WORKS

NICCOLÒ MACHIAVELLI

ON THE SOURCING OF MONEY(S) – THE HEGEMON (PRINCE) – HOW THE DUKE EXTIRPATES (EXTERMINATES) HIS OPPONENTS – THE INSURRECTIONISTS OF VAL – DISSERTATIONS ON TITUS LIVIUS (LIVY) – ON THE SITUATION IN FRANCE AND IN GERMANY

VOLUME ONE

INTRODUCTION-SELECTION-TRANSLATION

TAKIS KONDYLIS

EDITIONS "KALVOS", ATHENS, 1984

(FIRST PUBLISHED 1971 / 1972 (SEE HORST, G., *PANAJOTIS KONDYLIS. LEBEN UND WERK – EINE ÜBERSICHT*, KÖNIGSHAUSEN & NEUMANN, WÜRZBURG, 2019. S. 321)[1])

TRANSLATED FROM THE GREEK INTO THE BARBARIAN IDIOM BY THE KRAZY MAN BARBARIAN IDIOT © 2025 – WHENEVER

[1] Note that footnote 6 on p. 58 of P.K.'s «Η ΠΑΛΙΑ ΚΑΙ Η ΝΕΑ ΘΕΟΤΗΤΑ [THE OLD AND THE NEW GODHEAD / DIVINITY]» in : ΚΟΝΔΥΛΗΣ, ΠΑΝΑΓΙΩΤΗΣ, *ΜΕΛΑΓΧΟΛΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΠΟΛΕΜΙΚΗ. ΔΟΚΙΜΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ* [MELANCHOLY AND POLEMICS. ESSAYS AND STUDIES]. Θεμέλιο, Αθήνα, 2002, σσ. 51-74. First published in : περ. *Σημειώσεις*, τχ. 13-14, 1978, states that P.K.'s version of Machiavelli's works in Greek, with P.K.'s long introduction, was published in 1971 (not also 1972).

CONTENTS

The second volume (approximately 500 pages) will include the "Analysis of Florentine things (affairs)", the "Art of War", the "Memorandum to Raffaello de' Girolami", the "Florentine History", the "Belfagor", the "Mandrake (Mandragola)" and Epistles

[THE REMAINDER OF THE TWO VOLUMES ARE P.K.'S GREEK TRANSLATIONS OF MACHIAVELLO'S ITALIAN TEXTS, WHICH KRAZY MAN WOULDN'T TRANSLATE EVEN IF HE EVER FINISHED THE INTRODUCTION]

PROLOGUE

The fact is well-known and eloquent that in this ill-fated (doomed, damned, ill-starred) birthplace of philosophy, there does not exist even one systematic interpretative presentation of the texts of a or b great European thinker; I remind us that here, in order to simply say that we do not need to seek any particular reasons, for which Machiavelli's work is essentially unknown in our country[2], beyond general reasons of general delay (retardation)[3]. Only the "Hegemon / Prince" saw the light [of day] in Greek, whilst the minimal number of things written about Machiavelli, even though they were not all published in newspapers, remain at this or that level of newspaper columns and opinion pieces, and their authors were inspired at times by the goddess Fame and at other times by the goddess Fortune[4]. Of the presentations of the "Hegemon / Prince", leaving aside a minimal number of others, which are not worth the effort of being referred to, I'll mention two. The first was published in Athens in 1909, and the name of the translator is given with his initials, P. H (/ Ch).; the translation is most cold (frosty), but most precise [too], and is accompanied by extensive selected writings of Neocles Kazazis (1849-1936), of that scraggly (bony, harsh) old man erudite in law. In the small prologue of the translator, the Hegemon / Prince is connected with the man who will appear (be revealed) in order to resurrect humiliated and always-in-sorrow /

[2] Greece [**the footnotes are by the Krazy Man and the endnotes are P.K.'s notes to his Introduction**].
[3] Rest assured, folks, that the various "professorases" and "commentators" in "Gris" today are more retarded than a retarded JOO born of ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-INCEST.
[4] ***AAAA-HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!***

agony / anguish (badly suffering) Greece; and Kazazis, again, views Machiavelli above all like the great patriot with the high morale (cast of mind, mentality) and the enthusiastic faith, which showed the way / path / road towards / for the national unification of Italy and made the need for a strong man felt, the only man capable of realising this unification. It is extremely characteristic that such an interpretation was given in regard to Machiavelli, when the Greek statelet, crushed by military defeats, economic bankruptcies and political corruption, agonisingly sought a way out, a redemption; and this interpretation has no small significance for the historian of the epoch of [the movement of] Goudi[5]. On the other hand, the translation by Nikos Kazantzakis[6] constitutes a splendid achievement in/of style and the alive, luscious, juicy and curt, staccato, cutting discourse of the "Hegemon / Prince" gives richness (abundance, copiousness, roughness); however, Kazantzakis did not posit interpretative, but only stylistic, problems in his translation, with the result of the existence in it of a number of, more serious and not so serious, conceptual mistakes. Despite all of that, I would desire very much to include here certain chapters from his translation, recognising my debt to his endeavour and wanting to honour the memory of someone whose, in my opinion, greatest offering to our[7] letters was one of plasticity in language and of translation; however, the obstacle which stood in the way was / were again those notorious intellectual property rights of the inheritors (heirs) [of the Kazantzakis estate] and the narrow perspective of their local administrators ("How much [moolah] do you give ?").

This presentation, which shall extend to two volumes, has the ambition of encompassing whatever was the most essential which flowed from Machiavelli's pen. However, the problem of selection automatically raises the problem of interpretation,

---

[5] Η νύχτα της 14ης προς 15η Αυγούστου του 1909 για τη μικρή Αθήνα των 80.000 κατοίκων ήταν ξεχωριστή. Από νωρίς κυκλοφορούσε η φήμη πως η εκδήλωση στρατιωτικού κινήματος ήταν ζήτημα ωρών κι όντως τα πράγματα δεν είχαν διαφορετικά. Εκείνη τη νύχτα, λοιπόν, άμαξες και στρατιωτικά ιππήλατα οχήματα κουβαλούσαν ασταμάτητα αξιωματικούς και στρατιώτες στο Γουδί, στο χώρο δηλαδή που τότε βρίσκονταν οι εγκαταστάσεις της φρουράς των Αθηνών. Με την ανατολή του ηλίου στο πεδίο ασκήσεων του στρατοπέδου βρίσκονταν συγκεντρωμένοι 449 αξιωματικοί, 2.546 στρατιώτες και ναύτες και 67 χωροφύλακες, όλοι οπλισμένοι, διαθέτοντας επιπλέον και 22 πυροβόλα. Οι συγκεντρωμένες στρατιωτικές δυνάμεις διακήρυξαν την αντίθεσή τους προς την κυβέρνηση της χώρας εκφράζοντας ταυτόχρονα την υποστήριξή τους προς το πρόγραμμα του «Στρατιωτικού Συνδέσμου», στις εντολές του οποίου υπάκουαν. Τα αίτια που προκάλεσαν το στρατιωτικό κίνημα, όπως τα περιέγραψε αργότερα στα απομνημονεύματά του ο αρχηγός του «Στρατιωτικού Συνδέσμου» Ν. Ζορμπάς ήταν: «Η Βουλευτοκρατία και η συναλλαγή, η οικονομική δυσπραγία ένεκα της πλημμελούς φορολογίας, επιβαρυνούσης ιδίως τας λαϊκάς τάξεις, η κακή απονομή της δικαιοσύνης και η έλλειψις δημοσίας ασφαλείας, ο ατυχής πόλεμος του 1897, το Κρητικόν ζήτημα και το απαράσκευον του κράτους προς οιανδήποτε πολεμικήν δράσιν [[+ ή πτώχευσις τοῦ 1893]]». ***Ριζοσπάστης***, Κυριακή 12 Αυγούστου 2001, (https://www.rizospastis.gr/story.do?id=903432).
IF A NON-GREEK IS INTERESTED (I DON'T SEE HOW, EVEN I'M NOT INTERESTED ANYMORE), DO A CUT AND PASTE JOOGLE-TRANSLATION …

[6] 1883 – 1957. Great man of letters, Super-EGO (he thought he was divine !!!), Great ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-STOOGE, best known in the Anglo-sphere for Zorbas the "teach me to dance, Zorbas – Dance ? You say dance ? Well dance !!!" Greek, even though his *Odyssey* is as great an achievement for the Krazy Man Greek reader.

[7] Modern Greek.

and for the former to be resolved, the solution to the latter is presupposed. The interpretation is carried out in the introduction, which, despite all the effort at limiting it, spread out somewhat disproportionately; nevertheless, every shortcut / abbreviation would be a dangerous simplification or deficient validation / substantiation : for that reason, I preferred to write several pages more, with the hope that the informed reader will find those elements which justify them (the several pages more), not as the making known of things already said, but rather as the attempt at a new conception / comprehension. The interpretation, therefore, dictates the selection, yet the selection is obliged to include, apart from the theses/positions which support the interpretation, also whatsoever still constitutes a point indicative or contradicting, controversial in the Machiavellian texts, whatever is usually mentioned in the icy columns of the references. Finally, the translation posits/poses separate problems, its own. Machiavelli's style, albeit always elegant, in his other texts comes about as more protracted and drawn-out than in the "Hegemon / Prince", and always depends upon each and every respective disposition and the interest of the author. Apart from this here microcosm of his, he also has in parallel his macrocosm, all, that is, the style (stylistics) of Italian prose from Boccaccio and later, and the translator must move equally comfortably in both. Now, since the language of the transfer(ence) / transportation of the Italian text is Greek, that means that between these two languages, not only the grammatical and syntactical relations, but also their historical bonds, ties must be pointed out as props of translation, which begin with the injection / inoculation of elements from the time of Frankish Rule and peak / culminate with the remoulding (metamorphosis) of Italian models in Cretan theatre. Animated by the experience of the translation of Machiavelli, I would like to indicate as an excellent area, sector of study for the linguist or literary scholar those historical bonds, ties of the Italian language with the Greek language, whose, incidentally, knowledge directly interrelates with the understanding of important sectors, areas of our more recent literature, starting with Solomos's work and the School of the Ionian islands (Heptanesa / Seven Islands between Greece and Italy).

In conclusion, I thank all those friends who covered with their offers the proverbial destitution, want, penury of our libraries or who helped in the re-working (processing) of the introduction and the translation. Out of respect for their modesty, I (shall) keep them anonymous.

TAKIS KONDYLIS

N.B. For the translation, apart from the semantic analyses of passages which are given by various interpreters in their works, the more recognised German and English translations were taken into account too. The language of the translation in part accepts the morphological, form-related and phonological variety of the demotic language, deliberately following in regard to that the language of the original. On the other hand, the interpretive notes were limited to inaccessible (and not only to the Greek reader) incidents of European history or to the explanation of institutions which are referred to in the texts or in the indication of certain inaccuracies, not so much because these provoke the touchy conscience of the linguist / literary scholar, but because they reveal the mechanisms of Machiavelli's thought. Points are not clarified, illustrated, elucidated whose explanation is deduced, inferred, presumed from the careful reading of the texts; moreover, knowledge of Greek and Roman history is necessarily presumed.

. . . fortune gave it and, not knowing how to speak of either wool's or of silk's works, either of gains or of losses, it befits me to talk of the state, and I must either swear an oath that I shall be silent or that I shall speak about that.

N. Machiavelli

(epistle to Vettori, 9.4.1513)

N. Machiavelli was born in Florence on 3rd of May 1469, son of the lawyer Bernard M., who also had two older daughters and one son younger than Niccolò. On the 19th of June of 1498, a little after the overturning of Savonarola, he becomes the secretary of the second Chancellery of Florence and immediately thereafter the secretary of the Ten (of the ministry of External/Foreign Affairs and Defence, we would say today). In 1501 he marries Marieta Corsini from whom he shall acquire five children, four boys and a girl. He participates wholeheartedly in his work, he processes a volume, bulk of correspondence and takes part, officially as the second person usually, in many missions: to France (1500, 1504, 1510, 1511), to the German Emperor (1507 – 1508), to the papal court (1503, after the death of Alexander VI Borgia and, immediately thereafter, of his successor Pius III, in order to be present at the election of a new pope; and 1506, when he accompanies pope Julius II in his campaign against Imola and Bolognia), to Ceasar Borgia (summer 1502, autumn 1502 – January 1503; in the autumn of 1503 he sees Borgia again in Rome, now defeated), to Caterina Sforza at Forli (1499) and still in many more, in neighbouring cities. He repeatedly finds himself on the battlefield during the long-standing siege of Pisa (it surrendered in 1509), whilst in 1506,

wanting to enforce a personal plan of his, he gathers men in order to form national guard units, which appeared in Pisa as well. In 1512, the Spaniards bring to Florence again the Medici, in exile from 1494, and expel Piero Soderini, elected for life to the administration of the city from 1502. Immediately thereafter, M. loses his position too, whilst at the beginning of the next year he is arrested and tortured, suspected of participation in a conspiracy against the Medici. He withdraws to the paternal / ancestral estate of San Casiano, outside of Florence, where he writes the "Hegemon / Prince" and starts the "Dissertations". At the same time, he does whatever he can to approach the new rulers and to win again a new position. He frequents the humanistic circle of the Orti Oricellari, he supplements the "Dissertations", he writes the "Art of War" and most of his literary works (1515 – 16 and so on/following); and he corresponds with Vettori, ambassador to Rome, whom he asks to intercede / mediate on his account / behalf. Cardinal Julius de' Medici assigns, delegates to him the writing of the "Florentine History" and M. presents in 1525 in Rome its first eight books, when he (the said Cardinal) is by then pope Clement VII. He is in constant contact with Guicciardini and he travels to Lucca and to Carpi for matters which they assign, delegate to him, probably of a private nature. Finally, they entrust to M. a public office, to supervise the repair of the walls of Florence (1526). However, he runs out of time to enjoy his partial restoration, because in the following year the Medici are overturned, and M.'s old faction, sceptical, suspicious now of him, does not bring him back / restore him to his previous office, position. Embittered and ill, he dies (with)in a few days (21 June 1527).

Introduction[8]

From the point of view of chronological division, Machiavelli's life has such a schema, form, shape, that the/a simultaneous biographical and theoretical presentation is made easier within (inside) one sole study. If he follows this path, way, road, the researcher will first describe Machiavelli's action as [the action of] a political person, paying attention to stress those experiences which will later mark his works; reaching 1512, when / whereat Machiavelli's public activity stops, the interpreter will summarise its essence and will follow how this (public activity) was utilised / given value inside Machiavelli's by now written work, which is uninterrupted from 1512 and thereafter, and includes nearly all his writings, if we exclude his diplomatic reports. This approach (which illustrious, prominent studiers of Machiavelli followed) has the advantage that it proceeds by having as its compass two systems of reference together, the biographical and the theoretical; its disadvantage is that it excludes, in principle, the comprehension of Machiavelli from inside the prism of a more general methodology and with wider presuppositions, a methodology which could formulate interpretive claims about the life and the work of other personalities. In this way, however, the fear exists of factors remaining outside of the analysis which were / stood as very significant for the formation of Machiavelli's thought, even if they cannot be directly and tangibly traced inside his course of life / bioprocess and its interrelations / relevancies. That is why, whoever benefits from the external / outer perspicuity, sharpness of Machiavelli's life's arrangement and wants to rest/support the method of his approach on a symptomatically suitable, appropriate, expedient, opportune element, runs the risk of finding in the theme, topic he is examining solely the limited and the peculiar, idiosyncratic, but not also the threads which lead to more catholic, universal, general phenomena. Yet in this way a thinker is narrowed down and done an injustice / is wronged.

[8] Pages 15 to 187 of the 1984 Greek edition.

On the other hand, there exists the orthodox and somewhat trite, banal more methodological schema of the placing, putting, positioning of a personality inside its epoch. The worst case of the application of that schema is when the general features, characteristics, traits, attributes of an epoch are given (assuming they are given in perfect fullness and the criteria of their selection are right) and directly thereafter the general features of the personality are placed next to/beside and parallel to one another, without points of contact with the former; the simple / mere enumeration of the general features of an epoch in order for a personality to be exhausted appears to be here enough, as if this (personality) were solely their mirror: but then all the personalities which lived in the same epoch would have to be the same[9]. Things are presented better when the colour gradations of the painting which depicts the/an epoch correspond with those of the painting which depicts the personality, whilst the two paintings are not simply (in) parallel, but are connected with horizontal lines as well. And the schema is even fuller when the points of the painting of the epoch do not correspond rectilinearly (in a straight line, lineally) with the points of the painting of the personality, but are reached with diagonal (oblique, slanted, crosswise, abeam, transverse) lines, curves and crooked / twisted lines – when, that is, a serious attempt is made at the discovery and the reduction of the many and complicated social and psychological factors. Irrespective, however, of the sufficiency of its application, this schema suffers organically, because it is obliged to move at the level of abstraction, of the fictitious (fictional, fictive) construct(ion). The creature (figment) here is the "epoch" whose fundamental features are summarised / summed up, classified and are attributed retrospectively to the people who lived in it (i.e. the said "epoch"). However, the general and abstract image of the "epoch" is hysterogenic[10] (i.e. retrospective / backward-looking / one that comes about after the fact (ex post facto)), and nor could it ever be anything else; it is a logical construct(ion), an ideal type, an organ, instrument of research and of understanding, that is, by definition it has inside it as something intense the conventional element, and moreover, it directly depends on the level of our own positive kinds of knowledge, consequently it is subject to revision on account of / for purely technical reasons. The abstract comprehension and negotiation of historical forces contains, directly or indirectly, their onto-poiesis (i.e. entityisation, manifestation as beings) (which perhaps is the idealised nootropic remnant of primitive anthropo-

[9] Which has never been the case anywhere in any era.
[10] Nothing to do with "hysteria" here (Greek: ὑστερογενής).

poiia, i.e. humanisation as in the making of humans), that is, their observation as self-existent and self-sufficient beings, who stand above humans, people. However, these forces are presented as impersonal only (and solely) because in reality they are incomprehensibly many-faced, because they exist and act by means of infinite bearers. Solely these bearers here are real, more or less scattered; the "epoch", either as the systematisation of factual data, either as the "spirit of the epoch" of objective idealism, does not exist in itself.

If this is right, then the interpretation of personality by means of its reduction to an epoch constructed in terms of theory retrospectively, of essence (at (its) depth) is not but a tautology, since in this way we take the live / living nucleus / core of an epoch (which, of its own justice / automatically, constitutes a sector of the personality under investigation too), we project it (the said living nucleus) on our fictive painting and thereafter we restore, revive it (bring it back), transformed into an interpretive principle, in order to analyse areas, regions of the world from where we took it (the said living nucleus). (Here it must be noted that, since the theoretical construct(ion) is retrospective (hysterogenic, made ex post facto), it will characterise the "epoch" on the basis of its elements which a f t e r w a r d s proved to be more predominant, but which t h e n perhaps were balanced / brought into equilibrium with their counterbalancing elements). Consequently, the (by) chance / coincidental / accidental general features of an epoch, which we encounter most definitely varied in the world of the personality, the personality has not engaged / employed them in their unchanged (as they were in the beginning) and pure, clean form, with which we (re)present, depict them in our theoretical image – even though the existence of this theoretical image, with the unequivocal features, easily suggests to us such a deluded, misled, duped, deceived idea. The tendencies of the epoch reach the personality through incidents of life of individual, specific, everyday, daily contacts, through a thousand contacts of every hour with a tangible aspect of society. Thus, the personality is permeated by the epoch in a way much deeper, much more inwardly (as to consciousness), rather than finding its (the personality's) basic features collected somewhere and adopted all at once, and on account of that undigested / without being digested. And again, since the epoch permeates the personality by means of multiple bearers, in relation to which every one of those bearers embodies in a partial and insufficient manner the general features of the epoch, it follows from that, that the personality will mould, shape, form its world

with numerous refractions and contra-reflections, but with far fewer catholic, universal, general and abstract representations. The differences from personality to personality arise because the multitude and the many-sidedness of the refractions of every individual makes impossible their coincidence with the refractions of some other individual, and moreover, because all the refractions together fall upon the, in the beginning, different biological and psycho-intellectual texture of every individual[11].

If, therefore, we want to place people / humans in their epoch, we can imagine the epoch as a common base of countless (and uneven) pyramids (of various heights), with every one of them diverging more or less from the other pyramids, and thus has with the other pyramids more or less/fewer common points – from the greatest possible difference, which the common base allows, up to identification (i.e. the equating of one with another). The angle of view / viewpoint, with which we ought to look at the base, the epoch (when our end/goal/purpose is to interconnect it (i.e. the epoch) with a personality) will be different, in accordance with how acute(-angular/angled) the pyramid of every personality is, and with what kind of visual field its (the personality's) opening offers us. Hence, we shall try to see the epoch not in some clean, pure existence it has in common with everyone, but as a general trend / tendency which is impressed in everyone in a particular and fragmented manner. With that, certainly, the schema "personality – epoch" is not surpassed, overcome, and neither does today's level of our knowledge regarding / about social phenomena allow / permit us to surpass, overcome it in a scientific manner. But that is not a reason why we should not ceaselessly recollect its restrictions.

I

The difference between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance can grosso modo / in a rough / general fashion be summarised in the difference between feudal and early capitalistic / proto-capitalistic economy and society. However, this distinction does not

[11] There is no necessary direct (and exclusive) correlation between epoch and individual personality traits. Individual personality traits up to types can be found across many up to all epochs, just as different epochs can have characteristics in common, as well as their from-epoch-to-epoch differences.

represent two separate and successive historical stages; it more so suggests, implies the integration, inclusion, incorporation of two extreme characteristic features of two historical periods in two ideal types. The intense contrast, antithesis, opposition of these two ideal types is not due so much to the fact that historically their content(s) was counterposed / contrasted equally unequivocally, but more so to the fact that we, consciously designing, compiling, planning them / the ideal types, select and underline the elements of the antithesis, contrast, opposition, because we are interested in understanding the one type in contradistinction with the other type, and thus obtain, reap as much as possible more pure, cleaner guiding principles, with the purpose / end / goal of polarising around them (the said guiding principles) the great variety, multiformity of the in part / partial phenomena. Now, since here the aim is the finding of the sources of Machiavellian thought, the contradistinction of the two ideal types will be referred to solely in regard to the points which will be of use for the resolution of this problem.

The human type which is created by the natural economy[12], or at least which corresponds psycho-spiritually to this natural economy, lives attached, glued to a community, whose bio-practical principles are expressed in a tradition so strong, so that its presence is natural, unexamined and imperceptible like a breath. In this community the individual is found in compulsory solidarity with others, a solidarity which manifested itself in the necessary exchange of services[13]. (To use Durkheim's language, we here have mechanical and not organic solidarity). He / The individual is not free[14], but he is secured. He does not have a clear-cut knowledge of the boundaries, limits of his individuality, nor of its content, that is, he does not order, classify his life experiences in a chronological sequence, series, he does not live and experience time[15] and his capacity for volition is blunted. This intellectual rawness is expressed above all in the inability at calculation, at the precise, accurate measurement of goods and numerical quantities. In the Middle Ages, people were satisfied with data in approximation, nor could they properly keep in mind / take into account the concept of the "precise / accurate" and the simplest of calculations, reckonings, tallies which have reached us are full of mistakes[i]. The dissolution of this community, which Romanticism idealised without

[12] I.e. a pre-modern, pre-technicised, pre-massified, pre-atomised, pre-industrial agriculture-based economy.
[13] Obviously not in the sense of the mass-democratic services "industry", but in regard to master-servant relations etc..
[14] Not absolutely, of course, but legally compared with serfdom and slavery etc..
[15] Consciously / self-consciously.

success, is brought about by production for sale, trade / commerce and money. Money, last in the sequence/series of appearance, but more tangible as a direct motive, grants the possibility of detachment from the group. The individual can now be free[16], but he is no longer secured. Unconscious compassion and the dominance of tradition / traditionalism of the community are succeeded in his soul by the abilities which he needed to develop in competition with others.

Contrariwise, trade / commerce from the very beginning turns the mind towards the metric, measuring and quantitative side of objects. The pre-capitalistic producer, peasant or artisan, craftsman, sees only the quality of his products and considers them simply, merely as use values; the trader, merchant sees them as quantities, as exchange values, with which he does not have a personal bond. The medieval producer confused himself with his products; the trader/merchant has an external and cold, icy relation with those products, he sees them as magnitudes and counts them in money[ii]. In his mind, the measurement and accounting conversion of goods into money becomes a basic function, that is, the intellectual comprehension of tangible things becomes all the more abstract. Human activity is expressed also in numbers, because the numbers, when they are systematised in accounting terms in order to show us the active and the passive, at the same time show us the result of the effort/endeavour[iii]. Money is converted into cognition (understanding), into an abstract general/common denominator of goods, and cognition (understanding), the ability at the careful and well-aimed programming of act(ion)s, is converted into money. An analogy exists between cognition (understanding) and money : they are both hyper/supra-subjective and impersonal elements, foreign / alien to sentimentalism and ethical obstacles/barriers, which comprehend the world abstractly and constitute a measure of appraisal/evaluation and classification of people / humans[iv].

Naturally, there does not remain much room here for ethical crashing / shattering and repentance, nor for the metaphysical visions of (the) medieval (hu)man. The human / Man of calculating and weighting cognition (understanding) is more shallow and external; he is especially, primarily interested in weighing up one sector well and conquering it with the rational utilisation of his available means, at the moment when

[16] From the group, but not from money and those who control (KONTROL) / the group (i.e. increasingly from the twelfth / thirteenth, but especially from the seventeenth / eighteenth / nineteenth, centuries) ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YIDZ AND THEIR ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ) which controls (KONTROL) it.

the (hu)man of feudal society did not know how to exploit in a calculated fashion / manner either his means or his time. And thereafter, his circle of action was determined by tradition, whereas weighting cognition (understanding) draws the boundaries on its own of its motion / movement[v]. The differences between these two human types widen, expand, extend for as long as the younger type makes his calculating cognition (understanding) deeper, exercising it in sectors all the wider / broader, first in his household, then in his business and finally in its (i.e. his business's) many branches. As nicely / beautifully said, in the Middle Ages the household of the feudal lord was the product of custom, a simply superior / higher natural product[vi]; the Renaissance was first to seek and apply rational[17] organisation.

The place which in the ideal type of the Middle Ages faith (belief) possesses in the / its metaphysical, theological element, in the ideal type of the Renaissance is possessed by Reason[18]. The catholic (i.e. universal / general) prevailing, predominance of theological thought presupposes, like earthly, worldly sights, reflections of the centuries and of its immobile, immoveable models, situations which last, endure so much and so undisturbed that they suggest of themselves the idea of eternity, which is a basic predicate of God too. It presupposes political construct(ion)s which hold / last whole centuries / periods of one hundred years or institutions, like the monarchical institution, which go back so deeply inside history that their historicity is forgotten and they are presented as metaphysical categories. In this sense, medieval theological thought is related to the blunt (dull, flat, obtuse) living through / experiencing of time, which we referred to above as the essential psychical constituent element / component of the members of feudal society. (Contrariwise, theological thought, which is crystallised in periods of social upheaval(s), can have an almost existential sense of time, as Augustine shows us). The fragmentation, breaking up, shattering of society into merchandise, commodities, wares, (tradeable) goods and into competitive individuals brings about a series of ceaseless displacements, relocations and of unstoppable quick changes, whose following (monitoring, observation) needs, requires the development of another way, mode, manner of thought / thinking. One phase now succeeds the other phase and the fortune / luck of the individual alters, changes, varies so quickly that worldly, earthly things do not have time to be interrelated with some kind of transcendental category

[17] Referring to rational as means-end(goal)-calculation in the material / pecuniary sense and not to "rational" in the scientific sense discussed, inter alia, in P.K.'s *The Political and Man*.
[18] As an ideological / normative reference point.

and to be presented as its representatives; then the metaphysical systems of reference (referential systems) are dissolved and the mind / intellect seeks dynamic and tangible reasons, causes, homologous (similar, comparable, equivalent) to the facts which it (i.e. the mind) wants to interpret.

Since, in this way, the divine, godly and hyper/supra-individual order of things collapses, now the work of the regulation of the world and its formation in accordance with free purposes / ends / goals (that is, [[relatively free in the sense of]] outside of tradition) goes/passes/crosses over to the individual[vii]. Speaking always about ideal types, individuality in the Renaissance is naked, bare, despotic, self-sufficient (self-reliant, autonomous). Since the Christian perception of the meaning and the value of self-sacrifice and the renunciation, repudiation of individuality has already fallen by the wayside / abased, demeaned itself, these concepts do not again meet one another, albeit in a varied form, but when individuality also comes again under a catholic, general, universal governing, commanding principle, like the principle of Reason in the Enlightenment; especially, however, the principle of Community and of the People, in Herder and in Romanticism. Between these two epochs[19], that is, in the period of early capitalism, the individual stands/is for a period of time naked, full, above all, of himself / itself. There is no catholic, general, universal and official ideology in the Renaissance, which can cover (over, up) individual consciousness and which can give its fallacies, delusions, errors [in an already] ready, prepared [fashion, manner], even though certain groups form an elementary ideology for/by their own account / on their own behalf; the intellectual-spiritual demands and fermentations are expressed with symbols borrowed from antiquity, which Renaissance people imagine it (i.e. antiquity) as an epoch of free, unbound, unfettered individuals, projecting, in this manner, on its (i.e. antiquity's) screen their own demand, requirement or ideal. (From the perception of the Renaissance about, regarding antiquity, which was rekindled in the epoch of liberalism[20] and which underrates, underestimates, belittles, debases, downgrades, demotes, devalues the role of religion and of ideology in the life of the ancients / ancient people, we have not yet entirely freed ourselves). The early, opportunistic phase of capitalism corresponds with this nakedness of the individual, in his relative freedom from "ideology". Capitalism is not yet a hyper/supra-individualistic and

[19] Of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment (flowing into Romanticism).
[20] Here, circa 1700 to circa 1900.

unapproachable, inaccessible system which is expressed in an ideology equally hyper / supra-individual (albeit individualistic); it is an individual pursuit, a sum, aggregation of daring, personal acts. In the eyes of (their) contemporaries, the acts in themselves set the tone, and not their social content and the social perspective to(wards) which they tend. For this reason, still, the act, the action, not its result, the wealth, which in the beginning is considered to be a simple means or incidental / adjunct phenomenon, is worshipped much more. The businessman / entrepreneur must possess three basic abilities in relation to which all three are intensely individualistic: he must be strong-willed, volitional, volitive (that is free from (prior) commitments, bonds, ties (made in advance) and bold, daring); he must have an organisational spirit / intellect (something which presupposes a sense of expansion, dilation and a priority of the organiser vis-à-vis that which he has to organise); and he must have negotiatory skill(s) (that is, to pursue, seek / in pursuing his individual ends, goals(,) [whilst] aborting, frustrating, foiling, forestalling the opposite ends, goals of other individuals)[viii].

The intense, in especially the Italian cities, political life, – which in putting / setting aside inertia, becomes an invitation to action, a trigger of individualism[21] –, contributes to the outbreak of individualism. The more frequently the [[political]] parties in power change, so many more possibilities does the individual have of rising high[ix]. However, for the individual to reach [a] high [position], as an individual, another precondition, prerequisite is also essential : to not be bothered, hampered, impeded by the bonds, fetters of the nobility of blood, to recognise the concept of superiority which has its root in personal ability and value[22]. This concept is found formed from the 13th century and we see it clearly in Petrarch; on the field of social conflict, strife it constitutes a significant weapon in the hands of the bourgeois class against the feudal aristocracy.

This radical change in the position of the individual is expressed in all the literature of the epoch, era, which abandons at last / for evermore the motifs of medieval allegories and paints, draws, outlines, sketches man, his inner / internal self / world / dimension / being / space / aspect(s) and his passions, showing the peculiarity of every person and his differences from another man / others; in this way / thus, individualism is

[21] To be understood here ideal-typically and not ideologically as occurs primarily in the ZIO-ANGLO-JOO-world(s) under the ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-RAT-RODENT-PARASITE.

[22] Of course, under ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-RULE, from (18th-)19TH century ZIO-Great Britain etc. to 20th-21st century ZIO-USA, the ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID replaced the Christian nobility of Europe with its own ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-INCESTUAL-ORGANISED CRIMINAL-CONSPIRATORIAL-RAT-TUNNEL-EMETIC-FAECES-SELF AS A "ROOL DA WORLD, MASTER RACE" which only ruled "the West" and the absolutely useless part of the extra-West, destroying "the West" totally in the process, and leading everyone else to Final Perdition as is written, all in the name of equality!!! and merit !!!, especially from the second half of the twentieth century.

consolidated, which had already given birth / begot / generated this literature, and self-consciousness is intensified[10]. Aristotelian psychology of the constituent parts, components of the psyche and Galen's theory of constitutions (humours, temperaments) are abandoned and observation and description begin, start, commence already from the 14th century[11]. The concept of fame, of glory and of public praise, commendation, which the Latin authors continually echo, finds in Italy fertile ground, terrain from the moment legal classes are equalised and the medieval troubadour ceases to exclusively praise, celebrate, extol, laud the works and the name, reputation of noblemen, the nobility. The art of the biography, which is developed in (inter)relation with the fame of individuals, does not deal with / concern itself anymore with colourless chronological series of popes and of kings, but selects, chooses for discussion aiming at consensus / agreement, negotiation only a few men, which [[and]] tries, attempts, endeavours to psychograph, i.e. give a psychological profile of them[12]. Works are written with the topic, theme of famous, renowned men and places, and the houses, households where great personalities were born or their graves start to become places, loci, topoi of pilgrimage, worship[13]. In parallel, with the development of / growth in biography (and of / in autobiography), the development of / growth in topography is carried out / occurs as well, too, which stems, has as its source the same motive, fame and praise. In local, regional histories which are written, an attempt is made at the description of the peculiar features of the locus, topos, local place/area with the same spirit which in other sectors the precise description of feelings and physiognomic characteristics is sought[14]. As the manifestation of developed, evolved individualism, irony, scoffing, sarcasm, which now has a specific, special and individual aim (whereas in the Middle Ages the satirical poems made fun at, mocked the faults, defects, flaws, shortcomings of groups), and for this reason is oftentimes something unbearable, but finally is institutionalised in good society[15], corresponds with and is the inverse of the concept of fame and glory. And finally, as the coronation, crown(ing (glory)) of individualism, the human type of the "genius" takes the place of, replaces, substitutes the type of the medieval (master) craftsman[16].

The spirit of pondering, weighing up and calculation, secular, (this-)worldly, mundane and factual Reason and individualism are combined in another significant manifestation of (the) Renaissance mentality, cast of mind: in the concept of skill, craftsmanship, virtuosity, of pure technique, of the pre-planned and masterful

construction. This concept is hypostasised more clearly, transparently, obviously, perspicaciously, distinctly, lucidly in the birth, genesis of the work of art, the painting, the sculpture, the architectural construction (building, edifice), whereby the mind, functioning purposefully, on purpose, with intent, intentionally, creates order and form from inside of chaos. In this clash, engagement, scuffle, fray of the subject with the object, it is considered that the subject, the planning, designing, designer mind, plays the main role, since the more important work is not the final, real reining in, taming of the material (matter), as the study of this taming, reining in, a study which takes place, is carried out exclusively in the mind. The material (matter), the object, comes to the fore solely at the second stage, which, however, does not arouse, pique very much interest, since the problem is already, in theory, solved. (This, I think, is one of the most serious psycho / psychical-spiritual reasons why not many plans were realised, actualised by for instance da Vinci or by Michelangelo). The mind, therefore, becomes perceived here as an autonomous legislative principle; nonetheless, behind this mind, stands imagination, fantasy, because imagination, fantasy provides from the beginning the vision of the final construction completely / wholly ready, which the mind is called upon to specifically plan. The mind and the imagination in this way are mutually dependent[17] and they together give to the hand the correct, right and certain, secure direction for it / in which to move. Now, this concept of the skilled, craftsmanlike, craftsmanly, virtuoso, virtuosic pre-calculated construction does not stop at the creation of the work of art – in any case it was not born here, but came out of the experience of manufacturing, industrial[23], workshop labour, work and of technical construction, where the working, labouring hand is combined with the spirit-intellect governed by a rational purposefulness, expediency – but it slips, worms, enters into, like a schema for the confrontation, treatment of / dealing with things with pure Reason, in thousands of sectors, where it can find application, and indeed intens(iv)ely (as we must underline, since our end, goal is Machiavelli) in the sphere of politics. In (the) Italy of the 15th century and early 16th century, it is considered possible to deal with, confront the ceaseless political embroilments, engagements with the construction of a perfect polity which will arise from the correct weighing up, pondering of all (the) active factors and dispositions. In different cities, and especially in Florence, political men or public speakers (publicists) appear, who vis-à-vis the state take the same stance as the artist

[23] Pre-Industrial Revolution, obviously, i.e. of the workshops, not the factories.

vis-à-vis his (art)work, who count in their constitutional constructions dominant, governmental authority with the dropper, pipette and distribute it (i.e. the said dominant, governmental authority) with circumspection, deliberation to different groups, creating in this way an artificial balance, equilibrium based on detailed institutional settlements, which in the end proved to be hollow, shallow, devoid of essence[18]. The social factors are not able to be calculated in a theoretical construction with the same perfection, thoroughness which the data / elements of the artwork will be weighed up, pondered, since the latter (data / elements of the artwork) are defined by the artwork's same creator, whereas the former (social factors) exist outside of the subject and moreover are not all known; nonetheless, even though in every instance, case the meaning-related, semantic schema was not equally effectual, its root, in terms of mentality / cast of mind, was common.

If in the ideal type, clearly distinguished are natural law from the non-commitment of the individual; the divine, godly element from the (this-)worldly, mundane element; and the ethical act from the calculating act, in the real society of the Renaissance these elements are merged, conglomerated, consolidated and combined in ambiguous stances and in (ambiguous) ways of thought / thinking (with two meanings). First of all, Reason does not escape from its practical use to be extended, expanded up to its extreme consequence and to put in order nature and society inside a strictly causally determined philosophical system (since the main demand of Reason is the finding of / to find the relation between the cause and the caused / effect (the cause and effect relationship) in all fields). The rational positivism of the Renaissance, contrary to the positivism of the 19th century, does not have philosophical claims, but accompanies, goes with, walks hand in hand with a metaphysical agnosticism; science and philosophy are separated without the former wanting, as in the 19th century, to subjugate, subject, subordinate the latter[19]. This occurs, on the one hand, because Reason itself is not in itself, per se sufficient, but rather accepts contemplation and insight, vision, introspection and goes together with them when some problem is posited for a solution; Leonardo da Vinci (but also the Platonism of the Renaissance, which was totally foreign, alien to him) show us that empirical observation and contemplative philosophy were not mutually excluded in the mind of the intellectuals of the epoch, era. On the other hand, the intense individualism does not allow the comprehension of the concept of social law; where an attempt is made to subjugate, subordinate, subject the activity of the individual to some

causality, determinism, law-bound bindedness, again this causality, determinism, law-bound bindedness is reduced to psychological magnitudes (for instance, to a human nature)[24] and returns from a side road / roundabout way to the individual. And still more, the deterministic, law-bound, causal comprehension of individual activity is impeded by the fact that productive activity has not yet become impersonal; there is still direct contact between producer, maker, fabricator and consumer, i.e. the "fetishism of the commodity" does not entirely function, whilst the mechanisms[25] have not yet become closed[20]. Nevertheless, the idea of individualism and of competition does not wholly, entirely displace the concept of law, especially of natural law; and indeed, this concept, which the theological systems classified amongst secondary causes (causae secundae), is now projected much more, and this constitutes a victory of the bourgeois way of looking at things. Finally, an intermediate formula is found of a free[26] competition which is conducted in the framework, context of natural law[21], induced, prompted, impelled, prodded by this law and expressing it. (This perception was formulated with clarity, perspicuity by the ideological creators of bourgeois liberalism in the 18th century).

Secondly, the separation of the divine, godly from the (this-)worldly, mundane does not take place in the form of the open fighting, combatting of the theological element unto / until its final disappearance. God is not directly attacked, but only, solely goes into honourable discharge, retirement; in the real life of the economy and of politics, the criterion of weighing up, pondering and calculation presides, and that is what the individual uses in his longing, craving, yearning to rule over, dominate things and other men, humans, people. In the sphere of ideology, where, as we have said, an agnosticism governs, dominates, holds sway, the divine, godly element remains untouched, unspoilt as one of the sides, aspects which together make up, composes, constitutes this agnosticism. The papal Church, also embroiled, entangled in (this-)worldly, mundane, secular arguments and forced to move (with)in the framework, context of the (pondering, weighing up) spirit (of weighing things up), does not have the time to defend the metaphysical concepts of its ideology, and that makes the clash of the divine, godly

[24] In contrast e.g. to Montesquieu's "spirit of the laws" finding causality in the natural and social worlds, leading to classical modern sociology in the 19th century.
[25] Of production vis-à-vis the consumer.
[26] In the ideal type.

with the (this-)worldly, mundane, secular even more blunt, dull. And thirdly, in the same sense / with regard to the same concept, the separation of ethics / morality from praxis, practice is moderated (mitigated, toned down, abated). Ethics / Morality is not totally eliminated, nor is it in principle denied, gainsaid, negated as something desired and superior, however it is intensely felt, perceived and expressly ascertained that practical action, if it wants to have success, must be regulated with other weights and measures. I shall persist with / insist on these three points below, because they are of basic significance for the understanding of Machiavelli's thought. Here it must only be noted that the bearer par excellence of the moderation, mitigation of the separations in Renaissance Italy is their very same creator, the bourgeois. As a type, the bourgeois was a revolutionary, in the sense that his practical action demanded the rejection of (the) medieval bio-theory and mentality / cast of mind; as a member of a class, however, the bourgeois was conservative, particularly since he reconciled himself with the remnants of the old classes. In his social and business life, the bourgeois developed calculating, planning, designing and abstract(ive) thought and had self-conviction and cunning (guile, slyness); in his private life he was a good head of the family, he went to Church regularly / executed his religious duties normally, and he followed traditions, finding in that perhaps a (kind of) safeguard, safety, security and a prop inside the continual dangers which threatened him[22].

These two sides of the person of the bourgeois are reflected, mirrored in a pair of concepts which had (a) great propagation, diffusion, dissemination in the epoch, era, age of the Renaissance and found an intense resonance, echo in Machiavelli's work: in the concepts of virtu and of fortuna, from which the former expresses the energetic and the rational element, whilst the latter the passive and irrational element of the bourgeois bio-theory. The word virtus lost from early on its ethical, moral meaning, significance and began to be equivalent to studium, in order to then, thereafter evolve into virtu, which means the pondering, weighing up and the utilisation of all the possibilities, natural and spiritual, without mixing, mixture with / the interference of feelings (sentiments). It is characteristic that in an epoch when the distinction, differentiation of the intelligentsia from the bourgeois class commences, virtus starts to refer to the man of theory / theoretical man, and virtu to the man of praxis, practice / practical man[23]. Fortuna again, fortune / luck / chance, is a force which militates against virtu and sometimes neutralises (defuses, counteracts, obliterates, kills) it. Fortune is classical

memory, to which Dante refers, whereas the humanists personify, personalise it, but its root is not that: in a world where competitive relations become so complicated, so that calculation of the consequences of every single act is impossible (and consequently it is (potentially, eventually) possible, probable for the act to misfire, miss the mark, fail, go astray and also bring about a result entirely the opposite of (one's, the) expectations), fortune necessarily comes up / comes into sight as an "ideological", refracted expression of this here situation. However, capitalism did not need to at all reach complicated social relations for the concept of Fortune to be revealed / presented, appear inside its ideological superstructure; already from its early epoch, when it was almost equated with opportunistic adventure (and here (the) bourgeois(ie) took / lifted much from knightly / chivalrous thirst for new horizons), many times virtu could not traverse, cross up to the end of the sea, offing, high seas of adversities(,) and then Fortune appeared / arrived (came) on the scene to interpret the shipwreck. Trembling / Doddering / Shivering in the face of Fortune, that is, the uncertainty of the market and the prospect of bankruptcy, the bourgeois withdraws into himself, he reopens with more difficulty, he prefers what is less and certain; and yet, his attempt to investigate and unravel (discover the reasons for and course of) the desires, wants, pursuits, plans of this malevolent, malicious goddess – which in Florence they referred to in public documents[24] – has recourse to astrologers and diviners, clairvoyants, fortune tellers, prophets, prognosticators. Astrologers are hired, rented, engaged officially not only, solely by bourgeois communities, but also by hegemons, whilst in universities, astrology is taught next to / alongside astronomy from the 14th – 16th century. Even popes ask the stars, and in the "philosophical" circle of Lorenzo dei Medici, there are quarrels, dustups, run-ins, wrangles, rows, words, affrays, altercations, fracas(es), disputes around the value, worth of astrology: Marsilio Ficino supports it (astrology), whereas / whilst Pico della Mirandola rejects it (astrology)[25]. At this point the mentality / cast of mind of the ruling class coincides with the superstition in (regard to) which the popular masses[27] were indulging, floundering[26].

* *

It is very difficult for the calculating spirit/intellect, belief/faith in Reason and individualism on the one hand, whilst also virtu with fortuna on the other hand, to be

[27] Obviously, not in the sense of "mass society" from the 19th century.

seriously doubted that they are all found from the very beginning interwoven with the human type of the bourgeois and with the bourgeois organisation of labour, work in that epoch, era. Some who try to doubt that, put forward, proffer the argument that the same psycho-intellectual given facts / data co-correspond with many different sectors of society, and indeed with sectors which stood / were outside of the sphere of bourgeois relations, which then / at that time were still not catholic, i.e. universal, general; consequently, they say, that these given facts / this data must be reduced to the general "spirit of the epoch/age/era". Nonetheless, if the bourgeois spirit ruled, (pre)dominated, held sway, in extra-bourgeois / outside of bourgeois sectors too/as well, this solely means that the relative power of bourgeois relations was greater than every other counterbalancing social force. The mentality / cast of mind and the bio-consideration / way of looking at life of the socially more dynamic group is imposed on its rival, opposing, opponent groups even / still before they are defeated completely in (the) tangible social struggle / tussle, scuffle, fight, without this / that impeding, obstructing, blocking the long-term survival of ideological relics of defeated social classes[28]. Since the way of life and the general mentality, cast of mind of the more dynamic group better corresponds with / to social given facts / data, the rival, opposing groups are not able to but not adopt a smaller or larger part of them / such given facts, data in order to better cope with the demands of the struggle[29], and thus these same opposing groups unconsciously help, assist, aid the generalisation of the way of looking at life / bio-consideration which stems, springs from, has as its source precisely (from) that group which they are combatting, fighting, battling against – something which can even extend their [own] life. However, the dynamism of the opponent, rival does no rest upon / is not

[28] Differentiae specificae relate to ideal types, whereas actual, objective situational reality is always a mix, to varying degrees, of what is old(er) and what is new(er) situationally in actual objective reality (e.g. elements of societas civilis (which was essentially dead by the 18th century) in regard to "feudal privileges" being existent or simply invoked until late into the bourgeois era c. 1880/90 when the bourgeois era was ending and mass democracy dawning). With the current state (2025) of technological advancement, including AI ("artificial intelligence"), robotics etc., there is no doubt that Western and non-Western mass democracy is being extended into "something else", but it's too early to know what that "something else" will solidify as over a period of decades, if at all, especially given the crucial significance of geo-political rivalry and its potential to end everyone in our era.

[29] Let's say for argument's sake that in "the West" today (2025) such a struggle is being waged between patriots / nationalists and globalists / ZIO-one-world-ists, even though the ZIO-JOO-KIK-YID-preferred latter has the clear upper hand overall, notwithstanding "the Trump camp" within "the West" (which is still very SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN ZIO, ALBEIT NOT AS GLOBALIST JOO-BALL-GREAT SATAN-SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN-EVIL-DEVIL-SATANIK SERKOOS MONKEY-ZOROS!-ZIO), but which is at the same time faced with the complete defeat of their final aims outside of "the West" thanks to the hitherto successful patriotism / (inter)nationalism of Russia, China, India, BRICS+.

based on the way of looking at life in itself, but (up)on the social, and indeed productive circumstances of its creation, which the same opponent, rival controls; for that reason, the adoption of the way of looking at life on the part of the weaker social faction does not substantially, essentially change the correlation of forces, but rather solely makes easier the movement, jumping of the way of looking at life of the more dynamic group [to other (weaker) groups / the other (weaker) group], preparing in this manner involuntarily the ideological weapons of tomorrow's catholic, i.e. universal, general domination of this latter [former] / the more dynamic group. The members, however, of the weaker groups, even though they too as groups will disappear, vanish, have more / better chances, prospects, opportunities of finding, now as individuals, a place, position in the new situation if they adopt in advance the more up-to-date way of looking at life of their rivals, opponents[30].

Apart from that, and apart from the imperceptible, impalpable and almost automatic filtration, percolation, infiltration of the more dynamic way of looking at life and practice as regards life (bio-consideration and bio-praxis) inside the social body, corpus, the extension, expansion of the methods and of the mentality, cast of mind of the economically more dominant group becomes possible because certain of its representatives happen to exercise, simultaneously with the economic management, administration (which condenses in its purer form this mentality, cast of mind), other functions as well, in the sector of politics or of war; in this way they directly transplant in(to) these sectors too [[of politics and of war]], the spirit which possesses them also when they exercise economic functions in the narrow sense. Such a double, dual function was fulfilled in Florence by the Medici, who in their persons (the first of them at least) fused, merged, combined the art of the economic organiser with political art. Or again, persons, who initially, at the beginning, had no relation to / nothing to do with the technique of economic management, administration, but whose area of activity presented serious similarities with the characteristics of the economic enterprise, business, put, placed, took the technique of economic management in(to) another sector. E.g. the leaders of mercenaries also embodied the features of the businessman, entrepreneur, since they put at risk / in danger their capital (their soldiers and their

[30] Classic examples : the descendent of aristocrats entering the bourgeois diplomatic service or army as an officer (often of an up to much higher rank than that which he merits) and the bourgeois entering the mass-democratic "managerial class" / "corporate world" under the ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID.

reputation, fame), and they had to seek its / their capital's best possible investment and since they on a daily basis confronted, dealt with problems of (re)supply, replenishment, equipment, materiel and victualling, catering, provisioning, which solely with budgeting, a budget, counting, mensuration, measurement and accounting could be (re)solved[27]. Thus, gradually, step-by-step, politics, war and diplomacy (which will occupy us separately, in its particular interrelation with Machiavelli)(,) [[which]] are presented like magnitudes written in the columns of the assets and the liabilities of an accounting book, [[and]] become the object of a by and large, basically statistical way of looking at things / consideration[31]. From/Amongst the Italian cities, Venice was pioneering, trailblazing[32], however in Florence statistical consideration / the statistical way of looking at things becomes richer and even more multifarious, since it reaches the point of including phenomena of culture and of art. Real estate / Realty, services, incomes, earnings, taxes, expenses for the construction of public works or art works, are all measured and calculated, whereas the pure class arrangement of Florence and its social evolution – which unfolds in successive stages, scarred, marked, stamped by the rise and the fall of one class and its apparent (manifest, obvious) replacement by another class – allowed, permitted more than elsewhere the general and abstract depiction of political life[28].

There / Where in the Middle Ages (where) the ideological foundation of the political system is the law and the justice / right (equity) which spring, stem from / have as their source (the) divine, godly commandments, whilst the hegemon is solely their living embodiment and his subjects, in theory, do not owe him subjugation, subjection, subordination if he is not [the living embodiment of divine commandments][29] – in the Italian Renaissance, politics is a magnitude completely mundane, of this world, (this-) worldly, and the Catholic Church faces, confronts it in this way, (which (the Catholic Church)) tacitly, silently leaves (leaving) to one side the tradition of Gregory VII[33], and

---

[31] As we can see, the basis for the ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-JOO-JACKING AND ZIO-PARASITE-RAT-RODENT-VAMPIRE-TAKEOVER of M-C-M-capitalism-imperialism has its roots in the activity of Christians -(with the ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YIDZ, even as ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-LIZZARD-ENTRY-ISTS nowhere near the levels of power in 14th / 15th century Italy which they achieved from the 19th century in northern Europe, and especially ZIO-GREAT BRITAIN)-, who hailed (through their ancestors) from "feudalism". These passages by P.K. are supplemented by Rossellini's three TV films collectively known as *L'età di Cosimo de' Medici* (1972) which are set up to a few decades before Machiavelli's life (1469-1527).

[32] E.g. incl. 1204 as a sea power.

[33] 11th century, keep the Papacy supreme in view of ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-LIZZARD-ENTRY-IST-GERMAN-PIG HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE machinations etc.. ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-JOO-KEE-PEE-DEE-A : "**Pope Gregory VII** (Latin: *Gregorius VII*; c. 1015 – 25 May 1085), born **Hildebrand of Sovana** (Italian: *Ildebrando di Soana*), was head of the Catholic

Church and ruler of the Papal States from 22 April 1073 to his death in 1085. He is venerated as a saint in the Catholic Church. One of the great reforming popes, he initiated the Gregorian Reform [The **Gregorian Reforms** were a series of reforms initiated by Pope Gregory VII and the circle he formed in the papal curia, c. 1050–1080, which dealt with the moral integrity and independence of the clergy], and is perhaps best known for the part he played in the Investiture Controversy [The **Investiture Controversy** or **Investiture Contest** (Latin: *Controversia de Investitura*, German: *Investiturstreit*) was a conflict between the Church and the state in medieval Europe over the ability to choose and install bishops (investiture), abbots of monasteries, and the Pope himself. A series of popes in the 11th and 12th centuries undercut the power of the Holy Roman Emperor and other European monarchies, and the controversy led to nearly 50 years of conflict. It began as a power struggle between Pope Gregory VII and Henry IV (then King, later Holy Roman Emperor) in 1076. The conflict ended in 1122, when Pope Callixtus II and Emperor Henry V agreed on the Concordat of Worms. The agreement required bishops to swear an oath of fealty to the secular monarch, who held authority "by the lance" but left selection to the church. It affirmed the right of the church to invest bishops with sacred authority, symbolized by a ring and staff. In Germany (but not Italy and Burgundy), the Emperor also retained the right to preside over elections of abbots and bishops by church authorities, and to arbitrate disputes. Holy Roman Emperors renounced the right to choose the Pope. In the meantime, there was also a brief but significant investiture struggle between Pope Paschal II and King Henry I of England from 1103 to 1107. The earlier resolution to that conflict, the Concordat of London, was very similar to the Concordat of Worms], his dispute with Emperor Henry IV [**Henry IV** (German: *Heinrich IV*; 11 November 1050 – 7 August 1106) was Holy Roman Emperor from 1084 to 1105, King of Germany from 1054 to 1105, King of Italy and Burgundy from 1056 to 1105, and Duke of Bavaria from 1052 to 1054. He was the son of Henry III, Holy Roman Emperor—the second monarch of the Salian dynasty—and Agnes of Poitou. After his father's death on 5 October 1056, Henry was placed under his mother's guardianship. She made grants to German aristocrats to secure their support. Unlike her late husband, she could not control the election of the popes, thus the idea of the "liberty of the Church" strengthened during her rule. Taking advantage of her weakness, Archbishop Anno II of Cologne kidnapped Henry in April 1062. He administered Germany until Henry came of age in 1065.
Henry endeavoured to recover the royal estates that had been lost during his minority. He employed low-ranking officials to carry out his new policies, causing discontent in Saxony and Thuringia. Henry crushed a riot in Saxony in 1069 and overcame the rebellion of the Saxon aristocrat Otto of Nordheim in 1071. The appointment of commoners to high office offended German aristocrats, and many of them withdrew from Henry's court. He insisted on his royal prerogative to appoint bishops and abbots, although the reformist clerics condemned this practice as simony (a forbidden sale of church offices). Pope Alexander II blamed Henry's advisors for his acts and excommunicated them in early 1073. Henry's conflicts with the Holy See and the German dukes weakened his position and the Saxons rose up in open rebellion in the summer of 1074. Taking advantage of a quarrel between the Saxon aristocrats and peasantry, he forced the rebels into submission in October 1075.Henry adopted an active policy in Italy, alarming Pope Alexander II's successor, Gregory VII, who threatened him with excommunication for simony. Henry persuaded most of the German bishops to declare the Pope's election invalid on 24 January 1076. In response, the Pope excommunicated Henry and released his subjects from their allegiance. German aristocrats who were hostile to Henry called for the Pope to hold an assembly in Germany to hear Henry's case. To prevent the Pope from sitting in judgement on him, Henry went to Italy as far as Canossa to meet with the Pope. His penitential "Walk to Canossa" was a success and Gregory VII had no choice but to absolve him in January 1077. Henry's German opponents ignored his absolution and elected an antiking, Rudolf of Rheinfelden, on 14 March 1077. The Pope was initially neutral in the two kings' conflict, enabling Henry to consolidate his position. Henry continued to appoint high-ranking clerics, for which the Pope again excommunicated him on 7 March 1080. Most German and northern Italian bishops remained loyal to Henry and they elected the antipope Clement III. Rudolf of Rheinfelden was killed in battle and his successor, Hermann of Salm, could only exert royal authority in Saxony. From 1081, Henry launched a series of military campaigns to Italy, and Clement III crowned him emperor in Rome on 1 April 1084. …] to establish the primacy of papal authority and the new canon law governing the election of the pope by the College of Cardinals. He was also at the forefront of developments in the relationship between the emperor and the papacy during the years before he became pope. He was the first pope to introduce a policy of obligatory celibacy for the clergy, which had until then commonly married, and also attacked the practice of simony [**Simony** is the act of selling church offices and roles or sacred things. It is named after Simon Magus, who is described in the Acts of the Apostles as having offered two disciples of Jesus payment in exchange for their empowering him to impart the power of the Holy Spirit to anyone on whom he would place his hands. The

pursues its political goals, ends without invoking a lot anymore its divine, godly authorisation (as to exercising governmental dominance). Politics is classified / incorporated in / amongst the measurable quantities and irrespective of one's personal attachment, one can apprehend it / them (politics) in the technical sense, as / like the interdependence of factors, which their regulation (adjustment) will give this result and another regulation (adjustment), that / another result. Also, in Italy, the medieval and chivalrous, knightly concept of war is abandoned for the first time as an act of the conferment, awarding, allotment of divine justice and as a way, mode, manner of demonstrating / the demonstration of individual courage without the rational harmonisation of the endeavour(s), effort(s) of the whole. Now we see a "neutral gratification (satisfaction, contentedness, pleasure, joy)" for the correct conduct of the condottiere/condottiero [late medieval and Renaissance mercenary in Italy], who did not in terms of spirit, soul and identity belong to any faction; he served all factions alternately in accordance with payment / recompense, and was interested solely in the technical part/aspect of the conduct/waging of war, in correlation / interrelation with his own business interests. It is characteristic / typical that in the, at that time / then, literature of Italy, we encounter multiple descriptions of stratagems, that is, of (the) technical elements of war, and here, of course, not he who has right, justice on his side /

---

term extends to other forms of trafficking for money in "spiritual things"].During the power struggles between the papacy and the Empire, Gregory excommunicated Henry IV three times, and Henry appointed Antipope Clement III to oppose him. Though Gregory was hailed as one of the greatest of the Roman pontiffs after his reforms proved successful, during his own reign he was denounced by some for his ~~autocratic use~~ [[= RHETORICALLY-POLEMICALLY USEFUL, BUT OF NO USE SCIENTIFICALLY SINCE ALL AUTHORITY IS AUTOCRATIC-DESPOTIC-TYRANNICAL-TOTALITARIAN-ETC., OTHERWISE CIVIL WAR]] of papal powers. In later times, Gregory VII became an exemplar of papal supremacy, and his memory was invoked both positively and negatively, reflecting later writers' attitude to the Catholic Church and the papacy. Beno of Santi Martino e Silvestro, who opposed Gregory VII in the Investiture Controversy, accused him of necromancy, cruelty, tyranny, and blasphemy [[AGAIN, RHETORICAL-POLEMICAL ACCUSATIONS WHICH CAN BE HURLED BY ANYONE AT ANYONE IN THE HEAT OF POLEMICS, AND EVEN IF "COMMUNICATION WITH THE DEAD" OR "BLASPHEMY", FOR INSTANCE, CAN BE PROVEN, WHETHER THAT IN ITSELF IS "GOOD" OR "BAD" IS A QUESTION OF VALUES AND POWER AS ALL NORMATIVE POSITIONS ARE]]. This was eagerly repeated by later opponents of the Catholic Church, such as the English Protestant John Foxe. In contrast, the modern historian and Anglican priest H. E. J. Cowdrey writes, "[Gregory VII] was surprisingly flexible, feeling his way and therefore perplexing both rigorous collaborators ... and cautious and steady-minded ones ... His zeal, moral force, and religious conviction, however, ensured that he should retain to a remarkable degree the loyalty and service of a wide variety of men and women."" [[WHICH OF COURSE BY NO MEANS BINDS THOSE WHO ARE OPPOSED TO GREGORY VII ETC.. AS WE CAN SEE FROM THE ABOVE, EVERY MACRO-HISTORICAL SITUATION / PERIOD (OF LESSER SITUATIONS / SHORTER PERIODS) HAS ITS OWN VARIOUS AND CHANGING CORRELATION(S) OF FORCES ALWAYS IN RELATION TO 1) THE PRIMARY ENERGY AND 2) THE GEO-POLITICAL POTENTIAL OF THE ACTORS / COLLECTIVITIES INVOLVED.]]

is right wins (and is lauded, praised), but he who is more skillful and he who, in / whilst fighting, has more in mind technical problems rather than the ethical, moral ends, goals, purposes of war[30 + 34].

The new perception of politics and of war is not expressed in the Italian Renaissance by one bearer but by many, even though every such bearer utilises it (the new perception of politics and of war) to a different degree / extent. Nonetheless, we can make a basic distinction of these bearers in(to) (regard to) two types in accordance with the political regime. The two types fill the political foreground / proscenium of Renaissance Italy and it is on the one hand hegemony and on the other hand the republics in which the bourgeois communities of the late Middle Ages evolved[35]. The social roots and the conditions of the appearance of a hegemony present themselves more problematically and must be reduced to multiple factors. The Norman state of Roger II[36] or of Frederick II Hohenstaufen[37] could also be called a hegemonic state (in

---

[34] This does not mean that "medieval people" did not have in mind the practicalities of conducting war, it's just that their world view in the ideal type was "skewed" more towards interpreting phenomena as "God's will" and the (im)morality associated with that, with far less technical, stratagem/measurement-related rationalisation.

[35] In modern Greek, for reasons unknown to me, democracy / δημοκρατία is the word for republic (possibly because in ancient Greece no democracy was ever a monarchy). Interestingly, an Italian bourgeois city-state of the late Middle Ages and Renaissance (say 1400 to 1600) had some of the fundamental features of a democracy from the Greek and Roman worlds such as relative homogeneity as to descent (race and or clan), religion, a society based on patriarchal households and class (e.g. a slave or peasant or non-head of a household does not vote, whilst drawing lots can prescribe court or war-related or other duties for head of household citizens), all of which occurs in a pre-mass, pre(-post-)modern and pre-industrial context with society still anchored in the Agricultural Revolution notwithstanding cities, the development of tools and weaponry and commerce / trade not just being C-M-C, but increasingly M-C-M with the development of banking-finance-related "systems" etc..

[36] Roger II or Roger the Great (Italian: Ruggero II, Sicilian: Ruggeru II, Greek: Ρογέριος; 22 December 1095 – 26 February 1154) was King of Sicily and Africa, son of Roger I of Sicily and successor to his brother Simon. He began his rule as Count of Sicily in 1105, became Duke of Apulia and Calabria in 1127, then King of Sicily in 1130 and King of Africa in 1148.

[37] Frederick II (Italian: Federico, Sicilian: Fidiricu, German: Friedrich, Latin: Fridericus; 26 December 1194 – 13 December 1250) was King of Sicily from 1198, King of Germany from 1212, King of Italy and Holy Roman Emperor from 1220 and King of Jerusalem from 1225. He was the son of Emperor Henry VI of the Hohenstaufen dynasty (the second son of Emperor Frederick Barbarossa) and Queen Constance I of Sicily of the Hauteville dynasty. [Henry VI (German: Heinrich VI.; November 1165 – 28 September 1197), a member of the Hohenstaufen dynasty, was King of Germany (King of the Romans) from 1169 and Holy Roman Emperor from 1191 until his death. From 1194 he was also King of Sicily as the husband and co-ruler of Queen Constance I. Henry was the second son of Emperor Frederick Barbarossa and Beatrice I, Countess of Burgundy. Well educated in the Latin language, as well as Roman and canon law, Henry was also a patron of poets and a skilled poet himself. In 1186 he married Constance of Sicily. Henry, stuck in the Hohenstaufen conflict with the House of Welf until 1194, had to enforce the inheritance claims by his wife against her nephew Count Tancred of Lecce. Henry's attempt to conquer the Kingdom of Sicily failed at the siege of Naples in 1191 due to an epidemic, with Empress Constance captured. Based on an enormous ransom for the release and submission of King Richard I of England, he conquered Sicily in 1194; however, the intended unification with the Holy Roman Empire ultimately failed due to the opposition of the Papacy. In Sicily, Henry had a reputation for ruthless

the sense which the word took later), however the analogies with the hegemonies of the 15th century are not as absolute as some wanted to see them, since indeed the rule, governmental authority of Roger or Frederick was founded on feudal legality and in that they themselves too sought the sanction(ing) of/for their acts, at least officially. Similarities exist elsewhere, and we shall see them. But in South(ern) Italy, be it as it may / whatever the case may be, with its much more intense feudal arrangement, hegemony could have an air/spirit/ambience/aura/atmosphere/quality/mystique similar to the hegemony which sprouted (up) amongst the bourgeois communities of North(ern) Italy, and thus / in this way, the claim, assertion, contention that the southern-Italian hegemony owes much of its rationality to Muslim / Mohammedan models does not appear to be entirely unjustified. As far as northern-Italian hegemony is concerned, its character seems to have been determined by the relative political (regardless of the economic) strength, power, force of the bourgeois class. When the threat from below grew stronger and when upheavals, disruptions, commotions made the processing of transactions more difficult, the bourgeois class, willingly or unwillingly, accepted the assignment of political rule / governmental authority to someone who would keep stable the conditions which its (the bourgeois class's) needs demanded[38]. Nonetheless, oftentimes, the hegemons, wanting to put rule, governmental authority (dominance) in their hands on their own behalf and not as assignees, proxies, the recipients of orders, started to seek political support(s), props in the lower strata and the bourgeois accepted the blackmail for as long as they could not do otherwise/differently[31 + 39]. In any case, tyrannical hegemony cannot be interpreted in all cases as the simple reflection of the concentration of wealth in a few hands, as is shown by the fact that tyrannies first

---

suppression of political opponents. To this day, he is sometimes given the epithet "the Cruel" (il crudele) by Italian historiographers. Henry threatened to invade the Byzantine Empire after 1194 and succeeded in extracting a ransom, the Alamanikon, from Emperor Alexios III Angelos in return for cancelling the invasion. He made the Kingdom of Cyprus and the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia formal subjects of the empire and compelled Tunis and Tripolitania to pay tribute to him. In 1195 and 1196, he attempted to turn the Holy Roman Empire from an elective to a hereditary monarchy, the so-called Erbreichsplan, but met strong resistance from the prince-electors. Henry pledged to go on crusade in 1195 and began preparations. A revolt in Sicily was crushed in 1197. The Crusaders set sail for the Holy Land that same year but Henry died of malaria at Messina on 28 September 1197 before he could join them. His death plunged the Empire into the chaos of the German throne dispute for the next 17 years.]

[38] Especially since the 19th century in Europe and the 20th century in the USA, this "economy-politics game" became dominated by the ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-ANTI-CHRIST-SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN-EVIL-DEVIL-GREAT SATANIST.

[39] This can be seen in our times as a precursor of e.g. ZIO-Trumpian "populism" as opposed to ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-"elitism", though all politics in mass societies invoking the phantasm of "dee-mok-rasi" is some sort of mix between populism and elitism, since there is no mass without people, and there is no rule without an oligarchic ruling elite.

became cities with small, little economic significance, importance, whereas other rich cities like Florence and Venice became so / such / tyrannies indirectly or later[32], in accordance always with the political dynamism of the ruling class[40].

A rich reservoir, from which hegemons most often drew, were the ranks of the chief / leading mercenaries, of the condottieri (warlords / leaders of mercenaries / military formations), who had become essential persons, personages of the Italian political scene from when the social power, and together with that, the military virtue too, of the feudal aristocracy had collapsed, whereas / whilst the bourgeoisie, albeit quite practised / trained in internal conflicts / clashes, could not undertake systematic military duties and had recourse to the employment of mercenaries. The life of a chief mercenary / warlord was most harsh, austere, hard, and it unimaginably hardened him himself as well, but at the same time it sharpened, improved, refined him just as much / even more; his personal prestige, standing / status becomes his most important capital, and only with that, by the way, could he bring to book / put in order / adjust, regularise, handle and control subjects, since for mercenaries solely, only talent, skill and the absence of ethical / moral hesitation(s), scruples, compunction(s), qualms could secure his (the (chief) mercenary's) rise. To the throne of the hegemon, he rises either with regard / by means of direct usurpation, either by starting from despotic land ownership (manorialism, seigneurialism), which they gave him as payment, recompense for services (rendered) or for winter, hibernal, wintry settlement and by extending his realm / territory / dominion[33]. From this point of view, the hegemon is a "democratic" phenomenon, that is, he could wondrously descend from any social stratum whatsoever and impose himself / be imposed solely by virtue of his capabilities, (just) like a scholar (learned / literary / lettered / sapient man, savant) or artist too – and indeed, his modest origins, provenance, descent helped him go high, because they/it relieved / exempted him in advance from (the) ethical, moral and religious fetters, bonds or from the law of

[40] There is always a ruling class, i.e. a ruling oligarchy, since no individual ever governs on his own, albeit such ruling oligarchy can have power more concentrated in the person of a (STRONG MAN) monarch, emperor, dictator, despot, president, prime minister and or tyrant or more dispersed amongst its deep state, bureaucracy, administration etc., even though all polities will have some kind of such a dispersal/delegation of power. In other words, all polities are authoritarian, autocratic, despotic, otherwise civil war, and the ideological BLAH-BLAH-BLAH-bullshit e.g. about "dee-mok-rasi" from circa 1900 is only there to mask ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN-ANTI-CHRIST-EVIL-DEVIL-GREAT SATAN rule (based on the ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-CAPITALIST-IMPERIALIST-overcoming of the scarcity of goods, Konsens based on Hedonismus, Konsum, TOORIZMOOS-EXOTIZMOOS etc., i.e. the right to be any kind of degenerate and or pervert you want to be as long as you don't organise and act against the ruling ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID), in "the West", and other kinds of oligarchical rule in the non-"West", whether such "dee-mok-ratik" ideological rhetoric applies or not.

succession, which the class of the nobles accepted, as well as from the feudal – knightly, chivalrous feelings of honour etc.. The basis of the (governmental) rule of the Italian hegemons is illegal, entirely foreign, alien towards / as regards the divine and hereditary rights of the -by the grace of God / Dei gratia- kings, just like the bourgeois business, enterprise had grown / become strong by trampling, encroaching on / transgressing the feudal perceptions of usury and the "just price" of the commodity. And this illegality is gradually (slowly – slowly) consolidated in the common / public conscience / consciousness. The possessors of legal hereditary feudal rights – the emperors – were found to be very far away, incapable of dynamically influencing developments; it being, therefore, known to all and sundry that they could not impose themselves with arms / weapons, they were made fun of / ridiculed when they academically put forward / projected their divine titles, and even more so, when they on occasion came down to Italy in order to negotiate with the illegal possessors of (governmental) rule / power and to exchange their god-given rights with some meagre tax or to bestow hollow titles and to legalise illegitimate children. Apart from all of that, the self-made hegemon does not grow amongst nobles, nor is he limited / restricted by their circle, with the danger / risk of obtaining political prejudices, which will lessen, reduce his political acumen (sagacity, astuteness, sharpness); on the contrary, he comes into contact with all kinds of people and he knows first-hand their professions, vocations, occupations and their casts of mind / mentalities, being thus in a position to correctly make use of / exploit / extract value from them, that is, with (regard to) the only criterion of their productiveness / efficiency / performance, without the arrogance, conceit, presumption, haughtiness of the nobles vis-à-vis the people they used / made use of [34].

The hegemon was ceaselessly obliged to fight for his throne, he had to win it on a daily basis from the beginning; he struggled against the aristocracy, against the people and against his opportunist opponents. For success, the observation and knowledge of social phenomena was necessary, some administrative capability and indeed some general political perception too, a seminal, germinal, spermatic theory was necessary[35]. And later it was natural, since political struggles were usually conducted / carried out in the narrow environment of a city and the opponent were certain (well-)known person(age)s, for the knowledge of personal passions and of human nature to obtain great significance. Victory in this political struggle is presented as the victory of skills of the one individual over the capabilities of the other, and the individual reaches the point

of being considered the ultimate determinative factor of the form and of the fortune, luck, fate, destiny of a polity; thus, the significance of the capability of the individual – since Italy was fragmented / broken up into pieces and the same game was played thousands of times, until it took the complexion, hue, tinge, tint, nuance of the normal and of the universal – became the polity-related theory of the wise legislator / law-maker as the only regulator of the polity.

The means which will give to the hegemon governmental rule / power must be weight up / pondered rationally, with a suitable perspective and expediency (purposefulness, feasibility); also, even murders must unfold with the necessity and the consequence of reasoning, a syllogism, cogitation, thoughtfulness, they must be rational acts or rather a chain of acts whose inspiration and expediency (purposefulness, feasibility) are rational. As to the exercising now of governmental power / rule, rationalism means / signifies that the state is presented as the hegemon's individual enterprise / business (even if in this exercising of governmental rule the basic magnitudes are political magnitudes and not economic magnitudes), and consequently the hegemon is obliged to accept / take on the dangers, risks of the businessman / entrepreneur and to have his assets, merits, attributes, qualifications, virtues[36]. Since the state is thus / in this way identified / equated with the hegemon and since the hegemon acts rationally, the whole state organism appears from without / the outside like / as a living, vital and logical entity, like the animate bearer, carrier, vehicle of Reason.

Conversely, in the bourgeois republican communities of the same epoch, era, Reason is not embodied / incorporated in the polity by means of the hegemon, but is presented in a carved/sliced-up, parcelled-out, fragmented form, it is the weapon of the various social groups which seek, pursue governmental power / rule and thus does not embrace the whole / totality / entirety, but rather supports the (warring) parties (combatting one another); consequently, it is not reflected, like state power, towards the outside, in the relations with other polities, but is expended / spent / consumed on the inside / internally / inwardly. Thus, the republican (non-monarchical) polity, republic (even also a republic like the Florentine, which in its internal manifestations had adopted, shouldered, embraced, taken up the cause, absorbed, espoused perhaps more deeply than any other the spirit of weighing up / pondering and of calculation) to / on the outside / externally is not presented as powerful, it does not have a united and indestructible, impermeable volition, will or a stable (programmatic, (geo-)political, foreign policy) line – and as we

shall see, this weakness will be intensely consciously felt by Machiavelli. However, although political competition was intense, apart from the epochs, eras of uprisings, it was limited / restricted to the insignificant percentage of the population which had political rights : in Florence, with a population of 80 – 90,000 people, approximately one thousand families had political representation[41]. Inside this framework / context, governmental rule / power is deliberately broken up into pieces / fragmented, from / out of a fear lest someone or some concentrate in their hands to greater part of it / governmental power and become tyrants; elections take place by lot, the period in office / incumbency of the office bearers / officials / dignities / functionaries lasts slightly / does not last long at all (two months up to one year at most), going to / participating in elections in accordance with factions is strictly forbidden, the higher offices and the honorary diplomatic missions are given alternatively to representatives of powerful families, so that an equilibrium comes about and discontent is prevented, whereas promotion / rising to high positions takes place in an exceedingly, extremely complicated manner, so that room exists for the finding of compromises and equilibria. There exist many poles of governmental power, where the significant such poles could not of course be found inside a governmental mechanism exhausted by its bi-monthly or six-monthly rearrangements. The leaders / leading members (executives) of the large, great commercial and industrial / manufacturing guilds or of the other poles of real social power participate in the distribution of governmental offices as the representatives of those poles and care for the maintenance of the equilibria, when they cannot promote their own position. The members of the governmental mechanism, as such, exercise, perform a purely supervisory function; when an issue of real governmental power / rule arises, then they negotiate directly with those who have it (i.e. such real governmental power) or they seek it (i.e. such real governmental power), even if they are formally simple private individuals / citizens. But the weakness of the governmental mechanism does not only allow / permit the finding, discovery of artificial equilibria; simultaneously, it allows, permits effective, essential governance to be exercised permanently without the possession of absolutely any title, as it occurred in (the)

[41] Likewise, today in "the West", certain ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-INBRED-INCESTUAL-SICK-FUCKING-CRAZY-PSYCHO-PATH-HYPER-CONSPIRATORIAL-ULTRA-CRIMINAL-MAFIA-RAT-TUNNE-FAMILIES CONTROL (KONTROL) UP TO EVERYTHING under the cover of non-stop endless ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-POLITICAL AND CULTURAL FREAK SHOWS.

Florence of (with) the Medici[42].

Despite all, though, the difference in polity, both the hegemonic as well as the republican state, each in its [own] way, realised to a significant degree / extent the demands which the new social-economic physiognomy of the epoch projected. In both (such polities/states), legislation abolishes the privileges of descent, in both the theocratic perception withdraws, retreats, subsides, backs down, and an effort / attempt is made / undertaken of the subjugation, subordination, subjection of all sectors of life to rationalism[37 + 43]. And both (states) also conduct / wage wars which do not have the features of the anarchic, bandit(-like) (brigandish, predetory) war between individuals, but the character of clashes / conflicts between state organisms. Even though also external / foreign wars and internal / domestic financial settlements benefit certain groups[44], nevertheless, even as a tendency or as a surface (appearance, semblance, likeness), the endeavour of the unity of ends, goals, purposes and of the utilisation, exploitation of economic (re)sources for the benefit of the state, of the fatherland / motherland / patria, as an entity which has value for everyone, at whichever gradation, level, tier they may be found, exists. And still more / moreover, the bases / foundations for / of the creation of the administrative, fiscal, tax(-related) and judicial bureaucracy are laid / put in place[38].

However, this development did not proceed to take its natural / physiological dimensions, which are the dimensions of the national state / nation-state. Indeed, on the contrary, from approximately the middle of the 15th century, its (the said development's) inhibitory factors stood / were more powerful than the propulsive factors, Italy entered an epoch, age, era of economic and social crisis, and when about / circa 1530 the country totally succumbed to the Spaniards, a period of prolonged / centuries-old stagnation

---

[42] This is the blueprint for ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-BEHIND THE CURTAIN AND FROM THE RAT-TUNNELS-RULE in "the West" increasingly from the 19th century, with the difference that the RULING ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID (ruling by the mid-20th century not only economy and state, but also culture) has his bought / petrified-terrified to speak the truth (if aware of the truth) ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-ZOMBEE-STOOGE-politician addressing and ordering through legislation the mass of ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-BRAIN-WASHED-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ who think they have "power" by voting for what they are BRAIN-WASHED into voting for on the basis of Hedonismus-Konsum-Konsens. Those whom the gods seek to destroy, they first make mad. OVER. DEAD. ZIO.

[43] I.e. to "rationalism" as understood by the "modernity" of Renaissance (proto-)capitalism and calculation in terms of money and other forms of power with people more and more in **apparent** "control" of the world when compared to "medieval states of affairs".

[44] In some parts of Italy and Europe, ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YIDZ, either as ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-LIZZARD-ENTRY-ISTs or as plain ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YIDZ, had already obtained up to relatively great financial ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-power, even as nominal "Christians".

started / began / commenced. The crisis, and the sense / feeling of crisis, is Italy's dominant characteristic precisely in the (temporal) period (of time) which covers Machiavelli's life(time), and the quintessence, as well as the innermost motive of the Machiavellian work / oeuvre is the desire and the attempt / effort / endeavour of finding political solutions which would give a way out / outlet / vent to this crisis (which Machiavelli calls / names "corruption", placing / putting, in this way, weight on its extreme consequence, that is, on the effacement, obliteration of individual or collective virtue and merit and on the feminisation of life). In particular, as it concerns Florence, it seems that the social reasons for this "corruption" was the preponderance of banking capital over industrial capital and the creation of a class of idle, loafer, playboy, leisured bourgeois, which did not take long to fuse / merge with the remnants of the nobles and adopt courtly life. The same success and maturity of banking and financial / money-lending enterprises / businesses slowed down / retarded / decelerated the productive investment of capital / funds[39].

THE ENDNOTES ARE BY P.K., UNLESS [[]], WHEREAS THE FOOTNOTES ARE BY THE KRAZY MAN BARBARIAN IDIOM BARBARIAN IDIOT – NOTE THAT I COULDN'T GET ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-*WORD* TO PUT THE ENDNOTES INTO NUMERICAL FORMAT UNTIL ENDNOTE 10 – THAT'S HOW RETARDED AND KRAZY I AM … DANK YOOZ.

---

[i] W. Sombart, Le bourgeois, Fr. transl. S. Jankélévitch, Paris 1966 (1913, German), p. 21.
[ii] Ibid. p. 318 – 319.
[iii] Ibid. p. 123.
[iv] A. Martin, Soziologie der Renaissance, Stuttgart 1932, p. 51 (the idea belongs to Simmel) Cf Marx, Ökonomisch – philosophische Manuskripte, Leipzig 1970, p. 232 («Die Logik – das Geld des Geistes»).
[v] A. Doren, Italienische Wirtschaftsgeschichte, I, Jena 1934, p. 656.
[vi] J. Burckhardt, Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien, Stuttgart 1966 (1860), p. 374-375.
[vii] Martin, op. cit., p. 2.
[viii] Cf. Sombart, op. cit., p. 54 ff..
[ix] Burkhardt, op. cit., p. 125 – 126.
[10] W. Dilthey, Gesammelte Schriften, II, Weltanschauung und Analyse des Menschen seit Renaissance und Reformation, Leipzig – Berlin, 1923 (1914) pp. 18-19. In restoring an artificial relation(ship), interrelation between different things, Dilthey says that self-observation in literature starts, begins, commences from, with Seneca and Aurelius, it moves on to Augustine, the Cluniac movement [[10th century, Burgundy, France]] and Francis of Assisi and ends up in, with Petrarch.
[11] Burkhardt, op. cit., p. 285 – 286.
[12] Ibid., pp. 306 – 307.
[13] Ibid., p. 136 ff..
[14] Ibid., p. 316 ff..
[15] Ibid., p. 142 ff..
[16] A. Hauser, The Social History of Art, New York s. d. (1951), II, pp. 70-73.
[17] See the nice, beautiful pages by P. Valéry, Introduction à la méthode de Léonard de Vinci, Paris 1968 (1894), pp. 40-41 and passim.
[18] Burckhardt, op. cit., p. 79.
[19] U. Spirito, Machiavelli e Guicciardini, Rome 1945, p. 29.
[20] L. Kofler, Zur Geschichte der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft, Neuwied 1966 (1948), pp. 175 – 177.
[21] Martin, op. cit., p. 26.
[22] Doren, op. cit., pp. 477 – 479 Cf. Kofler, op. cit., p. 180.
[23] Martin, op. cit., p. 56.
[24] P. Villari, The Life and Works of N. Machiavelli, Eng. transl. L. Villari, vol. I-II, New York, 1878 (Italian 1877-1882) See I, p. 166.
[25] Burckhardt, op. cit., p. 482 ff..
[26] See indicatively the myths which circulated after the death of pope Alexander VI (Borgia) [[1431-1503]] in Villari, op. cit., I, p. 328. L. Russo, Machiavelli, Bari 1966 (1945), p. 158-159, nimbly, deftly supports the view that in Belfagor Machiavelli does not satirise, as is usually thought, the passions of spouses / married couples, but the superstition and the gullibility, credulity, credulousness of the people, of a people which believes that Savonarola talks to God (Diss. I, 11).
[27] Sombart, op. cit., p. 62. Cf. Martin, op. cit., p. 12.
[28] Burckhardt, op. cit., pp. 74-77, cf. pp. 67-68.
[29] W. Ullmann, A History of Political Thought: The Middle Ages, London 1965, pp. 101-102.
[30] Burckhardt, op. cit., pp. 92-93.
[31] F. Chabod, «Del Principe di Machiavelli» (1925), in Scritti sul Machiavelli, Torino 1964, pp. 40-42 and 49-50.
[32] Cf. A. Cobban, Dictatorship, London 1939, p. 311.
[33] Burckhardt, op. cit., pp. 21 - 23.
[34] Ibid., pp. 48 and 89.
[35] Villari, op. cit., pp. 8 – 11.
[36] Sombart, op. cit., pp. 64 – 65.
[37] Martin, op. cit., p. 14.
[38] Doren, op. cit., pp. 524 – 525.

[39] M. Dobb, Studies in the development of capitalism, London 1963 (1946), p. 160. For the development of banking capital, see Doren, op. cit., p. 647 ff..