Dear AP European History Student, 

I am so glad that you have been recommended and have chosen to take AP European History. I look forward to getting to know you over the course of the coming school year. I hope to have a lot to offer you in AP European and know that you will be able to teach me quite a bit, too.

AP European is a challenging, but rewarding, class and in order to be successful, learning for AP European has to start over the summer. At our up-coming meeting, I will explain in more detail the summer assignments. In the meantime, here is a brief overview capture your interest. In order to introduce you to the scope of APEH, you will work through Strickland’s The Annotated Mona Lisa. Through the transitioning of art over time, you will walk through European history from the Renaissance to the beginning of the Cold War. This summer you will also read Machiavelli’s The Prince. The Prince is one of the most important political treatises ever written. It lays the groundwork for modern politics as we understand them today and is a text that we will refer back to constantly throughout the year. Finally, I will be asking you to read and respond to chapter 10 (Renaissance and Discovery) in your textbook, The Western Heritage over the summer, in order to make the transition into AP European easier for you.

After our meeting, please read through the materials for the summer assignment carefully. These assignments are to be completed and turned in on the first day of class in August. You should have no trouble finding the books on our list. Please be sure to get the book with the same ISBN number listed on the course overview sheet.

Enjoy your summer and the reading!! I look forward to working with you in August and throughout the coming school year. If you have any questions about these assignments or the class in general, you may contact me via email at kendalld@stecilia.edu. I will also post this assignment to our class portal.

Historically yours,

Mrs. Kendall

"The function of the historian is neither to love the past nor to emancipate himself from the past, but to master and understand it as the key to the understanding of the present."

E. H. Carr
Expectations
It is expected that STUDENTS who enroll in Advanced Placement European History:
1) are responsible for European political, economic, social, intellectual and artistic history beginning in 1450 and ending in the present, therefore:
   a) Students must be diligent textbook readers with high-level reading comprehension skills, they cannot rely on the instructor to teach them everything, as there is not enough time in the school year to possibly go over every detail.
   b) Students must be committed to reading and re-reading materials in order to fully comprehend how history changes over time. This is not a class that you can cram for.
   c) Students must have above average writing skills, as the ability to express your ideas in writing is crucial to this class and the AP Exam. Be prepared to write standard five-paragraph essays regularly (every other week or more often).
   d) In addition to the textbook and primary documents, students must also be prepared to read six additional texts representing various important periods in European history. (See list below)
   e) Students should enjoy history as they will be spending a lot of time preparing and learning for class and the AP exam.

Readings:

2) Summer Reading:

3) Additional Reading Materials:

Learning & Assessment
1. Daily homework consists of reading the textbook, listening to on-line lecture and taking notes. For every unit students will complete Unit-End Questions that will serve as a study guide for the semester and AP exams.
2. Assessment will be given in the form of any or all of the following: multiple choice questions, short-answer ID terms, matching, essays, stimulus-based short answer.
The Annotated Mona Lisa: A Crash Course in Art History from Prehistoric to Post-Modern

by Carol Strickland, Ph.D.

Read all of the information below concerning the book to have a clearer purpose for reading.

Keep this paper and your sketch book near you as you read, and work on this assignment as you read. Trying to read the entire book first and then do this assignment will end in much frustration. Do not try to do this assignment all at once time. Give yourself a good four to five weeks to read and complete the assignment.

This assignment is designed to evaluate your ability to teach yourself. This skill is indeed imperative in any AP/college course because – given the strict time constraints – we will not be able to cover all the material in class and you will therefore be responsible to digest significant portions of it by yourself, using your textbook.

In The Annotated Mona Lisa, the sections listed below in the box touch on all the major art figures of each period, while continuing to explain the cultural/historical context out of which the art evolved. A timeline at the beginning of each section ties all of this information together, noting the historical events that shaped the art world and the world at large. Be sure to read and refer back to these timelines as you work through the text to help you envision a more complete “picture” of each art movement.

You should use the structure of the book to help you navigate the material. Make sure you understand the historical and cultural context of each art period and the overall trajectory art has taken over the centuries. For instance, think about the different trends chronologically:

- Why did Baroque come after Renaissance but before Impressionism? Why are classical themes introduced again in Neo-Classicism?
- How did the techniques and the subjects change over time, and why?
- What was the role of art in the different periods and how did the position/role/job of the artist in society change over time?
- You should also know the main representatives of each period and their basic techniques/approaches to art. You should also trace artistic influence; who relied on whose ideas; who added to or modified whose method, etc.

Do not let yourself be overwhelmed by the details. As you work through the book focus on the assignment themes.

Focus on European art – the American art sections give you a fuller picture of the development of art over time BUT we will not be concerned with them within the context of European History.

Assignment:

You will need:

a. The Annotated Mona Lisa  b. a sketch book  c. access to the Internet and a printer

In your sketch book, include the following things for each movement listed at the right:

a) identify the movement’s approx. time period and create an abbreviated timeline of the most important historical (not just artistic) events that coincide with it.

b) identify the movement’s defining characteristics.

c) write a short description of the role of the artist in society during this movement.

d) list several (no more than five) major EUROPEAN artists, include their birth and death dates, country, and the title(s) of their most important works.

e) choose one image, sculpture, building for each artist listed in d. that you think best expresses the movement, print them out and include them in your sketch book. Be sure to label them with the artist’s name, the title, and the date of the work.

f) write a concise paragraph explaining why you chose each image in e. to represent the period.

g) explain the movement’s relationship to other artistic movements (previous & future).

Grading: Each art movement, 14 pts. (= 115pts.); overall quality of information, 25pts.; overall presentation of sketchbook, 10pts.  

Total points: 150
Comprehension Questions for *The Prince* by Niccolò Machiavelli

**Copy these questions** into your sketchbook and answer them **fully and completely**. This assignment must be turned in on the first day of school. **Please remember that this assignment is not optional.**  (Grading: each question is worth 10 pts.; **Total Points = 100**)

1. Read the attached article on Machiavelli and *The Letter from Niccolo Machiavelli to the Magnificent Lorenzo de Medici* (the prologue to *The Prince*) then answer the following question: For what reasons (there are several) did Machiavelli write *The Prince*?

2. Describe the different types of armies outlined in *The Prince* and the purpose they serve within the state according to Machiavelli.  (See especially chapters 12-14)

**See especially chapters 17-19 for the next two questions:**

3. Describe the nature of love and fear in the relationship between a prince and his people. Why does Machiavelli say that it is best for a prince "to be both loved and feared?" Is it possible for a prince to be both? Explain.

4. What is Machiavelli’s view of human nature (human beings in their natural state without the influence of society or a ruler)? How does this help explain what he says about the way in which a prince should rule?

5. In **Chapter 20**, list and explain the three pieces of advice Machiavelli gives a prince?

6. According to Machiavelli in **Chapter 21**, what must a prince do to be esteemed? In what way(s) are these ideas “modern” (Modern = not previously developed, discussed or recognized in antiquity or the early Middle Ages)? (Yes, you must reflect back on what you learned last year to answer this question.)

7. **Name** three (3) recurring themes in *The Prince*. **Describe** the importance of each within the context of *The Prince*.

8. Compile a list of ten (10) important characteristics of a Machiavellian ruler. **Explain why** of each of these traits, according to Machiavelli, is important if one wants to become an effective ruler.

9. **See chap 26 and the Machiavelli info in Kagan (textbook)** and then answer these two questions:
   
   a. According to Machiavelli and Renaissance humanism, what is *virtù*. How does this notion of *virtù* in a prince positively impact the “state”?
   
   b. What does Machiavelli think about Italian unification and republicanism?

10a. As you perceive it, what advantages might a citizen encounter living under a Machiavellian ruler? Describe what a best-case-scenario Machiavellian state might be like. **10b.** As you perceive it, what disadvantages might a citizen encounter living under a Machiavellian ruler? Describe what a worst-case-scenario Machiavellian state might be like.

"**Whoever wants to be happy, let him be so:**
about tomorrow there's no knowing."  
—Lorenzo The Magnificent
MACHIAVELLI

Would you buy a used car from this man?

Machiavelli—the most hated man who ever lived: charged, down the centuries, with being the sole poisonous source of political monkey business, of the mocking manipulation of men, of malfeasance, misanthropy, mendacity, murder, and massacre; the evil genius of tyrants and dictators, worse than Judas, for no salvation resulted from his betrayal; guilt of the sin against the Holy Ghost, knowing Christianity to be true, but resisting the truth; not a man at all, but Antichrist in apish flesh, the Devil incarnate, Old Nick, with the whiff of sulphur on his breath and a tail hidden under his scarlet Florentine gown.

Machiavelli is the one Italian of the Renaissance we all think we know, partly because his name has passed into our language as a synonym for unscrupulous schemer. But Niccolò Machiavelli of Florence was a more complex and fascinating figure than his namesake of the English dictionary, and unless we ourselves wish to earn the epithet Machiavellian, it is only fair to look at the historical Machiavelli in the context of his age.

He was born in 1469 of an impoverished noble family whose coat of arms featured four keys. Niccolò’s father was a retired lawyer who owned two small farms and an inn, his mother a churchgoer who wrote hymns to the Blessed Virgin. Niccolò was one of four children; the younger son, Totto, became a priest, and the idea of a professional occupied by a Father Machiavelli is one that has caused Niccolò’s enemies some wry laughter.

Niccolò attended the Studio, Florence’s university, where he studied the prestigious newly-discovered authors of Greece and Rome. Like all his generation, he idolized the Athenians and the Romans of the Republic, and was to make them his models in life. This was one important influence. The other was the fact that Florence was then enjoying, under the Medici, a period of peace. For centuries the city had been torn by war and faction; but now all was serene, and the Florentines were producing their greatest achievements in philosophy, poetry, history, and the fine arts.

This point is important, for too often we imagine the Italian Renaissance as a period of thug-like condottieri and cruel despots forever locked in war. We must not be deceived by the artists. Uccello and Michelangelo painted bloody battles, but they were battles that had taken place many years before. If we are to understand Machiavelli, we must picture his youth as a happy period of civilization and peace: for the first time in centuries swords rusted, muscles grew flabby, fortress walls became overgrown with ivy.

In 1494, when Machiavelli was twenty-five, this happiness was shattered. King Charles VIII of France invaded Italy to seize the kingdom of Naples; Florence lay on his route. In the Middle Ages the Florentines had fought bravely against aggressors, but now, grown slack and effete, they were afraid of Charles’s veterans and his forty cannon. Instead of manning their walls, they and their leading citizen, Pietro de’ Medici, meekly allowed the French king to march in; they even paid him gold not to harm their country.

This debacle led to internal wars, to economic decline, in which Niccolò’s father went bankrupt, to much heart-searching, and to a puritanical revolution. Savonarola the Dominican came to rule from the pulpit. Thundering that the French invasion was punishment for a pagan way of life, he burned classical books and nude pictures and urged a regeneration of Florence through fasting and prayer. The French just laughed at Savonarola; he lost the confidence of his fellow citizens and was burned at the stake in 1498.

In that same year, Machiavelli became an employee of the Florentine Republic, which he was to serve ably as diplomat and administrator. Machiavelli scorned Savonarola’s idea of political regeneration through Christianity; instead, he persuaded the Florentines to form a citizen militia, as was done in Republican Rome. In 1512 Florence’s big test came. Spain had succeeded France as Italy’s oppressor, and now, at the instigation of the Medici, who had been exiled from Florence in 1494 and wished to return, a Spanish army of five thousand marched...
Grasping hands and a secretive half-smile mark Santo di Tito's portrait of Machiavelli, probably painted after the Florentine's death.
against Tuscany. Four thousand of Machiavelli's militia were defending the strong Florentine town of Prato. The Spaniards, ill-fed and unpaid, launched a halfhearted attack. The Florentines, instead of resisting, took to their heels. Prato was sacked, and a few days later Florence surrendered without a fight. The Medici returned, the Republic came to an end, Machiavelli lost his job and was tortured and exiled to his farm. For the second time in eighteen years he had witnessed a defeat that was both traumatic and humiliating.

In the following year an out-of-work Machiavelli began to write his great book The Prince. It is an attempt to answer the question implicit in Florence's two terrible defeats: what had gone wrong? Machiavelli's answer is this: for all their classical buildings and pictures, for all the Ciceronian Latin and readings from Plato, the Florentines had never really revived the essence of classical life—that military vigor and patriotism unto death that distinguished the Greeks and Romans. What then is the remedy? Italy must be regenerated—not by Savonarola's brand of puritanism, but by a soldier-prince. This prince must subordinate every aim to military efficiency. He must personally command a citizen army and keep it disciplined by a reputation for cruelty.

But even this, Machiavelli fears, will not be enough to keep at bay the strong new nation-states, France and Spain. So, in a crescendo of patriotism, Machiavelli urges his prince to disregard the accepted rules of politics, to hit below the belt. Let him lie, if need be, let him violate treaties: "Men must be either pampered or crushed, because they can get revenge for small injuries but not for fatal ones"; "A prudent ruler cannot, and should not, honor his word when it places him at a disadvantage and when the reasons for which he made his promise no longer exist"; "If a prince wants to maintain his rule he must learn how not to be virtuous."

Machiavelli's peculiar cast of mind. He grows excited when goodness comes to a sticky end and when a dastardly deed is perpetrated under a cloak of justice. He seems to enjoy shocking traditional morality, and there can be little doubt that he is subconsciously revenging himself on the Establishment responsible for those two profound military defeats.

Machiavelli wrote The Prince for Giuliano de' Medici. He hoped that by applying the lessons in his book, Giuliano would become tough enough to unite Italy and drive out the foreigner. But Giuliano, the youngest son of Lorenzo the Magnificent, was a tubercular young man with gentle blue eyes and long sensitive fingers, the friend of poets and himself a sonneteer. He was so soft that his brother Pope Leo had to relieve him of his post as ruler of Florence after less than a year. Preparations for war against France taxed his feeble constitution; at the age of thirty-seven he fell ill and died. Machiavelli's notion of turning Giuliano into a second Cesare Borgia was about as fantastic as trying to turn John Keats into a James Bond.

This fantastic element has been overlooked in most accounts of Machiavelli, but it seems to me important. Consider the Life of Castruccio Castracani, which Machiavelli wrote seven years after The Prince. It purports to be a straight biography of a famous fourteenth-century ruler of Lucca, but in fact only the outline of the book is historically true. Finding the real Castruccio insufficiently tough to embody his ideals, Machiavelli introduces wholly fictitious episodes borrowed from Diodorus Siculus's life of a tyrant who really was unscrupulous: Agathocles. As captain of the Syracusans, Agathocles had collected a great army, then summoned the heads of the Council of Six Hundred under the pretext of asking their advice, and put them all to death.

Machiavelli in his book has Castruccio perform a similar stratagem. Just as in The Prince the second-rate
Cesare Borgia passes through the crucible of Machiavelli's imagination to emerge as a modern Julius Caesar, so here a wildly villainous lord is dressed up as the perfect amoral autocrat. In both books Machiavelli is so concerned to preach his doctrine of salvation through a strong soldier-prince that he leaves Italy as it really was for a world of fantasy.

Machiavelli had a second purpose in dedicating The Prince to Giuliano de' Medici (and when Giuliano died, to his almost equally effete nephew Lorenzo). He wished to regain favor with the Medici, notably with Pope Leo. This also was a fantastic plan. Machiavelli had plotted hand over fist against the Medici for no less than fourteen years and was known to be a staunch republican, opposed to one-family rule in Florence. Pope Leo, moreover, was a gentle man who loved Raphael's smooth paintings and singing to the lute; he would not be interested in a book counseling cruelty and terror.

How could a man like Machiavelli, who spent his early life in the downto-earth world of Italian politics, have yielded to such unrealistic, such fantastic hopes? The answer, I think, lies in the fact that he was also an imaginative artist—a playwright obsessed with extreme dramatic situations. Indeed, Machiavelli was best known in Florence as the author of Mandragola. In that brilliant comedy, a bold and tricky adventurer, aided by the profligacy of a parasite, and the avarice of a friar, achieves the triumph of making a gullied husband bring his own unwitting but too yielding wife to shame. It is an error to regard Machiavelli as primarily a political theorist, taking a cool look at facts. The Prince is, in one sense, the plot of a fantastic play for turning the tables on the French and Spaniards.

What, too, of Machiavelli's doctrine that it is sometimes wise for a prince to break his word and to violate treaties? It is usually said that this teaching originated with Machiavelli. If so, it would be very surprising, for the vast majority of so-called original inventions during the Italian Renaissance are now known to have been borrowed from classical texts. The Florentines valued wisdom as Edwardian English gentlemen valued port—the older the better.

In 1564 Machiavelli wrote a play, which has been lost, called Masks. It was in imitation of Aristophanes' Clouds, the subject of which is the Sophists, those men who claimed to teach "virtue" in a special sense, namely, efficiency in the conduct of life. The Sophists emphasized material success and the ability to argue from any point of view, irrespective of its truth. At worst, they encouraged a cynical disbelief in all moral restraints on the pursuit of selfish, personal ambition. Florentines during their golden age had paid little attention to the Sophists, preferring Plato, who accorded so well with Christianity and an aesthetic approach to life; but after the collapse in 1494 it would have been natural for a man like Machiavelli to dig out other, harder-headed philosophers.

The source for his doctrine of political unscrupulousness may well have been the Sophists as presented in Aristophanes' play. The following sentence from one of Machiavelli's letters in 1521 is close to many lines in The Clouds: "For that small matter of lies," writes Machiavelli, "I am a doctor and hold my degrees. Life has taught me to confound false and true, till no man knows either." In The Prince this personal confession becomes a general rule: "One must know how to color one's actions and to be a great liar and deceiver.

How was it that an undisputedly civilized man like Machiavelli could advise a ruler to be cruel and deceitful and to strike terror? The answer lies in the last chapter of The Prince, entitled "Exhortation to liberate Italy from the barbarians." Often neglected, it is, in fact, the most deeply felt chapter of all and gives meaning to the rest. "See how Italy," Machiavelli writes, "be-sees the duty of God to send someone to save her from those barbarous cruelties and outrages"—he means the outrages perpetrated by foreign troops in Italy, a land, he goes on, that is "leaderless, lawless, crushed, despoiled, torn, overrun, she has had to endure every kind of desolation."

Machiavelli is a patriot writing in mental torment. He seldom mentions the deity, but in this chapter the name of God occurs six times on one page, as an endorsement for this new kind of ruler. Machiavelli really believes that his deceitful prince will be as much an instrument of God as Moses was, and this for two reasons. First, Italy is an occupied country, and her survival is at stake; and just as moral theologians argued that theft becomes legitimate when committed by a starving man, so Machiavelli implies that deceit, cruelty, and so on become legitimate when they are the only means to national survival.

Secondly, Machiavelli had seen honest means tried and fail. Savonarola had hoped to silence cannon by singing hymns; Machiavelli himself had sent conscripts against the Spaniards. But the Italians had been then—and still were—bantams pitied against heavyweights. They could not win according to the rules, only with kidney punches. And since they had to win or cease to be themselves—that is, a civilized peo-
people as compared with foreign "barbarians."—Machiavelli argues that it is not only right but the will of God that they should use immoral means.

We must remember that The Prince is an extreme book that grew out of an extreme situation and that its maxims must be seen against the charred, smoking ruins of devastated Italy. The nearest modern parallel is occupied France. In the early 1940's cultivated men like Camus joined the Resistance, committing themselves to blowing up German posts by night and to other sinister techniques of maquis warfare. Like Machiavelli, they saw these as the only way to free their beloved country.

But the most original and neglected aspect of Machiavelli is his method. Before Machiavelli's time, historians had been slaves of chronology. They started with the Creation, or the founding of their city, and worked forward, year by year, decade by decade, chronicling plague, war, and civil strife. Sometimes they detected a pattern, but even when they succeeded in doing so, the pattern was sui generis, not applicable elsewhere. Machiavelli was the first modern historian to pool historical facts from a variety of authors, not necessarily of the same period, and to use these facts to draw general conclusions or to answer pertinent questions.

He applies this method notably in his Discourses on Livy, and among the questions he answers are these: "What causes commonly give rise to wars between different powers?" "What kind of reputation or gossip or opinion causes the populace to begin to favor a particular citizen?" "Whether the safeguarding of liberty can be more safely entrusted to the populace or to the upper class; and which has the stronger reason for creating disturbances, the 'have-nots' or the 'haves'?" Machiavelli does not wholly break free from a cyclical reading of history—the term Renaissance is itself a statement of the conviction that the golden age of Greece and Rome had returned. Nor did he break free from a belief in Fortune—what we would now call force of circumstance—and he calculated that men were at the mercy of Fortune five times out of ten. Nevertheless, he does mark an enormous advance over previous historical thinkers, since he discovered the method whereby man can learn from his past.

Having invented this method, Machiavelli proceeded to apply it imperfectly. He virtually ignored the Middle Ages, probably because medieval chronicles were deficient in those dramatic human twists, reversals, and paradoxes that were what really interested him. This neglect of the Middle Ages marred his study of how to deal with foreign invaders. Over a period of a thousand years Italy had constantly suffered invasion from the north; the lessons implicit in these instances would have helped Machiavelli to resolve his main problem much better than the more remote happenings he chose to draw from Livy. For example, at the Battle of Legnano, near Milan, in 1176, a league of north Italian cities won a crushing victory over Frederick Barbarossa's crack German knights. The Italians didn't employ duplicity or dramatic acts of terrorism, just courage and a united command.

So much for Machiavelli's teaching and discoveries. It remains to consider his influence. In his own lifetime he was considered a failure. Certainly, no soldier-prince arose to liberate Italy. After his death, however, it was otherwise. In 1558 the Vatican placed Machiavelli's works on the Index of Prohibited Books, because they teach men "to appear good for their own advantage in this world—a doctrine worse than heresy." Despite this ban, Machiavelli's books were widely read and his political teaching became influential. It would probably have confirmed him in his pessimistic view of human nature had he known that most statesmen and thinkers would seize on the elements of repression and guilt in his teachings to the exclusion of the civic sense and patriotism he equally taught.

In France several kings studied Machiavelli as a means of increasing their absolutism, though it cannot be said that he did them much good. Henry III and Henry IV were murdered, and in each case on their blood-soaked person was found a well-thumbed copy of The Prince. Louis XIII was following Machiavelli when he caused his most powerful subject, the Italian-born adventurer Concini, to be treacherously killed. Richelieu affirmed that France could not be governed without the right of arbitrary arrest and exile, and that in case of danger to the state it may be well that a hundred innocent men should perish. This was raison d'état, an exaggerated version of certain elements in The Prince, to which Machiavelli might well have subscribed.

In England Machiavelli had little direct influence. England had never been defeated as Florence had been, and Englishmen could not understand the kind of desperate situation that demanded unscrupulous political methods. The political diseases Machiavelli had first studied scientifically were in England called after his name, rather as a physical disease—say Parkinson's—is called not after the man who is suffering from it but after the doctor who discovers it. Machiavelli thus became saddled with a lot of things he had never advocated, including atheism and any treacherous way of killing, generally by poison. Hence Flamino in Webster's White Devil:

O the rare trickes of a Machivilian!
He doth not come like a grosse plodding slave
And buffet you to death: no, my quaint knave—
Hee tickles you to death; makes you die laughing.
As if you had swallow'd a pound of saffron.

The eighteenth century, with its strong belief in man's good nature and reason, tended to scoff at Machiavelli. Hume wrote: "There is scarcely any maxim in The Prince which subsequent experience has not entirely refuted. The errors of this politician proceed, in a
great measure, from his having lived in too early an age of the world to be a good judge of political truth.” With Hume’s judgment Frederick the Great of Prussia would, in early life, have agreed. As a young man Frederick wrote an Anti-Machiavel, in which he stated that a ruler is the first servant of his people. He rejected the idea of breaking treaties, “for one has only to make one deception of this kind, and one loses the confidence of every ruler.” But Frederick did follow Machiavelli’s advice to rule personally, to act as his own commander in the field, and to despise flatterers.

Later, Frederick began to wonder whether honesty really was the best policy. “One sees oneself continually in danger of being betrayed by one’s allies, forsaken by one’s friends, brought low by envy and jealousy; and ultimately one finds oneself obliged to choose between the terrible alternatives of sacrificing one’s people or one’s word of honor.” In old age, Frederick became a confirmed Machiavellian, writing in 1775: “Rulers must always be guided by the interests of the state. They are slaves of their resources, the interest of the state is their law, and this law may not be infringed.”

During the nineteenth century Germany and Italy both sought to achieve national unity, with the result that writers now began to play up Machiavelli’s other side, his call for regeneration. Young Hegel hails the author of The Prince for having “grasped with a cool circumspection the necessary idea that Italy should be saved by being combined into one state.” He and Fichte go a stage further than Machiavelli: they assert that the conflict between the individual and the state no longer exists, since they consider liberty and law identical. The necessity of evil in political action becomes a superior ethics that has no connection with the morals of an individual. The state swallows up evil.

In Italy Machiavelli’s ideal of a regenerated national state was not perverted in this way and proved an important influence on the Risorgimento. In 1859, the provisional government of Tuscany, on the eve of national independence, published a decree stating that a complete edition of Machiavelli’s works would be printed at government expense. It had taken more than three hundred years for “a man to arise to redeem Italy,” and in the event the man turned out to be two men, Cavour and Garibaldi. Both, incidentally, were quite unlike the Prince: Cavour, peering through steel-rimmed spectacles, was a moderate statesman of the center, and Garibaldi a blunt, humane, rather quixotic soldier.

Bismarck was a close student of Machiavelli, but Marx and Engels did not pay much attention to him, and the Florentine’s books have never exerted great influence in Russia. In contemporary history Machiavelli’s main impact has been on Benito Mussolini. In 1924 Mussolini wrote a thesis on The Prince, which he described as the statesman’s essential vade mecum. The Fascist leader deliberately set himself to implement Petrarch’s call quoted on the last page of The Prince:

_Che l’antico valore_  
Nell’italici cor non è ancor morto.

Let Italians, as they did of old,  
Prove that their courage has not grown cold.

After a course of muscle building, Mussolini sent the Italian army into Ethiopia to found a new Roman Empire. He joined Hitler’s war in 1940, only to find that he had failed to impart to modern Italians the martial qualities of Caesar’s legions. The final irony occurred in 1944, when the Nazis were obliged to occupy northern Italy as the only means of stopping an Allied walkover, and Italy again experienced the trauma of 1494 and 1512. Mussolini’s failures discredit, at least for our generation, Machiavelli’s theory that it is possible for one man to effect a heart transplant on a whole people.

What is Machiavelli’s significance today? His policy of political duplicity has been found wanting in the past and is probably no longer practicable in an age of democracy and television. His policy of nationalism is also beginning to date as we move into an era of ideological blocs. His insistence on the need for military preparedness has proved of more durable value and is likely to remain one of the West’s key beliefs. His technique for solving political problems through a study of the past is practiced to some extent by every self-respecting foreign minister of our time.

Was Machiavelli, finally, an evil man? He made an ethic of patriotism. In normal times that is a poisonous equation, but defensible, I believe, in the context of sixteenth-century Italy. Machiavelli wrote on the edge of an abyss: he could hear the thud of enemy boots, had seen pillage, profanation, and rape by foreign troops. Imaginative as he was, he could sense horrors ahead: the ending of political liberty and freedom of the press, which put the lights out in Italy for 250 years. He taught that it is civilized man’s first duty to save civilization—at all costs. Doubtless he was mistaken. But it is not, I think, the mistake of an evil man.

Vincent Cronin, the author of two histories of the Renaissance and several biographies, contributed an article on the Humanists to the Winter, 1971, Horizon.