

When his ethics were more concentrated on

[Media](#), [Television](#)



When we look at ancient times (back way to Greek philosopher Aristotle), politics was considered as a so-called branch of ethics.

Ethics is characterized by the moral behavior of people. We can define politics as "morality" of people when they are organized in social groups. Machiavelli however, was the precursor of a view that politics should be separated from the morality and treated as a separate "special" branch.

If we look at Machiavelli's "The Prince" it sorts of reminds me Sun Tzu's "Art of War". It has similar way of guiding and educating the reader, how war (or in this case politics and ruling of lands) should be done. While reading "The Prince" we can see that the author was not especially interested in ethics and morality. He is interested in efficiency, pragmatism and telling the reader (or the "Prince") how to stay in power and what to do not to lose it. I think that best summary of this would be a quote from Machiavelli himself "How we live is so different from how we ought to live that he who studies what ought to be done rather than what is done will learn the way to his downfall rather than to his preservation." Politics itself is a very "dirty business" and it's very hard to stay afloat once you are on top.

You have to "sail" through a very rough water all the time. There is no "golden remedy" for anything. One way or other someone (or many "someones") will be unhappy. And sometimes the group that will be unhappy, is the group that already is "on the bottom". Ethically, we should find compassion and sacrifice, but if there is no way to achieve it, and end game will benefit society as whole (or the larger group) that is usually the way to go. He knew that, when risky or tough decisions were made, the empathy,

morality and so called "Christina values" would have to be put on a "back burner".

He believed that those things may besigns of weakness, and this kind of weakness can put republic at risk. Hisethics were more concentrated on efficiency and preservation rather than Christianvalues and morality (probably that's why His book "The Prince" was on a churcheslist of banned books for a long time). We may not like what we readand are faced with, but in a long run (and probably deep down inside) that puresoul of power (even the democratic power) is the use of violence to protect it.

That is why we have so many wars that were fought in the name of "preservingour values and way of life". That's is not very ethical and not very "Christianlike", but it happens all the time and even though some groups protest, it isstill being done for the greater good. Of course, pure violence is never justified, and violencefor the sake of violence is bad (and Machiavelli is very clear about that). One of the best examples ofsuch a behavior is portrayed in my favorite TV series "Scandal". Our maincharacters are the ones "in power". President, his (and hers) advisors andfamous Chief of undercover Section B613 are the ones who have to face thereality of every day politics and touch (and most of the times very questionableform ethics points of view decision). Wecan have a sneak peak ' behind the curtain look" of how its done.

Assassinationsand manipulation are almost "daily bread" there. Very often we hate the decisionsthey make, but in the "big picture" it was for the good and sake of "therepublic". I think that politics shouldbe separated from this

“ lovey dovey, lets all love each other ethics”, but it should not be separated to far. Its goal should be to work for the greater good of people, and some decisions would be tough and “ cruel” to make (maybe that’s why lots of futuristic books deal with AI and some kind ruling by that. Computers have no morals and their decision are based on pure calculations and most beneficial outcome).

On a finishing note I would recommend reading Dan’s Brown “ Inferno”(not movie as ending is different to a book and they majorly damaged the whole idea). What was done there was hugely unethical and immoral, but when we really think about it, it was done for a greater good and sake of humanity (even though we hate it from a moral perspective). I think that this fictional book perfectly describes why ethics and politics “ don’t mix very well”.