



Critical reading test of political power in "The Prince" by Nicolas machiavel using Democratic Republic of the Congo and Africa as model systems

Nzewe Takuru Charles¹, Gédéon Bongo Ngiala², Koto-te-Nyiwa Ngbolua³

^{1,3}Département de Philosophie, Faculté des Lettres et Communication, Université de Gbado-Lite, Gbado-Lite, République démocratique du Congo

²Département de Biologie, Faculté des Sciences, Université de Kinshasa, Kinshasa, République démocratique du Congo

Abstract

The Prince of Nicolas Machiavel is one of the most widely read books. Since its publication, it has been subjected to numerous analyses and multiple interpretations. For a long time, it has been the instrument of several political leaders, and he has bequeathed principles on which political systems have based their ideology. The work is born from the historical-political context well known of a man and his State. It is then a question of the personal and food crisis that overwhelms the unemployed diplomat, who was Secretary of the Florentine Republic alongside with Gonfalonier Pierro Soderine for 15 years, knew the great political antechambers of Europe in this capacity, will have to wait for 14 years on his terms until the conjecture becomes favourable to him again. In this work, Machiavel pleads for the fate of his country, "Italy", and its occupation by barbarians. His concern and dream was that a brave man would rise up and give his country a new form! It is in times of crisis (crisis: political, economic, social...) that new theories emerged. Thus in 1513, the purgatory moment of the diplomat allowed the birth of the thinker, henceforth was born his work commonly known as "The Prince"! As for the Prince, he was put on the index by the Council of Trent in 1545, since the speech contains the most openly bold, if not the most provocative, political thoughts; and this is what will also earn Machiavel his early prohibition in the States of the Pope. Then his being put on the index for cynical reflections on the real use of religion as an instrument of domination. Machiavel told the Prince what he is aiming for, is the conservation of his State. To this end, he puts holy religion between these means. Thus he says that the Prince must not make it a State either than it is suitable and useful to his State: "and the Prince must sometimes be religious and devout". We can now ask ourselves the question of what "The Prince" really is.

Keywords: Politics, The Prince, War, Marchiavellism

1. Introduction

« First and foremost, Philosophy is taken as a speculative discipline i.e. knowledge of which the primary purpose is to advance thinking by thinking, if not by rethinking principles and practices, by asking the questions of essence and foundation, seems to come back at the first role in the life which is to debate on the better of existence^[1]. The political upheaval of the era, the race to power by violent means and so many other vices that overwhelm and characterize the current political world globally and Africa in particular cannot leave an informed mind indifferent. These movements do not only attract our attention but offer an opportunity for reflection as a philosopher, responsible for the critical body of society and challenge us to remain lucid in order to respond to calls from the context and the socio-economic situation.

People's politics: To approach the question of political organization is to touch upon the problem which concerns the human life. Reason why, it is in cultural circles, associations and political organizations like (ABAKO, ALIBA, UN, USA, AU, CDAO, etc.) try to find solution to the controversial problems of

different nature which touch its life in order to live in peace, harmony and prosperity. But alas, these organizations are mostly foreign to him. Although seeking to live in a community, the situation of man in general and African in particular continues to deteriorate continually. Everywhere, we talk about coup d'état, migrants, rebellion, terrorism, fundamentalism, rapes, violation, etc.

For many people, this chaotic situation is due to the mismanagement of the res publica, that is, the diversion of public treasures, social injustice, and immorality of those who run the state. In short, the lack of political culture that is summed up in Machiavelianism thus, Machiavel is rightly or wrongly regarded as the inspiration, the conspirator or the undisputed model of the dictators of the contemporary world who threaten the world today. As such, many questions deserve to be asked: Is (the) politics violence? Does it have no morals? What is its essence? Should we exclude morality from politics as Machiavel did? Is it better that it happens before or after politics . well before all these questions, what is politics?

¹ Muyengo Mulombe S., Introduction à la bioéthique, Kinshasa, presse Universtaire du Sud, 1999, p. 41-42.

1. Abako est une association culturelle avant de devenir un parti politique dénommé Alliance des Bokongo, peuple Kongo en République Démocratique du Congo.

2. Aliba qui elle aussi est une association culturelle créée pendant la 2^{ième} République qui regroupe les Bangala de la province de l'Equateur.

It is to this question that we will attempt to answer in this first point in our work by identifying the thought of Nicolas Machiavel as the inspirer of the dramatic situation in current politics.

2. Political concept of Nicolas Machiavel ^[2]

At this stage, our effort will be to bring out Machiavel's political conception, like many other authors who have tried to reflect on politics as an instance of integration and organization of all human activities and thus of the whole city.

Machiavel approaches politics in the proper perspective, without any concurrence of morality. This is how he sees politics as "a matter for the Prince alone". It bases its actions on mechanisms of conquest and conservation of power without ethics. Also, Machiavel proposes an anthropological type that underpins such a policy.

A retrospective view shows that the political concept dates back to Greek antiquity, Plato and Aristote tried to define in their different dialogues and treaties. Also, we can not finish this work without referring to the point dealing with the politics of success without ethical purpose. So now what about politics!

3. Politics

3.1 Politics according to Plato (428-348 before C)

Indeed, etymologically the political word is of Greek origin "polite" which means "city" at the time of major questions of politics today. Twenty-four centuries separate us from Platon, who is one of the first thinkers to propose criticism of the realities of political philosophy, and the first to express the idea that: « the realization of a right policy finds its condition in a radical transformation of man, by placing knowledge in the principle of power, and makes education and the whole life the object of politics ^[3]. Thus conceived, everything is political according to Plato. And he is equally convinced that in philosophy, the principle of political good allows us to recognize the good and the bad in the State.

Plato's reflection on the causes of the ruin of states found its dominant inspiration in the view that the forms of political evil are the same, The only hope of forming the political order is to be based on the reform of human beings or at least of some of them. From this observation, the crisis in Africa and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) in particular, is essentially the crisis of men and it is currently important that some minds rise above the present era, show things in their philosophical and historical development if we do not want to make a serious mistake about the future.

3.2 Aristote and Politics (384-322)

Aristote conceived politics as an art, which consists of governing men by realizing their common interest or even better managing the city, the res publica. This is how Aristote writes that politics is the totality of the means to organize and ensure the best possible state happiness, by allowing this state, as well as the individuals who compose it, to live the most desirable life ^[4]. In short, Aristote conceived politics as the superior ethic that

ensures the happiness of the individual. Many others, on the other hand, conceive it as a skill in arrangements or positioning, as a force or an art of lying to be accepted in power, does not equal the tendency to never keep its promises! Aristote and his master remains an essential landmark in the history of philosophy and politics. As an excellent disciple, Aristote said after all who conceived man as a "social Being" that man by his nature can live and flourish only in a community. The man is only a "Zoon politikon" which means "a political animal". For Aristote, therefore, man is a naturally political being. The development of the notions of the policy conceived according to the ancient precursors of our author being made remains the approach according to Nicolas Machiavel

3.3 The Policy according to Nicolas Machiavel (1469 - 1527)

The political problematic of Nicolas Machiavel is summed up in the way of conquering and keeping the power. This is how he conceives of politics as a matter for the Prince and who must be at the service of power, that is, seeking to conquer power and how to preserve it. For this fact, Machiavel gives « three ways to stay in business » ^[5].

His policy turns to the political conception of these two precursors cited in the moral aspect.

The political conception of N. Machiavel, delivered in his main work "The Prince", occupies a special place, keeps his power of fascination and his whole youth. Let us recall here that Machiavel also designated his work by an Italian title " IL principe " which prevailed more.

3.4 Means of political power from Nicolas Machiavel

Machiavel says « that a prince endeavors to conquer and to preserve his power, the means will be judged honorable and praised by all » ^[6]. Thus we find in Machiavel that among the means advocated for the maintenance of the Prince and his power, a place of choice is given to military service i.e. to weapons.

▪ The Role of the Army

Addressing the question of the organization of a political order presupposes the main foundations that all states have, which are « the good laws and the good weapons » ^[7] such that an army, subject of so many reflections, is to touch to the crucial problem of survival of a State and its entire component. The army has always played a great role in both the maintenance and conquest of territory as in the conquest of the Prince's power and the preservation of the latter. Machiavel, therefore, says that « a prince must be firmly seated otherwise, he will fall » ^[8]. The army is a force and a bulwark on which a Prince uses for the efficiency of his action. However, does it distinguish the weapons with which a prince defends his country and his power are « his own or are mercenary, or auxiliary, or mixed with each other » ^[9] or four categories, but we will not speak only of three categories.

▪ Mercenary Armies

² Nzewe Takuru Ch., La Primauté de la politique sur la morale. Essai d'analyse de compréhension de «Le Prince de Nicolas Machiavel », Mémoire, UNIKIN, Fac. Des lettres/Philosophie, 2001-2002, p. 72

³ Platon, cité par Professeur Mbolokala Imbuli N., Notes de cours des questions Aprofondies de la Philosophie Antique, L2 Philosophie, Fac. Des lettres, UNIKIN, 2001-2002

⁴ Aristote, Politique, Paris, éd. les Belles lettres, Tome II, 1971, p.3.

⁵ Machiavel N., Œuvres complètes, Gallimard, 1952, p. 302.

⁶ Machiavel N., Op. cit., p. 343.

⁷ Idem., p. 324.

⁸ Ibidem.,

⁹ Idem., p. 325.

These are usually soldiers who intervene for causes that are not theirs, and often engaged for lesser balances. For this reason, they do not always feel motivated and flee at the first opportunity. These armies are currently similar to the terrorists^[10] who are on the front page. Machiavel warns any Prince who would base his power on them. He considers it an abomination to resort to mercenary armies, because the recourse to mercenary armies would be for Machiavel a death of all national independence. As can be seen, these troops are also disloyal, unfaithful, disunited but ambitious. Moreover, Machiavel recalls that the ruin of Italy is caused by nothing but resting for years on mercenary weapons^[11]. This is how he recalls all his wishes to an independent Italy and to do so, reunited. So what about auxiliary armies?

▪ Auxiliary Armies

It is usually troops from friendly and neighboring countries that are called upon to come with their weapons to help, that is, to help the country that has appealed to them and to defend it.

Just as Machiavel rejects the mercenary armies, he also describes auxiliary troops as useless and dangerous, even harmful. It is in the same perspective that he warns a prince who holds his power based on mercenary and auxiliary armies that he will never be solid or secure.

Machiavel never ceases, he insists they are disunited, ambitious, without discipline and disloyal. With his arms, he remarked, valiant among friends, cowards among enemies, one generally differs his fall only as long as the assault is deferred. Machiavel said, "If a prince does not intend to conquer, let him use such weapons, for they are far more dangerous than the mercenaries, with them the ruin is ready, accustomed to them are to another than to you^[12]. These armies are described as useless and dangerous because with it, if we lose, we are beaten, and if we win we remain their prisoner^[13]. And the old story is full of these examples. The most recent example is the recourse of the AFDL to foreign troops (Rwandan, Ugandan etc.) to conquer the power in 1997 and SADC to save power in the DRC, remained "the economic and political services of his allied troops, and were in the pay of the country, although no war was waged". No longer, the troops of the DRC had just shone in immorality among the UN troops in the Central African Republic. So, this concept tried to show that the weapons of others, "or fall from your back, or weigh you, or squeeze you^[14]. In both cases, he notes, by founding a state based on the support of these troops, the throne will always remain shaky. The historian, the diplomat who claims in the first person the length of his experience, the theorist repeats here the pen in an indictment against the stipendiary armies'. For him it would be an abomination to resort to mercenary arms and auxiliary weapons, so that the recourse to these weapons would be the agreed death of any national independence. And with it, says Machiavel, ruin is accomplished^[15]. We need to qualify things to say that auxiliary armies (also known as allied forces) do not always fail. Europe ended up the 1940-1945 war with so-

called Allied forces in the United States. In the same way the United States had to win quickly the war in Iraq thanks also to the allied forces. Although one can support such weapons, the better it is for a republic to have a clean and national army.

▪ Necessity of a clean army

It is now proven that it is the nations endowed with military power that say the world's deucers; they are the ones who predestinate the future of the planet. In this respect, our African Prince must do as much not to appear as unarmed Princes.

Machiavel was clear about this and had stated bluntly that between an armed man and an unarmed man, there is no possible comparison; for it is not logical for the strong to force the weak willingly and for the unarmed to be assured in the midst of armed servants. For, having in one of the contempt and in the other suspicion, it is not possible that they act well together^[16]. Given that what makes the good foundation of a Prince or a republic is to have an army, and the one that Machiavel deems safe is a clean army and that has as characteristic "that of being composed of subjects or citizens or creatures^[17]. Apart from this characteristic, all the others, Machiavel qualifies them as mercenaries or auxiliaries.

At the time, the diplomat Florentin already perceived the danger that could permanently constitute a foreigner who comes to arms in a country. This coming, as we have seen, creates a climate of insecurity for you who welcome it. And the principle that the friend of my enemy is my enemy has been settled. This is one of the origins of conflict that Zaire at the time of Marshal Mobutu could not manage well, the effects of which are still felt until now and the authorities of Kigali (Rwanda) have always brandished as a trick allowing them to do the war until today. Since it has a clean army uniting the characteristics evoked, united as are with electrons revolving around the nucleus of its authority, the authorities of Ruanda are able to keep welded their territorial integrity i.e. their sovereignty, to ensure life, harmony, peace and security for their people. When people are living in peace and security, they need only work that is the main factor of all development. This is why Machiavel is right when he stated that only the Princes and the armed republics make very great progress^[18], the United States, China, Japan, etc. are the eloquent examples. In the opposite case, we see the property of looted people, and the people themselves in perpetual displacement. The current situation of the Central African Republic, which does not have a national army, gives us more thoughts. It resembles the case of violent conflict known as identity conflict^[19] by Noël Obotela Rashidi who had as actors two ethnic groups Héma and Léndu in DRC. It should be noted that this conflict triggered by order of evacuation given to the villagers Léndu on behalf of a farmer Héma^[20]. The Central African Republic has a total of 13 rebel fragments. Emigrated by militias, each one of them makes its law where it directs.

¹⁰ Microsoft, Encarta®2009 © 1993-2008 Microsoft. Intimidation par l'exercice abusif d'un rapport de force défavorable à la victime. Le terroriste fait recours à la violence dans le but politique. Il utilise les armes dans but de semer que la terreur.

¹¹ Machiavel N., Op. cit., p. 325.

¹² Idem, p. 329.

¹³ Idem, p. 329.

¹⁴ Ibidem, p. 331.

¹⁵ Idem, p. 329.

¹⁶ Idem, p. 333.

¹⁷ Idem, p. 332.

¹⁸ Machiavel, N., Op. cit., p. 332.

¹⁹ Ibidem, Le Prince, trad. Christian BEC, Coll. Pocket classique, Paris, 1990, p. 68.

²⁰ Conclave du MONT-AMBA, Elections, paix et développement en République Démocratique du Congo. Prise de position des Universitaires Congolais, publication de la fondation Konrad Adenauer, Kinshasa, 2007, p.41.

The high hillside to speak only of this part of the country is disputed today by the SELEKA group on the one hand and on the other hand by the self-defense force commonly called the Anti-BALAKA, who in their struggle wants to create a State of Autarky i.e. a state where only the Central Africans can live, a pure utopia! Other peoples are their potential enemy; especially Muslims and Mbororo are people to kill. In this country, it is the jungle and the state of pure nature. We can not speak here of the war in the true sense of the term but of an intense violence characterized by the general non-observance of the war law (kidnapping, murder of the civilians, rapes, tortures, massacres, etc.), they are very bloody that we could not imagine. The peculiarity of this kind of conflict is that it can not be extinguished in the short term. Human life, which is sacred by nature, does not represent anything for the latter. Admittedly, death is inscribed in the biological structure and is a natural term of the biological life of the man who participates in the life cycle (birth, growth and death) that affects all living beings. Although it is natural for man, it often triggers said André Bernard the strange phenomenon of anxiety ^[21]. The famous anti-barakas people invulnerable and invisible to their reputed enemies precisely the Muslims and Mbororo ^[22]; for the most part make their battle with machetes. War is now a common place for many of our African countries. It affects countries such as the Central African Republic, South Sudan, Burundi, and Burkina Faso, etc. and impoverishes the people, to make it the responsibility of international organizations that occasionally found their way (UNHCR, Red Cross, WFP, WHO, OXFAM, FAO, UNICEF, etc.). As can be seen in the following passages, Machiavel's analyzes in the Prince endeavor to examine the contemporary Italian situation, and it shows why the Princes of Italy lost their states. He finds the reasons for this in the negligence of this profession of arms ^[23] in favor of pleasures. This is how Machiavel makes a series of recommendations in the matter of the Prince's army, of which here are some of them: "The Prince must go to the army in person and perform his own duties as captain" ^[24]. Machiavel requires a military service for citizen between 17 and 40 years old. The Prince must send to the war his own citizens says Machiavel but one who does not appear valiant, he must change it; and he warns any state that after offending a citizen that he can not give him a command or any other important mission. The illustrative example is Nero Claudius, of which Machiavel alludes, and the most recent case in our history is that of General Donatien MAHELE. Machiavel said those princes who have no army of their own, or a national army for attack or for the defense of the nation, deserve to be blamed.

▪ **The indispensable support of the people.**

The Prince, says Machiavel in his attributions, must flee from the people, who makes him above all odious (being rapacious and usurping the goods and wives of his people) and despicable (i.e.

judged to be changing, light, effeminate, irresolute). If he flees these vices and if the "people judge himself satisfied with him, which he must obtain, thus "he would have cured the conspiracies and not be hated by the majority of the people" ^[25] because he considers, when one conspires, whoever does so, believes he satisfies the people by the death of the Prince. We see from experience that there have been many conspiracies and that few have succeeded. One of the reasons for this is that the people do not like the Prince's death. Thus, there is often not enough courage to take such a share.

The people's solution is essential and even one of the important pivots of the Prince's power. This support is essential because it is the best guarantee against conspiracies, whereas popular rejection would be unacceptable for a Princely power at the first opportunity. Machiavel concludes this point by saying that a Prince would take very little account of conjurations "if the people were affectionate to him otherwise, he must fear everything and everyone" ^[26].

In this excerpt, Machiavel emphasizes the essential support of the population alongside an army, its power perhaps destroyed if the people would find themselves in front of it.

If there is a fact that men living in community and in a society cannot do without it, then it is the source of conflict. And this is the birth of different tendencies of oppositions and other barbarous acts of men, of certain people, for one reason or another, resist any foreign attack and by occasion make war.

The war concept in its definition highlights the individual, collective character and must also assume the use of weapons. However, many definitions are proposed for this purpose. JJ Rousseau conceived that war is not "a man-to-man relationship, but a state-to-state relationship in which individuals are enemies only accidentally, not as men or even as citizens, etc. not as enemies for other states and not men, because between things of various natures we can not fix any real relation" ^[27].

R. Aron defines it as "a social phenomenon that arises at different times in human history, it is an organization of violent action by the communities at stake" ^[28], human societies, continues the author, put into play a series of conditions that push men unwittingly to attack each other.

As for Thomas Hobbes, English philosopher thinks that the state of men in natural freedom is the state of war. For he says "war is nothing but the time in which the will, the effort to attack, to resist by force and by the word or action sufficiently declared. the state of war as such as through him, the human race is destroyed and men kill each other" ^[29]. Thus, Hobbes imagines the theory of the civil pact where men at war in the state of nature alienate their natural rights in favor of Leviathan in the name of natural law. The state of nature is a state of the "war of all against all (Bellum omnium contra omnes) and the man is a wolf for man (homo homini lupus)" ^[30], according to a formula of Plaude

²¹Idem., p.37.

²² Bernard A., L'Homme et son accomplissement, essai d'anthropologie philosophique, Saint Paul Afrique, Kinshasa, 1989, p.141

²³Les Mbororo sont de peuple pasteur d'origine Nilotique, ils ne vivent que dans de vaste foret pour de raison de bétail.

²⁴Machiavel N., Idem., p. 76

²⁵Ibidem, p. 68

²⁶Ibidem, p. 92

²⁷Le Prince, trad. Christian BEC, Coll. Pocket classique, Paris, 1990, p. 93.

²⁸Rousseau, J.J., Op. Cit., p. 47.

²⁹Hobbes Th., cité par Nzege A., in Intelligence et Guerre. Essai sur la Philosophie Politique de Bergson, thèse de Doctorat en Philosophie, UNAZA, Lubumbashi, 1980, p.119.

³⁰Hobbes Th., cité par Kriegel., in Texte de Philosophie Politique Classique (que sais-je ?), Paris, PUF, 1993, p.25.

Professor Nzege Alaziambina following Bergsonian addresses the problem of war with this questioning: "why did nature want war?"^[31].

Briefly continues the professor that it is with "the appearance of private property" and the class struggles that is at the root of the war in its supreme form of struggle to solve, at a certain stage of development, contradictions between classes, between nations, between states or political blocs.

Mao Tse-tung, on the other hand, thought that "war is the continuation of politics"^[32] in the sense that it is itself a political act. If history can be traced back to the earliest times, one can not find war that has not had a political character. War is the continuation of politics by other means because it breaks out to remove the obstacles that stand in the way of the path of politics when they have reached a certain stage which cannot be surpassed by the usual means. When the obstacles are lifted, the goal of the policy reached, the war ends. This is why it is said that "politics is a war without bloodshed and war is bloodshed"^[33].

Today, it remains as a fundamental and principal mode of taking and maintaining power in many states in the world and particularly in Africa.

War, said Machiavel, is the product of our passions; it is in itself a very good thing. Because it can help to unite a state and also to order it. It is to a certain extent, a rational response to the difficulties experienced by certain States when their individual selfishness is abandoned to themselves. For the author of the Prince, "the art of war is the true science of all who rule and a Prince consequently can have no other object or thought, nor choose anything else when his job is being done out of war"^[34]. He continues stating that no other motive can explain this conception of the war of the art of governing. This one finds its real justification of the analysis of Machiavel because of all politics i.e. "the power" that the Prince holds. It is not the tradition that the Prince's office is to defend his homeland that could justify all the wars that many African states and our country are experiencing today, but also the fear of losing their lives. Referring to Tite-live, Machiavel said: "war is just for those who need it, and weapons are holy when there is no hope"^[35]. Machiavel justified this position by saying that God did not want to do everything and not to take away our free will and part of the glory that belongs to us. Henceforth it is imperative for all States by the very fact of their existence to make war or the threat and demonstrations of war. Such are today the cases in the Middle East (Syria, Palestine, Iraq and so on) and the United States with North Korea, Iran and others.

Machiavel recommends to the Princes that they should never divert their thought from the exercise of the war, they must practice there as much during the peace as during the war and this in two ways: "either by the actions or by the mind"^[36]. As for the Princes without this experience, Machiavel says that they must know that they are deprived of the first part that a captain must have. For it teaches him how to find the enemy, how to take his dwellings, how to besiege the cities of the enemies to his advantages.

³¹La formule apparait dans l'Asinaria ou comédie des Anes comme suit : « lupus est homo homini, non homo, quom, qualis sit, non novit » l'homme est un loup pour l'homme (et n'est plus un homme) quand il ignore ce qu'il est ».

³²Bergson cité par Nzege Alaziambina, Op.cit., p, 103.

³³Nzege Alaziambina, Op.cit., p, 104.

However, although Machiavel supported the logic of war as the Prince, it does not mean that he was against peace. In his opinion, war is not the opposite of peace, but lasting peace can come only from it. For him, on the contrary, peace is a natural tendency, a state of tranquility that makes the war to be forgotten. Therefore, peace is not, says the Florentine, a happy absence of war, but rather its latent threat. This is how he warns the Prince that he does not rely on what he sees in peacetime.

It is by deciphering the signs of a war in the silence of the public tranquility that Machiavel breaks the most promptly with the tradition which considers peace as a means allowing the State to accomplish its ends i.e. living well in justice, security. It is scandalous for many readers of the Prince author today because of very breakthrough analysis when it shatters the rigorous sharing between the desirable peace of all and the war hated especially when he says, the war is no longer the opposite of peace (by that, he knew as Heraclitus when he spoke of the harmony of the opposite) although his externality is wild and furious, since she lives within her. Machiavel recalls a repetitive fact when he says: many states are victims of the illusion of peace that they live in making them forget the law of degradation of all things, even if the adage of the cultural milieu of Machiavel stipulated for this purpose "if vis pacem para bellum" i.e. whoever wants peace prepares war". Thus, it is rightly said that the best way to keep the peace is to wage war.

From this same point of view, St. Augustine said that true peace does not consist only in the absence of armed struggle but in the peaceful order (*traquilitas ordinis*). Conversely, the absence of war does not necessarily mean the absence of conflict. Without pretending to exhaust what Machiavel thinks about the war, we can now approach the central aspect of his political thought.

From this same point of view St Augustine said that true peace does not consist only in the absence of armed struggle but in the peaceful order the absence of war does not necessarily mean the absence of conflict without pretending to exhaust what Machiavel thinks about the war we can now approach the central aspect of his political thought war in its simplest form id ther

▪ War in the Machiavel Universe

"War in its simplest form is therefore the duel between two communities, each of which aims to defeat the other"^[37]. War appears in Machiavel's eyes as the manifestation of the natural enmity that draws men against each other. It has its origin in the fact that nature has put man in such a condition that he can desire everything. But he could not get everything, she has vowed not to love his fellow men on the contrary to jealousy, to fear and to attack them in order to extract from them, if need be, what they have of admirable, honorable. In short, to gain power, it appears to be very important for the seizure of power as well as for its preservation, yesterday and today.

3.5 Policy of success, i.e. without ethical purpose

³⁴S.A., Citation du Président Mao Tsé-Toung (le petit livre rouge) éd. du Seuil, paris, S.a.p., p.39.

³⁵Idem.

³⁶Machiavel, N., Œuvres Complètes, Gallimard, 1952, p. 332.

One of the classic accusations against Machiavel is the immorality of his thought. Unlike his political precursor as Aristotele to the Christian tradition that made politics an extension of morality. The author of *The Prince*, unequivocally, distinguishes it and separates clearly Ethics and Politics which constitute to his views as autonomous registers, consequently different from each other.

For this, according to Machiavel, the golden rule of any political act is 'success'. This is the first evaluation criterion. It is the success which determines the value of a policy. A good policy is one that succeeds i.e. one that achieves its goals. This is what Professor Michel Mbabbi Monganotes states: "In fact, what is at stake in Machiavel is political success, so that if there is a morality to promote in politics, morality must be subordinated to the objective of so-called practical policy. A morality that would endanger political success should be in Machiavel's logic outlawed" [38]. According to Machiavel, this is a good policy that is not to be confused with good politics. The distinction between real and good politics is the privilege accorded to the former in defiance of these conditions to show that in Machiavel, it is not ethics, but rather success that governs politics. From this point of view, lending the language of Blaise Pascal who said that politics has its reasons that morality or ethics ignores it. As for Jacques Maritain, he said that "politics in conformity with its nature and with its authentic ends hence a non-moral policy" [39]. It follows that to succeed in political action, that is, to achieve a political goal, the means will always be considered honorable and praised by all. For this purpose, we only consider the end. In this way, Machiavel no longer submits to political morality, on the contrary, politics is freed and autonomous. For Machiavel, there is no moral policy, but there is rather a morality proper in politics that is not generally accepted think that politics has its morals meaning that a morality founded by reality close to observe its functioning. This maintains Professor Nzege Alaziambina in the wake of Thomas Hobbes qualified "morality close" [40]. From the analysis, it appears from the recall of his participation in the humanist movement of the Italian Renaissance that can help to understand it well. He would simply like to express the idea that the purpose of the policy is to achieve a moral end. As Julien Freund will say, "the political end lies in the inner peace and the external security of a state, if it is necessary to do so, to spoil personal morality" [41]. On this point, Machiavel uses a beautiful expression when he says: "The Prince must know how to enter into evil in case of necessity, to act against humanity" [42].

Machiavel does not deny moral values, but he refuses to see it as the only criterion according to which a states man should be judged by the fact that the value of the latter resides in the efficiency with which he authoritatively promotes the city grandeur which he ensures the government. Political morality is therefore for J. Freund to "perform as well as possible the duties that the political charge imposes (unity, peace, concord, defense, justice, employment, etc.) we can do good politics in the name of moral honesty, but at the same time precipitate a whole people in

distress" [43]. Thus, moral evil can be applied to what is evil "[44]. It is in this sense that one must understand the political exaltation of cruelty, considered clever, effective at the same time indispensable by Machiavel.

From this point of view, Machiavel relieves the Prince of all obligations in the name of reason of state. What matters is the effectiveness of its action above all else. Thus, wars of aggression by certain states are justified. The most recent example is that of the war that the United States had made in Iraq, etc. The divorce instituted between ethics and politics in Machiavel seems to find a favorable echo among contemporary thinkers such as Hannah Arendt who recognizes the difficult link between them. On this subject, she writes: « Truth and politics are bad terms and no one has counted the good times among the political virtues. Lies have always been regarded as necessary and legitimate tools, not only of the profession of politician or demagogue, but also and especially of that of states man » [45]. And this is what she still lets us hear in a text with such evocative title like: From lies to violence, when she says: "the secret what is diplomatically called discretion or *arcana imperi*, the mysteries of power - deception, deliberate falsification and outright deception used as legitimate means to achieve political ends, are part of history as far back as we go back in the past. Veracity has never been one of the political virtues, and lies have always been considered as a perfectly justified means in political affairs".

Precision: whenever the Machiavelian primacy of politics to ethics in no way implies a pure and simple disqualification of morality in itself. But Machiavel aims to show rather that politics is an autonomous field that is not rooted in morality, any more than it essentially drinks from the sources of morality. Machiavel thus cuts off the morality of the public domain and confines it to the private life of the Prince. This is what John Gottlieb Fichte already pointed out in a very illuminating commentary by Machiavel: "to the universal laws of morality; the Prince is bound in his private life of the Prince, and politics is a register of another order, in which the conduct of the Prince obeys, above all else, the imperatives of power rather than the virtue of the soul. This separation of politics and ethics is not without danger for the latter, which loses almost all its normativity in the face of political action. Of all that has just been said, it will be seen that beyond the mere description of what is, Machiavel laid the foundations for a primacy of politics at the expense of ethics, of which he is responsible here and there for justifying the practice. Machiavel's distinction between politics and ethics has allowed us to understand that politics is a game that has its own rules. Not concerned with value judgment, Machiavel upsets opinions, upsets tradition, and defies morality in what it usually establishes as definitive values. Even religion is not left in the shadow of its tranquility as revealed truth.

The goal that Machiavel assigns to all political activity is the conquest of power and its preservation. Everything seems to be subordinated to it. This is what one of these powerful ideas says, that we must use all the means necessary for these two ends. It is

³⁸Machiavel, N., *Op.cit.*, p.333

³⁹S.A. Citations du Président Mao Tsé-Toung, (le petit livre rouge), éd, Du seuil, Paris, s.a.p., p. 39.

La formulation apparait dans l'Asinaria ou Comédie des Anes comme suit : « lupus est homo homini, non homo, quom, qualis sit, non novit », c-à-dire « l'homme est un loup pour l'homme (et n'est plus homme) quand il ignore ce qu'il est ».

⁴⁰*Ibidem*.

⁴¹Maritain J., *Principe d'une politique humaniste*, N-Y., 1944, p. 176.

⁴²Nzege Alaziambina P., *Op.cit.*, p. 64.

⁴³Maritain J., *Idem*.

⁴⁴Freund, J., *Politique et impolitique*, Paris, 1987, p. 243

⁴⁵

to this end that the recourse to certain virtues and certain vices are not of less importance.

4. Conclusion

In this work, it was question of the political conception, the army and the war according to Marchiavel respectively. First of all, Machiavel is a political actor characterized by realism, his work "The Prince" is inspiring many malicious African political stakeholders. The latter conceives politics as a matter for the Prince and which must be at the service of power; otherwise the Prince must seek to conquer power and must do everything to preserve it for a long time. For this reason, Machiavel advocates and says that a Prince therefore strives to defeat and retain his power; the means will be considered honourable and praised by all. To this end, the means and ways implemented to stay in business and the means per excellence for the conservation of political power is the army. Thus, military service, i.e. weapons, is given a prominent place. The weapons that Machiavel considers laudable by our author are the auxiliary army. As for his conception of war, Machiavel said that it is the product of our passions, it is in itself, he says, a very good thing because it helps to unite a state and also to order it. But let us qualify by saying that those who do have a sense of patriotism and nationalism. It is, he continues to some extent, a rational response to the difficulties faced by some States when their individual egoisms are abandoned to themselves. It is neither the tradition according to which the office of the Prince is to defend his country that could justify all the wars that many African States and our country in particular are experiencing today, but it is also the fear of losing their position as Prince (of receiving honour, of thinking about the pleasure that this position gives to them) that drives most Princes to wage war.

The war in Africa and DRC in particular instead of causing population decline increases it on the other hand. This is the phenomenon of war in the east of the country of the DRC.

References

1. Machiavel N. Complete Works, Gallimard, 1952.
2. Aristote. Politics, Paris, the beautiful letters, volume I, 1971. File J.C. Machiavel writer.
3. Freund J. Political and impolitic, Paris, Sirey, 1984, 426p.
4. Hobbes T. Leviathan, Englend, 1651.
5. Kriegel, Text of Classical Political Philosophy, What do I know ?, Paris, PUF, 1993.
6. Maritain J. Principle of a humanist policy, N-Y, 1944.
7. Muyengo MS. Introduction to Bioethics, Kinshasa, Press University of the South, 1999.
8. Rousseau JJ. Social Contract, Paris, Flammarion, 1982.
9. SA. Quotation of the President Mao Tse Tung, Paris, ed. du Seuil, S.A.P.
10. S.A. Conclave of the Mont Amba of the congolese university, elections, peace and development in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (statement of the Congolese academics), publications of the Konrad Adenauer Foundation, Kinshasa, 2007.
11. Nzege AP. Intelligence and war. Essay on the Political Philosophy of Henri Bergson, PhD Thesis in Philosophy, UNAZA, Lubumbashi, 1980.

12. Mbambi MM. Moral and Political in Political Responsibility of the African Philosopher. Act of IX Scientific Week of Philosophy from June 20 to 23, 1993, Kinshasa, FCK, 1996.
13. Mbolokala IN. Advanced Questions of Ancient Philosophy, notes of Unpublished BSc Course, University of Kinshasa: Faculty of Letters, Department of Philosophy, 2001-2002.
14. Nzewe TC. The primacy of politics over morality: Essay analysis of understanding of "The Prince of N. Machiavel", BSc thesis, University of Kinshasa: Faculty of Letters, Department of Philosophy, 2001-2002.