MACHIAVELLI AND POP MANAGEMENT LITERATURE: THE WORLD OF UNCERTAINTIES AND INVITATION TO ORGANIZATIONAL FANTASIES

Luis Fernando Tosta Barbato

Instituto Federal do Triângulo Mineiro
Address: Highway 365-BR, Patos de Minas - MG - Brazil.
Zip Code: 38706-328
Phone: +55 (34) 3820-8700 Branch 8713

Mateus Henriques Patrício

Instituto Federal do Triângulo Mineiro
Address: Highway 365-BR, Patos de Minas - MG - Brazil.
Zip Code: 38706-328
Phone: +55 (34) 3820-8700 Branch 8713

"It would be most praiseworthy in a prince to exhibit all the above qualities that are considered as good; but because they can neither be entirely possessed nor observed, for human conditions do not permit it, it is necessary for him to be sufficiently prudent."

(Nicolau Maquiavel)

"Leaders should identify and meet the needs of their people, serve them."

(James C. Hunter)

ABSTRACT

This article aims to bring a comparative study of the work *The Prince*, by Niccolò Machiavelli, and The Servant: *a simple story about the true essence ofILeadership* by James C. Hunter, and understand how both books work the issue of leadership. From the analysis of the two works, we intend to show how the labor subject occupies a central place in discussions of modern society, and to show that, although the two works in question are apparently so antagonistic in their leadership concepts, there is a series of common objectives and strategies that help us better understand the corporate world.

Keywords: Leadership; Pop management; Machiavelli; Human resource management.

1. Introduction

The question of leadership has been an element of analysis and debate since ancient times in human history, and examples are diverse in this sense, such as Xenophon's quest in ancient Greece for the archetype of an ideal leader in his *Ciropedia*, or Sun Tzu's search the great general, able to lead his armies to glory, in his *The Art of War*, a treaty produced in ancient China.

If this quest for the ideal of perfect leadership runs through our entire history, it is no different today, with the growing development of capitalism, which has at its base precisely the question of productivity at optimized and maximized scales, the question of leadership also plays a prominent role in contemporary literature, with the management phenomenon, which emerged mainly in England and the United States in the 1980s, and whose objectives are the pursuit of managerialism, the cult of excellence and the culture of entrepreneurship, one of the main evidences of the importance of this theme in the present times (Wood Júnior & Paula, 2002).

In this sense, what we are looking at here is to deal with this question through the analysis of two works, which, at first, may seem somewhat antagonistic and contradictory: *The Prince*, by Niccolò Machiavelli, and *The Servant*, by James C. Hunter. The first, one of the most celebrated, controversial and studied books of all time, which brings the issue of leadership to governance regimes, and the second, one of the greatest editorial successes of recent times, which brings the issue of leadership focused on the administrative environment of business.

Mutatis mutandis, the two works have objectives that move towards a common sense, since, keeping their specific historical specificities and temporalities, which results in diverse political, social and economic universes, they seek to work on the question of regimes of leadership, whether applied to politics or to business management. Nevertheless, the two works trace the ideal leader in quite different ways, being the leader of Machiavelli marked by the hardness and rationality, in contrast to the leader of James C. Hunter, marked by the humanized and complacent posture.

In this way, through this article, we will try to understand, through a comparative analysis of the two works, the conceptions of leadership present in them, observing the points in which the two authors converge and diverge in relation to the subject, trying to understand how the current conceptions of leadership models behave towards such seemingly distinct models in seeing the leader-led relationship.

2. Work and the world of uncertainties

According to Zigmunt Bauman, we are experiencing a period marked by the "malaise of postmodernity", in which there is a new kind of uncertainty, which "comes from a kind of freedom to look for pleasure that tolerates too little an individual security" (Bauman, 1998, p.10). That is, in this postmodern world described by Bauman, in which pleasure and freedom holds sovereign dominion, people have the sensation of innumerable opportunities, easily arranged, thus fostering the allusion to great desires.

In this sense, while identities in the pre-modern world were related to fairly stable factors, such as religion, kinship, or community, the postmodern, capitalist world par excellence presented us with an environment in which personal identities are increasingly tied to labor relations, which, unlike the pre-modern bases, do not have stability, which results in a series of subjects scattered throughout society, who, although free, seek to establish their identities, are faced with the difficulties of establishing these bonds in a world in which such ties are increasingly scarce and ephemeral (Bauman, 1998).

In this world of uncertainties, marked by the rapid changes and ephemerality of relationships, people often see in work, and in the identity it provides, a port to settle their identity aspirations, which results in very specific relationships in work relations.

With the advancement of this social model, we are always under a thin layer of stability, and always running in search of a kind of "self-positioning" in such a dynamic and unstable environment. Thus, the search for ways to improve in a new global and competitive world, efficiency and effectiveness, good curriculum and the notion of "wearing the company shirt" are shown as ways to be situated in this environment, putting their hopes in work to find an element of identification that will put an end to this malaise that liberal, fluid, and unstable postmodernity has brought.

Moreover, in the midst of this situation, in which "talking about life is talking about work" (Sá, 2013, p.35), that is, in which personal identities are as intricate to the professional career, as Sá said: "it is impossible to think and discuss the subject today without taking the dimension of the work into account, because, directly or actively participating in the productive process, work transcends the subject of the way of being" (Sá, 2013, p.35). Consequently, work becomes for the individual a personal acquisition that perhaps affords sufficient stability for the attainment of self-realization, which goes far beyond the simple economic gains that a job provides but means its own full realization as a subject.

In this sense, leadership relationships gain importance, because it is from them that this long-sought stability is operationalized. Leading well, or being a good leader, are key issues to ensure that this momentary stability, which also results in a momentary identity, is not broken, which would mean a return to the unstable world of uncertainties that is foreign to that business environment .

And if being a good leader ensures stability, and becomes the object of desire, being a leader is even more sought after in this environment of which we are dealing, for, besides the stability we are referring to, it is also on the basis of the personal construction of the subject , thus ensuring the impression of a more solid, delimited and valued space in this world in which labor and social relations interpenetrate.

Starting from this dazzling position of leader, it is not surprising that the great flow of information and consumption of several manuals aimed at leading this common citizen, avid for stability and self-realization, the art of leading. In this sense, this worker/subject, a competitor in the labor market, wrapped up in his anguish due to uncertainties, and striving for prominent positions and stability, does not hesitate to seek various sources, often without rigor with content, in order to meet their desires.

Therefore, this worker/subject will consume from lectures with motivational discursive content, to books that promise a better knowledge of themselves for an improvement in their performance at work. And in this zeal for leadership, there is a whole literature willing to guide the steps to the supposed full realization that a leadership position can apparently provide.

There is, then, a complete flood of everything that aims to maximize performance at work. These books, videos, lectures and courses, often distant from the reality of labor relations, seek to build a better 'I', appeal to the emotional, transiting mainly between self-help literature, technique and esoteric beliefs. This literary lode, aimed at serving this audience, was called *pop management*, and is characterized by passing through various literary styles, covering a wide range of knowledge, at the same time that it is not configured as a well-demarcated area of knowledge, being restricted to the theoretical instance (Carvalho, Carvalho & Bezerra, 2010).

In the same way, *pop management* has become a space that cultivates certain ideal behaviors, driven by the interest of business elite groups such as flexibility, transparency, companionship and a often false and idealized market view in which, in most an idea of wanting is power. Therefore, this literature places the individual at the center of their own success, in an environment decent marked by freedom, and in which the responsibilities for their success or failure fall largely on themselves.

Among the contents that proliferate in these books and other means of communication, are summaries of theoretical approaches of administration distorted to a simple and minimalist vision, removing the less superficial difficulties and the need for macroeconomic understanding of the market, and are therefore distant of scientific and academic knowledge dedicated to the administration and management of people. However, these same works sell the impression of promoting some kind of theoretical and scientific information, when in fact, in most books framed within this category, an understanding is reproduced that lacks these academic elements, so much that it is directed to an audience that is often lay, or who knows little of the theories and academic knowledge of the area.

The consumption of this corporate literature also gains space in Brazilian universities, and is often even indicated to the students of the administration course, as demonstrated in a survey by José Luis Felicio Carvalho, Frederico Antonio Carvalho and Carol Bezerra (Carvalho et al., 2010), in which there was the widespread dissemination of this literature, often indicated by the teachers themselves, among future administrators.

In this same research, interesting data came to the fore: when instructed to classify certain passages read between esoteric literature, *pop management* or self-help, interviewees in the research often failed to perceive the clear characteristics of each text shown, failing to see "that, from the point of view of the readers, there are no significant perceptual differences between the *pop-management* literature, the self-help books and the esoteric books" (Carvalho et al., 2010, p.538). Another warning of the impact of this profusion of pop-management literature. From the previously mentioned points, we can see that this new reading of leadership appears in the reality lived as a great disseminator of concepts lacking solid foundations from the academic point of view.

In this way, we can infer that the competitive market and the world of insecurities and uncertainties that characterize this current moment attract the thirsty reader for the stability that a leading position provides. In this sea of uncertainty and infixity that postmodern freedom has brought with it, soft and positive discourses become highly consumable by a whole mass of workers/subjects in search of stability, thus indulging in fantasies of power, as if the responses to positioning themselves before the challenges of the labor market were only within themselves.

In order to understand this significant correlation of *pop management* discourses and the business world that surrounds us, with the recent motivations of the worker, we directed our study to a comparative analysis of two seemingly antagonistic works, intended to instruct those who aim to be leaders, or who intend to maintain leadership positions. In this way, we will analyze this question in the works, *The Prince*, by Niccolò Machiavelli, an old reference in the subject, and *The Servant*, by James. C. Hunter, a recent phenomenon in the literature of *pop management*.

The two works approach leadership in different, even antagonistic, ways (at first), and it is in their comparative analysis that we seek our reflections on the figure of the leader in the present times. In order to fulfill this premise, we will divide our analysis into the following steps: the reasons for the comparative study of the two works and why the study would make it possible to understand the above statements; the comparative analysis of *The Prince* and *The Servant* and Machiavelli educator: the Machiavellian discourse hidden in *The Servant*.

3. The reasons for the comparative study of the two works and why the study would make it possible to understand the above statements

Starting from the understanding of the evolution of business administrative theory and the way companies disseminate their image and cultivate the so-called organizational culture, which can be understood as the set of beliefs, values, norms and rituals adopted by a particular organization and shared by its members, there is a current tendency towards a more "human" treatment of the employee, leading, even, to the extinction of some jargon used in the first theories of the administration. For example, the statement by Jules Henri Fayol, one of the great names of administrative theory, that "the hierarchy is the series of bosses that goes from higher authority to inferior agents" (Fayol apud Batista, 2013, p.103) loses strength, and each time sounds more inappropriate.

 Nowadays, terms like "bosses" and "inferior agents" are loaded with a heavy semantic and social character, that is, it is not suitable for use in companies that want to transmit a more adequate organizational culture to these new times, in which they preach a more humanized people management. In this new context, "boss" conveys the impression of authoritarianism and the unwillingness to change, while the term "leader" suggests dynamism and ability to attain by influence rather than by order or a simple superior hierarchical position. Likewise, the term "inferior agents" falls into disuse and the term "collaborators" gains space.

These changes in the semantics for the treatment of these professionals in a hierarchical business order, which alludes to this new time in which the management of people should be based on humanization, can serve as the basis for a series of reflections and questions: the new discourses aim to give a humanized dress to everyday business. However, even these changes give rise to a series of questions, such as: how far has the semantic change of words accompanied reality? As much as these words suggest change and humanization in the business environment, have relations of domination actually followed these changes? Bosses have even become leaders, and inferior agents have even become collaborators, if so, are there palpable distinctions between terms? Throughout the text, we will use the comparison between the works of Machiavelli and Hunter to seek answers to these questions.

The technologization of discourse, that is, the substitution of terms in order to modify the dimension of domination, as leader by leader, it is apparent in the various books of the collection of literature in the so-called *pop-manegement*. *The Servant*, our great example, makes its intention clear to separate views on the "old" and "new paradigm", as is, in fact, a practice between works of this genre (Sá, 2013, p.84).

In this sense, the bipolarization of terms that highlight these reductionist distinctions and separations between the so-called "old" and "new" people management models, as Danielle Sá brings us, are extensively worked on such works as *The Servant*, or even in others of the genus. The conflictive and collective stance, and rejected in the name of the "old", while the humanitarian and individualistic stance is defended by alluding to these "new" models:

> The system of oppositions defines, on the one hand, the right and the good in the field of work, and on the other, the pole of otherness to be repudiated as outdated, inadequate or irrational. Among the "others" rejected, the worker who collectively negotiates with his employer (thus adopting a conflicting stance) and the union itself, less properly represented as a representative institution of the labor force, is distributed more or less visibly in the text and more as a hindrance to individualized and "peaceful" negotiation. Excluded from the texts are political militancy in the field of labor, as well as political movements of violent confrontation; the movements highlighted as a model are those that refer to the anti-colonial struggle (for example, in the mention of Ghandi), racial (mentioning Martin Luther King), and others notoriously pacifistic in orientation such as Mother Teresa of Calcutta (Sá, 2014, p.84-5).

Therefore, it is notable that the leader model advocated and idealized by Hunter is far removed from the archetype associated with the old, then outmoded leadership model. The outstanding paradigm polarizes dichotomically in relation to the paradigm overcome, marked by a weaker, less productive and inefficient style of leadership. The question remains: does this model advocated by Hunter and by many other authors of *pop-management* really mark a break in leadership styles and in the relationships between senior managers in the business hierarchy and their subordinates? Are these relationships, constructed and developed within a remarkably hierarchical system, now, in fact, guided by a tendency in which leaders are servants and humanized?

The deeper analysis, unrelated to the marketing-editorial fantasies of *pop-management*, shows that we must at least question, and even doubt, the veracity of this ideal leader sold by business-oriented *pop* literature, as in the case of *The Servant*.

The perception of a forced estrangement from the past, the technologization of discourse, added to the ideological force that the new spirit of capitalism needs, among other dubious forms of later investigated reality judgments, led us to turn our gaze to Machiavelli, a Florentine thinker of the turn of the fifteenth to the sixteenth century, in the quest for answers to the questions we have just brought up. In order to approach real politics, to pursue the actual truth of things, as expressed, Machiavelli breaks with a millenarian look based on Christian ethics and morals to conceptualize a leader, and ends up drawing a profile that is very different from the humanized leader of Hunter, since, when necessary, the Machiavellian leader uses his strength and the fear that is inherent to him to guarantee its maintenance in power.

Machiavelli emphasizes seeking to be lucid in his human understanding, since he understands man himself as a being one who longs for power. In this way, the Machiavellian or Machiavellian leader, as the new literature prefers to use (Bagno, 2008), will serve us to understand these human desires and their relationship to power. And even if there is a cruel and cold side to these leadership relations, which Machiavelli's work reveals in some of his observations, the work remains quite current, since it was thought and written based on the search for an understanding of human reality, which often escapes the idealizations and fantasies that *pop management* preaches, serving us as a very interesting counterpoint to problematize the question.

Thus, no matter how much *The Prince*, and the Machiavellian work in general, bring controversial passages, since it does not deny that a leader must be hard and use his power and the fear he arouses in his subordinates to guarantee his desires and maintain his position, there is no denying that this is an essential and useful work for those who want to understand better the relations of power, and especially for those who want power and seek its maintenance, as the author himself makes clear: "My intention is to write a useful thing to those who are interested, it seemed to me more convenient to search for the actual truth of things than what one imagined about it" (Maquiavel, 1999, p.91).

The comparison of *The Servant* and *The Prince* shows different proposals of the way to lead, although both converge towards the same point, since the first is based on agape love, in which leadership is a style copied from Jesus" (Hunter, 2004, p.65), which enables the leader to serve those he leads and meet their needs. Already in the classic Machiavellian thought of commanding, the leader must know how to use actions that are far from this Christian goodness, and proof of this is that the Florentine thinker goes so far as to say that "it is much safer to be feared than loved" (Maquiavel, 1999, p.137).

In this comparative view of two such antagonistic works in conceiving the ideal leader, their critical reading enables us to question whether the real influence of the work of pop management, and its concept of

leadership, is based on the "effective truth of things" in the real search for a people management model that in fact is applicable and results in organizations, or if it is only a discourse of discipline and massification for those who seek positions of influence in the professional world.

In addition, the rescue of a text from 1513, considered one of the great milestones of political science, put forth face to face with a supposed new way of leading that has conquered great spaces in the editorial, organizational and even university market, can help us to better understand this postmodern world and the place that the work and the worker occupy in it. The Prince, compared to this "servant leadership", can still reveal to us in what Machiavellism has endured, in what has been surpassed and in what it still instigates. Through comparative analysis, we can understand the two forms of leadership proposed, their convergences and divergences. Moreover, the comparative study of these two universes may serve as a tool for understanding the labor and personal space in which individuals in this postmodern world, lacking the foundation of identity fixation, live and support their expectations.

4. Comparative analysis of The Prince and The Servant

The Servant, launched in 1998 by business consultant James C. Hunter, whose full title *The Servant: a Simple Story About the True Essence of Leadership*, is divided into seven chapters - these being: the definitions; The old Paradigm; The model; The verb; The environment; The choice; and The reward; as well as the Prologue and Epilogue - that lead us through the story of John, a family man married for 18 years, skeptical and proud of having conquered the management of an important "flat glass factory with more than 500 employees and more than 100 million dollars in annual sales" (Hunter, 2004 p.11).

At the beginning of the narrative, this, the central character of the work, has been going through delicate moments in his personal life. Soon in the Prologue of the work John affirms to notice that his family is being unstructured: his son manifested rebellion with respect to the orders of the parents, the daughter was more distant from him and the wife, who distressed by the situation, was dissatisfied. In these moments of personal difficulties, there is still a union movement in the factory that leaves him to the point of saying: "My job, the **only** area of my life where I felt safe and successful, was also undergoing a change" (Hunter, 2004 p.13).[1]

All these professional and personal difficulties end up designing a very palpable character in our times: one who has abdicated personal pleasures and cares for the family in the name of professional obligations, and which at a certain point is observed in a situation of extreme fragility, perceived as impotent in both spheres. In this sense, the persuasion of the text consists in showing the redemption of this so common character, through a journey of spiritual growth, that will eventually bring positive consequences also in his personal development, mainly as a leader, that was the function that was within him of this corporate universe of which he was a part.

This journey of the main character will concomitantly lead to the "evolution" of three abilities, which are the ability to deal with oneself, spirituality and leadership. From the first lines of the book it is clear the existence of a relationship between self-government, the unique characteristics directly linked to interpersonal development and leadership, emphasizing that there is a close relationship of achieving your true self with an efficient performance in organizations. Therefore, from the beginning of the work, the notion that the professional subject and the personal subject are mixed, confirms the idea of a personal identity increasingly marked by professional identity, as we have discussed previously.

---

[1] Emphasis added.

In fact, John's search does not seem to be far removed from the search for the postmodern man: the discomfort caused by the insecurity of his surroundings and the position of leader signifying the solution to individual problems seem to resemble the generalization of sensations, the target audience (in this case, people connected to the corporate world) is reached daily. Empathy with the character is easy, we may say, even instantaneous, making the reader welcome the ideas that will come in the following chapters, since John arises as the archetype of this standard postmodern corporate man, being observable, if not in the own lives of their readers, in the lives of people close to them.

Hunter's simple and engaging language conquers the reader and presents it in an intensely abridged way to a bipolarization, as we have already said, of an old and outdated thought opposed to a new and functional thinking in these leadership relations, ignoring the difficulties of understanding of the Fordist and post-Fordist era, and feeding the diffusion of certain ideals such as flexibility, commitment to the company and continuous adaptation, which, directly or indirectly, intervenes in the behavior of those who adopt these elements, making them more susceptible to obedience and manipulation. In this sense, as Danielle Sá has brought us, "Hunter's book is marked as one of those artifacts produced by the current culture of managerialism, which discloses pasteurized notions about administrative methods, in a prescriptive and ideological language" (Sá, 2013, p.33).

Continuing the narrative, on his quest for peace and balance, John meets Monk Simeon, a former successful businessman named Len Hoffman, whose career is admirable for his ability to lead, and who had abandoned business to live alone in a monastery. The teachings of Simeon are formulated in the course of dialogues with interested visitors of his calm spiritual corner, which occur in systematic meetings, in which the subjects on the relationship with the people are approached, being that the product of these lead to the formulation of the idea defended by the book: the serving leadership.

The monk's proposal is to change the classical way of seeing relationships within corporations, thus distancing himself from an authoritarian boss, so that one uses influence (which turns out to have a sense of authority) as "ability to lead people to do willingly what they want because of their personal influence" (Hunter, 2004, p.29).

In this way, the monk of the title of the work brings a whole new way of leading which brings authority as something distinct from the old standard, since it was based on fear. For Simeon, authority must be exercised by influence, which is only achieved if the leader is concerned with precepts and characteristics that collaborate in establishing this relationship, such as honesty, reliability, caring for others, commitment, ability to listen, positivity (...) and finally, a series of characteristics necessary for the leader, through the empathy exercised over his subordinates, to exercise effective leadership, even though he is far from that old authoritarian model of boss of the past.

In addition, one of the premises of server thinking is to identify the real needs of employees, to recognize what is fundamental in their desires, and thus to provide instruments that lead to their well-being, since, accomplished, these collaborators will be made available with greater tools in order to work collectively, which is essential for the regular functioning of organizations. Simeon's justification for these attitudes, on the part of these leaders, is the study of the hierarchy of human needs (in which the needs of all workers are consequently framed), and in which an order based on physiological needs is pointed out, travels through security, love, relationships (included here is the desire for belonging, love, and acceptance), esteem, until arriving at self-realization.

Servant leadership, as advocated by Simeon, would provide the means to walk the path of the pyramid developed by the psychologist Abraham Maslow, which ends in personal conquest (Hunter, 2004). In this way, the one that supports these values will allow the increase of his followers in the individual aspects along with the improvement in the professional performance in functions performed.

The basic sentiment that sustains all the action of the leader, according to the author's thought, is Agape love, which means universal love: "unconditional love, based on behavior with others, without demanding anything in return" (Hunter, 2004, p.79). The persistence of the original idea for this thought, dialoguing on the question of love and leadership, discussed in chapter four, makes one of the participants reflect with himself: "Agape love and leadership are synonyms" (Hunter, 2004, p.81). What stands out is Hunter's convictions spelled out in *The Servant*, who preach a new kind of leadership, based on the love and humanization of the leaders.

This essence of leadership, promoted by Hunter, aims to rescue the ancient thought of Jesus Christ and his preaching about love, now inserted in a context of people management. In this perspective, the relation between the style of leadership championed by Hunter, compared to that defended by Machiavelli, makes the relation between the premises of the two authors even more interesting, and the comparisons between *The Prince* and *The Servant* even more and to resume the work and the very figure of the Florentine intellectual becomes important for us to conduct our reflection.

During the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, when Machiavelli lived, Florence, one of several small principalities located in the Italian peninsula, had an economy focused on workshops specialized in wool and silk, which favored the development of an accumulation of capital and served as the basis for the formation of a business banking system. In this context, marked by the movement known as the Cultural Renaissance, the medieval theocentric conception begins to lose more force among the intellectuals, and Classical Antiquity is revalued among artists and thinkers, who begin to look at these models, which helps us to explain certain positions of Machiavelli and his willingness to write a work based on the real, the man, as he himself makes clear.

In this sense, his *Magnum Opus, The Prince*, keeps away from the popular prince mirrors of the time[2], since it brings the originality of the domain of political philosophy in its elaboration, mainly by the distance of the councils based on the good conduct of the time, based mainly on a religious position, of a Christian nature.

His words make the pragmatic meaning of his intention clear, since he proposes to "write something useful to those who understand it", which results in the distancing of utopian ideas from religious bases, as it is clear to criticize the prince mirrors of the time, in which "many imagined republics and principalities that were never seen" (Maquiavel, 1999, p.91).

Drawing on this rhetoric, and based on a supposedly real and pragmatic ideal, Machiavelli uses some argumentative methods to support the teachings he intends to pass, because, as Cortina brings us, "the Machiavellian text intends to convince its recipient that it is presenting the best way to conquer and maintain the political power of a state"(Cortina, 1995, p.94).

Among these arguments, we will briefly raise three of them, the first being the historical illustrations, followed by the model and finally the analogy. On the first, there are a series of comparisons between the actions of Classical Antiquity with his time, as the following section of Cortina, helps us to better

---

[2] The mirrors of princes were a very common literary genre in Medieval Europe and early Modern Europe, and had as their purpose to serve as a manual for good governance, since they brought the practices and actions that would lead the kings, princes and any other rulers to become the perfect rulers, especially in the eyes of God (Hahn, 2008).

understand: "initially an affirmation is made, and then the enunciator presents a fact that occurred during the period of Classical Antiquity and another during his time, which serves to confirm the truth content of the rule he enunciated"(Cortina, 1995, p.101).

Regarding the second, it is the establishment of a model of attitudes to be followed, which emphasizes this character of a governance manual present in the mirrors of prince, which is notoriously found in Chapter VII of *The Prince*. In this sense, once again Cortina's words help us to better understand the question: "the enunciator uses the figure of Caesar Borgia (...) to build the model of the ideal prince, able to more effectively fulfill its purpose of conquest and maintenance of power in one State"(Cortina, 1995, p.102).

With respect to the third rhetorical aspect, the use of analogies in the writer's text is noteworthy, which, "besides allowing the conveyance of a thought, draws attention to the linguistic expression through which it is manifested" (Cortina, 1995, p.104).

Another point to emphasize, entering a little more in the philosophical conceptions of Machiavelli, is about the concepts of Virtue and Fortune, highly present in *The Prince*. Virtue is the prince's primary quality, is the capacity for decision in the course of action, similar to the Greek concept of phronesis (wisdom). Fortune is the uncontrollable, close to luck and causal adversity, and which demands an exaggerated virtue on the part of the rulers to be circumvented.

Thus, there is room to speak directly of the Machiavellian "leader", who, as he claims and intends, would be able to unify Italy. For Machiavellianism, the prince (we can do the parallel here as a leader, which facilitates our analysis) must look at history and draw from it the support of its decisions[3], as is clear in the following passages: "if it is true that history is master of our acts, it would not be bad for those who should punish and judge (...) to take as a model and imitate those who owned the world 'because' the world has always been inhabited in a way by men who always have Passions"(Maquiavel, 1999 p.165).

Notorious in his teachings on governance and leadership (which makes possible his approach to management), what happened was the banalization of the expression "Machiavellian", attributing to Machiavelli a kind of "virtualization" of evil, these positions, in the largest sometimes unfounded. Several are the passages that revolve around the evil for Machiavelli and explain the reason of knowing how to act with evil, in the case of the prince. In chapter VIII, for example, the Florentine writer argues in favor of well-used cruelty and warns of the evil employed, and states that the way cruelty acts are (good or bad) employees are directly related to the success of preserving power.

 In this sense, Machiavelli, writing "so it is necessary that a prince learns to be evil in order to be preserved, and whether or not he should use it according to need" (Maquiavel, 1999, p.99). Of actions is based on how opportune it is to be bad for the prince[4], and so this attitude is acceptable when it comes to staying in power, which marks the rupture with an old structure of councils for the ruler, which instructed them to reach the position of effective wisdom, in the circumstances in which the choice was near. Within this Christian context in which the ancient mirrors of prince were enveloped, to be evil as necessary to remain in power becomes a virtue that until today arouses controversies, hence many people associate the author with something negative.

---

[3] As Marcos Antonio Lopes points out, the mirrors of princes can be framed within the perspective of Historia Magistra Vitae (Master History of life), on a smaller and more objective scale (Lopes, 2004, p.67).

[4] In Machiavelli's work, as we well know, what pragmatism is worth, in this way, when we affirm that Machiavelli stands for "how opportune being" we mean that for Machiavelli it is more important to appear to be than in fact to be, The prince must take advantage of the conditions of the situations he faces. Thus, if in that particular situation, the most intelligent thing to do is "to be" good, the prince ought to "be"; When it is sensible to act as a religious person, it should "to be", as well as when the need says that it must "be" evil. Therefore, the value of actions is not only based on how timely it is to be bad, but on how timely it is to adapt to each of the situations and challenges that arise, whatever they may be, and shape oneself according to what is more appropriate to that situation, not necessarily bad.

This Machiavellian proposition, contrary to what can be precipitously induced, does not preach the continuous action of evil. Since, according to Machiavelli, evil is indispensable in situations in which there are games of power, as a political means, in this case. In this way, for one who intends to perform the deeds of a virtuous leader, one must become aware of evil, knowing that its use is inevitable, in this way, it will transit between "being glorious" and "being bad" according to the situation in which the regent is. Thus, Machiavellian is to know that "even if it is not possible to give the title of a valorous act to the killing of fellow citizens, to betrayal of friends, or to lack of faith, piety and religion, with all this, <u>power is gained</u>."[5] From this point of view, we can note that according to Machiavelli, the use of these means on what could be considered wickedness, or at least what escapes the standards of Christian ethics, may be quite wise on the part of the ones who want to keep themselves in power. However, the Florentine thinker then warns that "while crime may conquer an empire, it does not gain glory" (Maquiavel, 1999, p.68), making it clear that evil should not be the way to go, and should be used with parsimony and wisdom.

The leader, guided by values such as the one that James C. Hunter preaches, has a specific characteristic that very much communicates with one of the bases of the set of imperatives present in the Machiavellian prince, and that rests in the intention to enter in the content on the symbolism. In this way, Chapter XVIII expresses, quite clearly, the prince's position in knowing how to enjoy the means at his disposal as a good thing, and thus, similarly, one of his rhetorical resources, is explained in two animal archetypes: to be a fox to know the traps, and a lion to frighten the wolves" (Maquiavel, 1999, p.110).

Two useful forces are thus displayed for the arsenal of a perceptive leader: the intelligence and rapacity symbolized in the fox, and the more direct and violent forces of action found in the figure of the lion. Thus, the Machiavellian leader, in order to gain the confidence of those who are governed, needs to be seen by the people as an image worthy of trust, and it is in this aspect that the fox figure appears as appropriate to be copied.

Machiavelli deviates from instructing the pursuit of the virtues, yet for him it is certain that "it is not necessary for the prince to have all the qualities mentioned; it suffices that it appears to possess them" (Maquiavel, 1999, p.111). As the author himself tells us, "men tend to judge more by the eyes than by the hands", then "he must (prince) cause his acts to be recognized as greatness" (Maquiavel, 1999, p.113)

The preoccupation with the boy's fox thinking is clear, in the sense that the ruler uses his own cleverness to shape his image before his ruled ones, being necessary to know the best ways to go, the best ways to appear. In this way, within Machiavelli's conception, a leader must be attentive to his environment, to meet certain desires of those who see him: sometimes bearing goodness, sometimes religiosity, sometimes care, sometimes blindness, or in another case a leader as what John becomes at the end of his experience, after all, it was the leader the subordinates wanted to see.

A final reflection can be made on how the prince relates, more precisely, how he sees his subjects.[6] In this sense, some questions belong to The Prince, from the reading of the work: should attention be given to the people?

It is important to keep in mind the fact that Machiavelli has already set out the search for critical analysis and not to misrepresent the author, that Machiavelli guideth his choices in the convenience and situational advantages of the prince, and so he concludes that the population deserves attention. The following explains why, in three different reasons.

---

[5] Emphasis added.
[6] In an analogy in which, as we have already said before, the prince can be understood as a leader and the subjects as those led.

Of course, if the symbolic factor is necessary for a despot to sustain itself, as has been shown previously, it is also important to emphasize the importance of the people within this power play as one of the points to investigate symbolic constructions. That is, to symbolize something, we must know what deserves to be symbolized, and it is in the subjects in which we find part of the answer.

In chapter IX, in the midst of a reflection on the principality, it is argued that it is instituted either with the support of the people or the great ones, and they do not wish to be oppressed, while the latter yearn for oppressing, therefore, to please the people is easier, since he has a more honest purpose, being easier to fulfill his desires, since those desires are based only on not being oppressed. In addition, it says there is no security for the leader who does not like the majority, and after analyzing the circumstances of what supports are most valuable, raises two precious observations. In this way, Machiavelli concludes:

> He who makes himself prince for the favor of the people must remain his friend, which offers no difficulties, because he wants simply to not receive oppression. But he who ascends to the principality against the will of the people, by favor of the powerful, must, first and foremost, conquer the people (Maquiavel, 1999, p.75).

Machiavelli then goes on to show how important it is for a ruler to heed the people's wishes, showing that although Machiavelli figures in common sense mainly as an author who despises the wills of the subordinates, he actually brings this good relationship between ruler and governed as one of the keys to the success of the prince, as it is clear in the excerpt below: "only that, to a prince, it is necessary that the people devote friendship; otherwise, he will fail in adversities" (Maquiavel, 1999, p.75).

Moreover, in chapter XIX, reserved to address the ways of avoiding being despised and hated, precisely by his subordinates, Machiavelli says it is fundamental for the leader to distance himself from being seen as frivolous and cowardly, as the navigator dodges cliffs. By the express way, there is no reason to be afraid of conspiracies if you have a friendly people, for, since threats can come only internally or externally, good weapons will protect you from abroad, while good relations with subordinates protect the leaders from inner danger: "thus, I conclude by stating that a prince should care little for the conspiracies if he is loved by the people; When, however, they are his enemies and hate him, he must fear everything and everyone" (Maquiavel, 1999, p.115).

Thus, having addressed the role of those in the above, there is no doubt that the people and their needs are of the utmost importance in Machiavelli's conception, which shows that his perceptions of leadership are not so far removed from those preached by Hunter. In both the leadership is shown as important, and conquering it is fundamental, what changes is the way to act on certain occasions.

Still in the same chapter, the Florentine thinker writes this phrase to summarize well what he has hitherto discussed in the text, and to summarize also the identification of the relation between leader and possible leader in the whole work: well-organized states and prudent princes have always been concerned not to reduce the great to despair and to satisfy the people, for that is one of the most important things a prince should have in mind" (Maquiavel, 1999, p.115-6).

5. Machiavelli educator: *The Servant* travesty the Machiavellian speech

We can understand *The Servant* as one of several valuable works in the current productive system, since it brings the idea that "a new social contract, based on commitment and participation, was established between the management body and the employees" (Wood Júnior & Paula, 2002, p.44). In addition, the existence of this type of literature brings together norms, rituals, and patterns that often refer to the symbolic universe and help to exercise behavioral control and the rules of conduct of the employees (Wood Júnior & Paula, 2002, p.44).

Moreover, the way these writings present themselves, in addition to the content they convey, invites the employee to a fantasy of seeking leadership and self-improvement. The abandonment of the classic administrative view, referring to it as obtuse and bad, generalized and intensified the personal search for leadership prominence, but "management positions remained unavailable to the majority, but explicit oppression lost ground and the employees were invited to participate in the power fantasies of management" (Wood Júnior & Paula, 2002, p.44).

In this way, the fantasy sold by these works of so-called *pop management*, and consumed with dedication by those participants in corporate hierarchies, rests on thinking that business failure is more linked to how you understand yourself than how the market articulates, transforming into "the macro-structural conflicts between capital and labor" (Sá, 2013, p.90), from which Hunter's work is not absent, and can be seen in the following excerpt: "healthy families, healthy teams, healthy churches, healthy businesses, and even healthy lives speaking of healthy relationships. Truly great leaders have this ability to build healthy relationships" (Hunter, 2004, p.38).

In this sense, Hunter's work helps bring a universe that can be considered immersed in this fantasy world we are dealing with, in which successes and failures that seem to depend solely on the person himself and his ways of acting, forgetting that there is a whole network of elements that are closely linked to these issues. Hunter forgets, or at least minimizes, what Machiavelli has called a fortune, and along with the virtues of the leader, are at the basis of leadership relations. In this sense, our ideas converge with those present in the following section, by Danielle Sá:

> Hunter's text effectively suppresses the dynamics of power, that is, it hides the fact that the exercise of professional activities, whether in command or subaltern positions, involves the dependence of resources and facilities that are unequally distributed among social actors. The servant leadership discourse reduces such inequality among social actors through various mechanisms (Sá, 2013, p.90).

The creation of a business plan for a better, even playful, world encourages individuals to project their fantasies of power into the organization (Wood Junior &Paula, 2002, p.44). In this sense, as we have shown, the world designed by James C. Hunter is hardly seen in the real world, yet it cannot be exempted from being linked to it, since it serves a whole productive logic that increases employee productivity and consequently the gains of corporations, which emphasizes that, even starting from essentially fantastical premises, *The Servant* and the reading of pop management, in general, cannot be ignored as mere literature to be discarded.

In this way, starting from the implicit viewpoint of this ideal present in *The Servant*, and in other works of its editorial universe, knowing the employee's desires and covering the feelings company can be understood as a strategy of maximizing profits, a Since Hunter's vision brings a way of seeing the company as a space for personal self-realization of its employees, not just professional. Thus, since personal satisfaction shows itself to be closely linked to professional achievement, in Hunter's universe presented in *The Servant*, personal fulfillment must be accompanied by professional achievement, which is to meet the productive interests of the companies.

We must resort to Machiavelli once again, since, in seeking this benevolent and happy leader, and especially productive, we cannot ignore also that, even within this view of Hunter's "servant leader", there is still a fund of exploitation and manipulation of those led, in order to achieve specific goals, which in the case, would be the smooth running of a company and therefore the growth of its profits.

In this sense, Hunter's leader is not too far from Machiavelli's leader, since both use strategies (and manipulation) to stay in power. Whether it is Hunter's loving leader, or Machiavelli's cold and rational leader, they both have very similar goals, and they do not refrain from using their subordinates/employees to reach them. The following passage from Machiavelli helps us to better understand this question: "thus, I conclude, stating that a prince should not care about the conspiracies, if he is loved by the people (...) well-organized states and prudent princes have always been concerned not to reduce the great to despair and to satisfy the people, for that is one of the most important things a prince should have in mind"(Maquiavel, 1999, p.115-6).

When we think of a company that adopts the philosophy of loving its employees, we can, after a deeper analysis, realize that in the end, that matters little. In fact, what she seeks is more productive employees. The speech of love is the key to this, to be used. In this sense, love, at least within this corporate branch, can be understood much more as a strategy of maintaining an order than altruism and benevolence. From these relationships, we can see that the idealized leaders of Hunter and Machiavelli, so distant in time and in their representations, deep down are not leaders so distant from each other in their conceptions, for both seek to remain in power, each by means of the weapons that they find most appropriate, each according to the demands of their time.

The Servant allows the insertion of the leaders in a fictitious relationship, in which the leader becomes a symbol of romanticizing, representing the will of the employees to achieve in the work their personal well-being and simultaneously the professional. As Machiavelli brings us, "it is not necessary for the prince to have all the qualities mentioned; (Maquiavel, 1999, p.11), this is the essence of the leader servant, using jargon, and acting so that the company is reviewed as having desirable qualities, hyperbolizing the relations of human affection, but also concealing the constant division of power between company-employee, which precludes a genuine mode of management based on Agape love, at least in its essence.

A deep connection is then formed between employee and company, which turns the organization into an entity in which the employee devotes his power to act, and who consecrates this enterprise as a part of himself, as an essential part of his own essence as a subject. In this universe, therefore, the company, through a discourse based on love and generosity with its employees, and headed by a leader who symbolizes that and who manipulates these employees to a very mundane end based on power and profit, The center of a range of desires, aspirations and interests.

So the company becomes necessary, and Hunter's speech helps to evidence this, which shows that he is not too far from what Machiavelli's book advocates: "it is concluded, then, that a prudent prince must think in ways that he is necessary to the subjects, always, and that they need the State; Then they will always be loyal to him" (Maquiavel, 1999, p.76).

From the moment that the employee sees his personal life as intricate to the company in which he works, whose personal desires and social life are equivalent to the professional world lived, not only does the employee feel love, but also feels the fear, because his employment has already become a precious and too essential commodity to be lost, so even within this discourse based on employee well-being, there is a whole strategy of hidden power, since it makes this employee very dependent on these organizations, which justifies conduct, in addition to being productive, loyal.

Losing employment in this sense means losing much more than a source of income, but losing all identity and stability in this fluid and intense postmodern world, so that employment becomes too valuable to be put at risk, and adapting to the conduits ends up being necessary to guarantee this longing for social and identity stability.

The questioning of Machiavellianism, "is it better to be loved than to be feared?", in this way, can be seen to be related to that distant (but paradoxically very real) world proposed by Hunter, since, however much the discourse whether it is of love, fear is not absent, one of the necessary bases, according to Machiavelli, for the power of a prince. "It will be said that one would prefer to be one and the other; but as it is difficult to unite at one and the same time the qualities that promote those results, it is much safer to be feared than loved." (Maquiavel, 1999, p.106). Moreover, as Machiavelli himself brings us, "a wise prince, loving men as they wish them to be loved, and being feared by men as he desires to be feared, must be based on that which is his own, not on others. In short, he should only seek to avoid being hated" (Maquiavel, 1999, p.108).

The words that come out of the mouth of the Simeon character seem to rephrase the typical Machiavellian premise, for it is extremely important to become loved by the "people" (here in an allusion to subordinate officials) and hide the consequent and inherent fear of organizations adopting organizational culture and the leadership model suggested.

The following logic is thus obtained: Hunter's leader centralizes in himself all the positive visions and fanciful desires of the employee; the evils and the possibility of suffering them that arise in the life of the collaborator, in the opposite way, are hidden, or even the cause is distorted by the demands of the market, or even more, by the mistakes of the leader himself, who makes them the main culprit for their failures, as if the external agents should be excluded or minimized.

Thus, from the perspective of one who occupies a subordinate function, for example, professional achievements, reaching a higher position in the organizational hierarchy, or a salary increase are received as a result of the good return rewarded by the company. Therefore, even if these promotions have advantages, they also reflect this hidden perspective present in *The Servant* of which we have spoken, which binds the worker to the company, precisely because it shows itself as benevolent towards its employees, too precious to be put at risk.

6. Conclusion

We conclude, then, that the ideas in *The Servant*, which preaches a model of leadership based on love, are not so different from the ideas proposed by the seemingly antagonistic *The Prince*, who advocates a leadership model based on reason and in coldness, both serve as a guide to how leaders of companies or states should be, and how they should behave in order to maintain their power and control their leaders, extracting from them all the support that justifies their legitimacy in power, at the same time as they advocate the use of strategies for this, whether based on love or fear, but designed to achieve this common goal.

However, the distances in time and space between the two authors helped to obfuscate these similarities, which, basically, after going through a deeper and more accurate analysis, show themselves quite convergent in the objectives, changing only the strategies used to reach them. If today's world preaches that by being a charismatic, benevolent, and servant leader, that leader will gain greater control over his employees, and will maximize the profits of his corporation, and better secure his own retention in power, so they should do it, Machiavelli would probably say.

REFERENCES

1. Bagno, S. (2008). "Maquiavélico" versus "maquiaveliano" na língua e nos dicionários. *Cadernos de Tradução*, *2*(22),129-50.

2. Batista, F. R. B. (2013). *Do comandar ao servir: noções de poder nos discursos sobre liderança* (tese). Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Recife, Brasil.

3. Bauman, Z. (1998). *O mal-estar da pós-modernidade*. Rio de Janeiro, Brasil: Jorge Zahar Editor.

4. Carvalho, J. L. F., Carvalho, F. A., e Bezerra, C. (2010). O monge, o executivo e o estudante ludibriado: uma análise empírica sobre leitura eficaz entre alunos de administração. *Cadernos EBAPE. BR*, *8*(3),535-49.

5. Cortina, A. (1995). As condições históricas de produção de O Príncipe de Maquiavel e sua organização discursiva. *Alfa*, *3,:*87-109.

6. Hahn, F. A. (4 de novembro de 2008). *Espelhos de Príncipes*: considerações sobre o gênero. *História e-história*. Recuperado de http://www.historiahistoria.com.br/materia.cfm?tb=alunos&id=134

7. Hunter, J. C. *O Monge e o Executivo* (2004)*.* Rio de Janeiro, Brasil: Sextante.

8. Lopes, M. A. (2004). *Voltaire Político: espelhos para príncipes de um novo tempo*. São Paulo, Brasil: Unesp.

9. Maquiavel, N. (1999). *Maquiavel-Vida e Obra II*. São Paulo, Brasil: Nova Cultura.

10. Sá, D. R. (2013). *Autoajuda, trabalho e novas subjetividades em tempos de incerteza: análise do discurso de o monge e o executivo e seja líder de si mesmo* (mestrado). Universidade Federal do Ceará, Fortaleza, Brasil.

11. Wood Júnior, T., Paula, A. P. P. (2002). PoP-Management: contos de paixão, lucro e poder. *Organizações & Sociedade, 9*(24),39-51.