to stop troublemakers from backsliding into civil disorder. At the same time, though, you are meant to be calming things down: your job is to create the ground rules for peace. You are supposed to be reliable as well as terrifying, familiar as well as remote, different from everyone else and yet no different from anyone else. (The power you have is made up of the power they would have if they hadn't handed it over to you.) You can't claim to be anyone special, certainly not hand-picked by God. You will be judged not by who you are but by what you do, but you can only do what you do because of who you are. It's a schizophrenic task. It's easy to see how it could make anyone a little crazy.

How to be bad and good at the same time is a fundamental challenge of modern politics. The bad is the threat of violence. The good is using it well, to make things better. But how can threats of violence make things better? Hobbes provided one answer. Another, different sort of answer comes from an earlier thinker, who is often identified as the true founder of modern politics. Machiavelli's *The Prince* was written in 1513, and it has haunted the Western political imagination ever since. If 'Hobbesian' has come to mean a violent free-for-all, 'Machiavellian' has come to mean the unscrupulous and devious pursuit of power for its own sake. Machiavelli is seen as the arch-exponent of what later became known as 'realpolitik': the idea that a political act is justified if it works to the advantage of the person who performs it. In these terms, it is easy to see how the threat of violence can do good: it just has to make you better off than the person on the receiving end. The blunt implication is that any other notion of 'good' is for losers.

'Machiavellian' in this sense is a caricature of Machiavelli, just as 'Hobbesian' is a caricature of Hobbes. Machiavelli was really a kind of moralist. However, the morality he had in mind was a distinctively political morality. He was satirising the idea of Christian virtue and the assumption that rulers should be in the business of justifying their rule in the eyes of God. Like Hobbes, he thought that politics had to be justified in its own terms. Unlike Hobbes, he saw the problem from the point of view of the people doing the ruling, not those being ruled. For Machiavelli, the job of ruling was to maintain your estate: that is, to preserve intact the domain over which your power runs. The purpose was not just survival; it was also glory. To master a domain is to be master of one's fate. It meant being alive to the role of chance in politics.

No ruler survives who discounts the unexpected hazards that can appear out of a clear blue sky. Danger can come from anywhere. Christian virtue is no protection against nasty surprises. If you turn the other cheek, you'll just get hit from the other side. A ruler must use his power to preserve it: divide his enemies, probe for weaknesses, seize the moment; lie, flatter and deceive if necessary; but always make sure that others are more afraid of what he can do to them than he is of what they can do to him. As Machiavelli famously said, it is better to be feared than to be loved. If you can manage to appear lovable while still being feared, that is even better.