition for gaining power, not weakening element for governments, but as backgrounds to make balance among forces and, ultimately, reach freedom which is the outcome of this balance. “In different sects, although, have no other selfish interests, it seems that there is an in-



visible hand that directs them toward consideration of public interests in all their constitutional activities" (Skinner, 2002: 116). Machiavelli, when thinking about the reasons of the stability of power and greatness of Spartans in comparison to those of Athenians, states that in Athens, "there was no balance between the power of people, and the king and the noble men (Machiavelli, 1999: 44)". He brings the same reasoning when he talks about the reasons of the freedom of Rome and its detachment from the idea that power is gained because of the more domination of sovereign over obedient. By this, he believes that the political power is derived from the interaction and harmony between sovereigns and the free citizens. "I am inclined to say that writers who insult the conflicts, between people and aristocrats, actually condemn the principle reason of the freedom of Rome" (Ibid, first manuscript, Chapter 4: 48), and he continues to state that "the good people are the offspring of good education and good education is derived from good laws, and good laws are the outcomes of the party campaigns, which are insulted by thoughtless people" (Ibid: 49).

Machiavelli in explaining and exploring the political power and at the same time the nature of government, has special emphasis on the balance of the sovereign power, and condemns it while stating that imbalance between them means the termination of any government. In his advises to governments and kings, he includes the difference between and among political systems as a serious proposition. As an example, when he compares two systems of sovereignty by Valerius and Manlius as two Roman rulers with two different approaches, one with kindness, and the other with hardship and harshness, both of whom achieve the same type of success, considers the approach of Manelius more compromising with the nature of Republic government and says: "I apt to say that for any citizen who is living under the laws of a republic country, Manelius's approach is more pleasant and less dangerous because this approach

only benefits the society and has no relation with ambitious, objectives (Ibid, third manuscript, Chapter 22: 365). This approach, however, is not as good for kingship as it is for republic system, because in this system the king should try to make his subordinates both to love him and to obey him. The popularity of the king and devotion of soldiers is more agreeable with the kingship system, but subordination of Militias to a citizen who is chosen to govern them, is not compromising with the republic system (Ibid: 365)"

Political power is not after a restrictive definition and a detached one from itself, in permanent development. Here, the right, civility, and moderation in producing and preserving power are as effective as arms and power are. Power, with Machiavelli, is not something that we could keep it, the way we acquired it. In this type of thinking, the strong point of governments anytime can change to weak points, and the other way round, i.e. strong points might change to an element for their Knocking down, if they are not alert enough. According to Machiavelli, power cannot and should not coordinate itself with only one type of understanding and political construct, forever, because it is possible, that mutual understandings, become introductions for contradictions, or contradictions potentially become ready to found political power in a different shape, during the process of time (Tabatabaee, 2004: 495).

### 2.3. Realism

To explain the concept of realism the way Machiavelli recognizes it in a better way, we have tried, here, to fake the meaning of realism (specially with the meaning of Superficialism) by placing it against the concept of actualism, and on the contrary try to refer to the real meaning by the help of opposite meaning. In a sense, we take political realism as "passive politic" and political actualism as "real politic". We brought these two expressions and their difference in meaning because it is observed that they are used interchangeably and

sometimes they have conveyed the same meanings. In fact realism is an awareness action but actualism a practical reaction. In other words realism creates potentials, but actualism, defenders. Realism in Machiavelli's thinking is supposed to accept virtue, while actualism awaits luck, realist creates concepts and objectify them, but actualist follows phenomena and events. Realism is derived from a type of thought, but actualism is a type of instinct and its manifestation is solely preserved in obedience to events. A realist intends to change, stabilize, and/ or form realities according to thought and mind and elevate her or his power of exploration and perhaps prediction, and put unexpected elements and choices of the outer world, in their interpretation framework, and with this background to get ready to account for any change or development (3). Actualist, however, observes, the real things, or feels them, and since lacks necessary concepts and categories to understand and explore, and as a result is not able to relate and understand the meaning of actions and events, s/he can only present a passive reaction. In sum, realism contrary to actualism has some theoretical foundations, regardless of these foundations, s/he might not understand, this concept, either, and anytime the concepts might interpenetrate, one might get decreased in expense of the other.

Since we talked about theoretical foundations, it is better to present our intention more clearly, and because of this reason, for surveying the political thought of Machiavelli as a realistic political thought and his initiation in this respect, in summary we talk about the theoretical fundamentals of Machiavelli's thinking. In none of the two works of "speeches", and "king", however, which have been translated into Farsi, no section can be found to have only talked about theoretical discussions, but there are some theoretical foundations in both these two treatise which are hidden and established. Political thinking, because of being a thought system, and if we want to understand it as a constellation of ideas, it should be said that it is

based on a theory, but since it is present in the domain of investigation, it acts as the cornerstone of a theory whose identification is not possible (Tabatabaee, Op, Cit: 589). It can be said that investigation in the humanistic fundamentals in the political thought of Machiavelli, plays an important role in understanding his ideas. For him, since human beings are subject to ego, and is instinctively selfish and ambitious, as a result any relation and interaction between them is based on acquiring profit and repelling damage. Centrality and nobility of individuals' passions and their disobedience from the ethical and religious obligations and their doubt about their instinctive preference and their doubts about their instructive preference, and principally doubt in calling them virtues lead to a new approach which is contrary to the old thinking and in contradiction with it. In explaining the idea of Machiavelli, it should be stated that "the most important motivation for everybody in his life, is his wishes, and these wishes, contrary to the ideas of the ancients who consider them as the outcomes of passions and the causes of ethical corruption, and, in fact, ethics and politics of the ancients did not have any objective except egotism, in Machiavelli's political thinking, it is a natural issue (Ibid: 496). Exploration of disputes, tension, friendship and generally, any social relations, and any interstate ones, with the help of explanation of instinctive characteristics of individuals who are, as was mentioned before, ambitious and selfish, can help illustrating the definition and elaboration of the politics in the new era.

Realism in political thinking of Machiavelli means that since human beings are naturally after their own interests, countries are also after their own natural interests. Powerful governments look for preservation or development of their powers, and those who are not powerful look for power. These factors lead to wars, tensions; and competitions in different shapes. The Modern political thought, with all these preliminaries looks for understanding these interactions and tensions among

nations, and if they talk of interaction, it is also, derived from their competitions to gain either power or wealth.

As it was mentioned before, if we could use a counter argument to explain realism in Machiavelli's political thinking, actualism, which is conceptually related to welfare in the thought in the idea of some of the contemporary Islamic thinkers (4), because of the lack of theoretical basis, will be led toward actions which are being conducted regardless of theoretical foundations of the Modern political thought. It seems that the concept of expedience, as was mentioned, compared with the actualist's thinking, is a theory, which because of the lack of thinking foundations, except some traditional theoretical ones, tries to take the world of action and theory together; the two identities, which are left devoid of their origin. As an example, if, by talking about ethics in political thinking, the objective is its understanding in the logical framework of politics, in traditional theories the discussion would end to the issue that ethical necessities are after imposing themselves on the domain of politics and gaining independence from the political affairs. It should be emphasized that there can be no relation between these two concepts (Actualism, expedience, and realism), and if there is any relation or combination, it is no more than eclecticism, because in the interest oriented traditional theory, the more we approach the more we get unfounded, because expedience is just accidental and not instinctive in thinking. Stated differently, the interest or expedience oriented theory or that of the actualist, since is based on the old thinking, can accept the Modern political thought as the secondary one, because the Modern political thought is no more than expedience, itself. On the contrary there are people who believe that the expedience emanated from the traditional thinking, which is in one way or another, similar to realism! In Machiavelli's thinking, which conforms to the changes in time and situation of the external world and, is to explore its own problems, it should be

stated that the notion of expedience cannot act, alternatively and permanently, be contrary to its nature. It means that the expedience cannot adhere to another expedience because of its incapability, if it could act according to the necessities of the time, it could be possible by either applying fundamental changes in its traditional theories, which it is taken from the new theoretical foundations, or, because of contradiction and accident, or, in another world, is a reaction emanated not from the theory of exploratory logic, but from practically imposed logic.

In Machiavelli's political thinking, we are not acting passively against the time events, but actively create it. A politician is the one who is alongside the time impression, and not its follower, and since the time impression is always changing, a keen-and wise king, the main actor, is the creator and is inside the changes, not outside them. In one sense reality in Machiavelli's thinking is not only the "fact" or a tangible and stable issue, or is not something with external being, but it can get actualized, only if it changes to the "factor", i.e., an actor whose nature is not formed with beings, but the one in which logic of manifestations is an indispensable part of realities, because in the domain of political action any power which is effective in manifestation of changes and powers- even the appearance or the appearing logic which is more effective than the real action, is the reality of the happened event (Ibid: 489).

It should be taken into account that if Machiavelli's political thinking is considered as an expedience oriented thinking, it should be accounted that expedience for Machiavelli follows its own special logic, contrary to the traditional thinking in which expedience follows a logic beyond that of its own, i.e., the traditional thinking logic. In another sense, in reality political thinking, contrary to the traditional thinking, expedience is not an inconvenience that one should escape from, but is a site; escaping from which is to the benefit of the totality of the political thinking. Thus, in Machiavelli's political thinking, expedience is not the same word



as common among the mass, but it is an independent thought which is internally solid and has logic.

### 3. Conclusion

Associating the adjective of “new” to the political thinking follows the changes, through which man could succeed in finding a relative order, from among disorders, and complexity of disoriented political events, and tried to stabilize it. The mentioned relative order, was, in fact an instrument and armor from which the old political thinking was devoid.

Surveying the four fundamental political concepts by Machiavelli and exploring different and contradictory interpretations of these concepts proposed by the political thinkers before him, shows the same relative order in political thinking which is only found in that of Machiavelli. This means that with Machiavelli, for the first time, the expanse of politics as an independent one could illustrate itself and could be meaningful. It was after Machiavelli that ethics lost its unified meaning and was limited to its special domain, and politics could only accept the ethics only when it was interpretable in the framework of political issues, and consequently, political ethics was no longer an individual ethics.

In the political thinking of the new period, the king or the ruler could no longer ignore the public and gradually the national expediency. Because its ignoring, was not only tyranny upon subjects, but it was an unwise and unthinkable action whose ultimate purpose was to provide benefits for the king, and to stabilize his/her position, a king who was no longer able to picture a powerful and magnificent future for himself, independent from the benefits of the population. It was also, with Machiavelli, and in the new period that the political power could redefine itself in unison with the public interest, and seek the increase in the power of the king, not in contrast with that of the subjects, but along free citizens.

In conclusion, in Modern political thought, the actualism was neither passivity nor superficiality, but an action derived from a theoretical fact and a new understanding from human being as it is. A creature who is power and interest seeking and benefiter, one whose actions; individual, social, political, i.e., making army, making political and economic relations with other societies, war, peace, and the like, are according to his wishes, one whose gaining and preserving interests are interpretable in the framework of power.

### Footnotes

1. Romulus, according to Ancient Rome Myths, founder of Rome and the twin brother of Romus.
2. Roman Emperor who was destroyer of the freedom of Rome, by Machiavelli.
3. Machiavelli, in a part of chapter 3 of “king” says “Romans predicted problems and tried to find solutions for them, and did not let them increase in volume, because of getting away from wars. Because they knew that if they refrained from war they could leave its benefits to the competitor, Machiavelli, Niccolo, King, Op, Cit: 50.
4. It should be mentioned that in recent decades in Iran, it is tried to give an interpretation from the divine law which claims that all subjects and events in different political, social, and cultural domains can be presented and dealt with following a new interpretation from the tradition and that of the Divine Law. Although this reasoning is prevalent, this theory has not yet been able to either render a new reading, nor to solve the problems, fundamentally. The reason is that these efforts have been led to

presenting the traditional thinking in a new framework and with a new decoration. At last, it has to be mentioned that the concept of expediency in the Islamic- traditional thinking could not detach itself from its traditional bases, and the new thinking is just regarded as a sub branch of the old thinking tradition.

### References

- Mackiavelli, Niccolo,(1997) *Shahriar (Princes)*, translated by Ashouri, Dariush, Tehran, Markaz Publication.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo,(1999) *Goftarha (Speeches)*, Translated by Lotfi, Mohammad Hassan, Tehran, Kharazmy publication.
- Skinner, Quentin,(2002) *Machiavelli*, Translated by fooladvand, Ezat-allah, Tarh-e no publisher.
- Tabatabaee, Javad,(2004) *Tarikh-e Andisheh-e siyasi-e Jadid-e oropa (The History of Modern political thought in Europe)*. Tehran, Negah-e Moaser publisher.

#### **Mansour Mirahmadi**

Has PhD from Tehran University and is currently associated professor in Political Science and International Relations Department, Shahid Behashti University. His field is Iran and Islam Political thought



#### **Abozar Kousari**

He has M.A in Political Science from Shahid Beheshti University.

