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ABSTRACT

Objective: To examine Schmitt's influence on the Machiavellian ethos, leading it to a more extreme and radical conception, in which politics focuses on the struggle between friends and enemies, in which war and violence are fundamental elements to achieve power and authority.

Methodology: In this sense, a critical review of Schmitt's influence on contemporary political pragmatism is made, considering the challenges facing twenty-first century democracy in terms of the defense of human rights and the inclusion of minorities.

Results and discussion: It is highlighted how this conception of Schmitt distances itself from the democratic tradition and human rights, putting at risk the fundamental values of society. While Schmitt’s work represents an important contribution to political thought, his conception of politics based on violence and exclusion is not compatible with democracy and the universal values of humanity.

Conclusion: It is necessary to adopt a critical and reflective stance in the face of Schmitt's influence on political pragmatism, and to seek alternatives that allow the strengthening of democracy and respect for human rights in the current context.

Research implications: Currently, the ethos of contemporary political theory focuses on interdisciplinarity, inclusion, and diversity.
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CARL SCHMITT, APROFUNDANDO O ETHOS PRAGMÁTICO NA TRADIÇÃO MAQUIAVÉLICA DO SÉCULO XX

RESUMO

Objetivo: Examinar a influência de Schmitt no ethos maquiavélico, levando-o a uma concepção mais extrema e radical, na qual a política se concentra na luta entre amigos e inimigos, na qual a guerra e a violência são elementos fundamentais para alcançar poder e autoridade.

Metodologia: Neste sentido, uma revisão crítica da influência de Schmitt no pragmatismo político contemporâneo é feita, considerando os desafios enfrentados pela democracia do século XXI em termos de defesa dos direitos humanos e a inclusão de minorias.

Resultados e discussão: destaca-se como essa concepção de Schmitt se distancia da tradição democrática e dos direitos humanos, colocando em risco os valores fundamentais da sociedade. Embora o trabalho de Schmitt represente uma importante contribuição para o pensamento político, sua concepção de política baseada na violência e na exclusão não é compatível com a democracia e os valores universais da humanidade.

Conclusão: É necessário adotar uma postura crítica e reflexiva diante da influência de Schmitt no pragmatismo político e buscar alternativas que permitam o fortalecimento da democracia e o respeito aos direitos humanos no contexto atual.

Implicações da pesquisa: Atualmente, o ethos da teoria política contemporânea concentra-se na interdisciplinaridade, inclusão e diversidade.

Palavras-chave: poder, autoridade, humanidade, sociedade, pragmatismo político.

1 INTRODUCTION

The relevance that Machiavelli has in Schmitt's political reflection, and the understanding of the resources around which the modern state is sheltered in the twentieth century for the consolidation of a totalitarian order, of continuous permanence of some factions over others, establishes a "true point of reference" (Galli, 2013, p. 245) for political philosophy. According to Galli, Schmitt regards Machiavelli as the author who introduces a secular conception of politics, in which the state is the main protagonist and its survival depends on the struggle for power. In these coordinates, thinking from political theory the Machiavellian amoral techniques and the essentialisms of the engine that constitutes the exercise of Schmittian power, would reflect the ethos that promulgates the space of pragmatism, utilitarianism and political realism, used in the naked life of the current democratic states of exception, tending to conform – the ravings on human rights – more as national territories than as small spaces of financial concession.

On the other hand, it is relevant to mention the obstacles that would sustain in other spaces of reflection, the area analyzed here, on the administration of public affairs or the teleological determinations of the modern state, in these authors, since Schmitt
makes Machiavelli, according to Laleff, a partial and biased interpretative selection. The author points out that Schmitt focuses exclusively on Machiavelli's theory of the state, without considering other important aspects of his work, such as the theory of virtue or reflection on the republic. It is argued that this partial reading leads Schmitt to present a distorted image of Machiavelli, as defender of the absolute state and the Schmittian conception of politics as a struggle between friends and enemies.

In this way it is of opportune imprint to detail the role of political theorizing, in the whole of the pre-established control-order, either as the requirement of duty in a space not yet constituted by specific influences of politics or to scrutinize the germinating seeds of the estates in the existing, since in the readings of the "Ens realissimum" The cultural conditioning that would facilitate the forms of the political are immersed. Detailing its foundations would thus explain a broader vision of the debacles on the instrumentalization of the Florentine in the pen of the one born in Plettenberg.

Political theory is a branch of philosophy that is dedicated to the study and analysis of the organization and functioning of political power in society. The study of political theory is of vital importance, since it helps us to understand the origin, nature and scope of political power as well as the different ways in which it can be organized and distributed in a society, which was once defined within the scheme of "the rationality of control" as: Dominari nequeat qui prius alicui servitutem praebit denegat. When we speak of the political from an etymological vision we refer to: from the Latin lo polīticus ("of the State"), and this from the ancient Greek πολιτικός (politikós), derived from πολίτης (polítēs, "citizen"); it is the essentialist feature of the forces found between self and self in a given historical space under the symbolic-material foundations of a cultural order disseminated for a social purpose.

According to Horkheimer (1973), the cultural order, which disposes of the political and social, derives from the domination of one social class over the others. In his work "Critical Theory", Horkheimer argues that culture and social institutions are the reflection of the dominant ideology of a society and are designed to maintain the power of the ruling class. The cultural order becomes a tool of control and domination of the elites.

Similarly, Marcuse (1964) argues in his work "One-Dimensional Man" that the cultural, political and social order derives from the logic of the system. Modern society, in this sense, is dominated by instrumental rationality and mass consumption, which
create a false consciousness in the population. The cultural, political and social order becomes a way of controlling and manipulating the population into accepting their situation of oppression and exploitation. Marcuse (1964, p. 10) states that "technical progress has tended to produce a one-dimensional world, in which culture addresses the need for reproduction of the existing."

In context, the ethos in Machiavelli's theory focuses on the need for the ruler to act effectively to maintain the power and stability of the state. According to Machiavelli (1532), "A prince, therefore, need not worry of incurring the infamy of those vices without which he can hardly save his State, for, if one pays attention to all that I have said, it will be seen that some of the vices which make man despised are those which keep him in his State and preserve him the government." (p. 51). That is, the end justifies the means, which means that the ruler must do anything to maintain power, even if it involves violence and cruelty.

The scientific article is justified in the agreement of Schmitt and Machiavelli on the dispositions of culture in maintaining the power of elites and perpetuating social inequalities. In this sense, Horkheimer (1973, p. 20) states that "in all societies culture is used as an instrument of domination and oppression", while Marcuse (1964, p. 6) argues that "culture is part of the system and serves for integration and stabilization". Therefore, the main objective is to examine the influence of Carl Schmitt and the Machiavellian ethos towards a more extreme and radical conception, in which politics focuses on the struggle between friends and enemies, in which war and violence are fundamental elements to achieve power and authority.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Marx and Engels, classifying and detailing the conformation of the senses in human organization, argued that the political structure (...) is the result of the relations of production that exist in it. The ruling class has control over the means of production and uses its political power to maintain its privileged position. The class struggle is the motor of history and the basis of any social change. In capitalist society, the ruling class controls the means of production and exploits the working class, which has no choice but to sell its labor power to survive. The political structure of capitalist society reflects this power relationship and dominates the institutions that govern social life.
From a Marxist perspective, social order follows from the political order because power relations and social inequalities are intrinsically linked. The ruling class has control over political institutions and uses this power to maintain its privileged position. Laws, norms and policies reflect the interests of the ruling class and perpetuate unevenness in access to law. From a critical perspective, the political order becomes a tool to perpetuate economic inequalities and reinforce the power of elites.

Elites are a small group of individuals who have the economic, political and cultural power of a given social group. These elites are responsible for decision-making in the different societal spheres and for the creation and reproduction of economic asymmetries. They have control of economic and cultural resources, and use that power to maintain their privileged position and perpetuate structural poverty. According to Álvaro D'Ors (1994), the elite is a group of people who have a high level of competence and excellence in their field of activity, whether in politics, culture, science or economics. This elite is essential to the functioning of society, as they are the ones who make the important decisions and direct the course of a vital momentum.

In this vision held from the traditionalism of law (Romanism), the elites are not a privileged group that defends its own interests, but are a group that seeks the common good and works for the welfare of society. Elites have a responsibility to lead society and make decisions that benefit the majority of the population.

For critical sociology, these elites have a fundamental role in the reproduction of the social system. It is the elites who define the economic, cultural and social policies that govern the life of society. In theory, authoritarianism is not ideal in the practice of democracy, because it has long been understood that the ethos of democracy does not transcend, but is acquired and experienced (Sadeli et al., 2023). In this way, elites can decide who has access to society's resources and opportunities, and who is excluded from them. In addition, elites have the power to define the norms and values that govern the life of society, enabling them to establish the cultural foundations of domination and social control.

In addition, the Marxist paradigm highlights the importance of class struggle as an engine of social change. The working class, according to Marx, has the potential to overthrow the ruling class and build a more just and equitable society. From a critical perspective, class struggle is the only way to break with social inequalities and build a more just and equitable social order. Social change requires collective action by the
working class and the building of new political institutions that reflect the interests of the majority.

We can understand thus, according to Navarro (2017), establishing the parameters that govern the hypothetical-empirical formulations on governance, and on the study that from social reality emanates an intention to theorize power, that:

Political Theory composes the set of knowledge that derives from the concern to understand the political phenomenon, understood as that human activity that concerns life in common – that is, what we can understand as the public. In turn, and to the extent that it is effectively human, this life in common can only be evaluated, it is a type of knowledge explicitly or implicitly subjected to the following premise: the political phenomenon expresses and sets in motion an inherent tension, which can be made explicit as that which occurs between what is and what should be. In other words, is there a political theorist who does not refer in one way or another to the topic of the "perfect city”? (p. 1)

The beginning of political theory dates back to ancient Greece, where authors such as Plato and Aristotle wrote about the organization of the state and the virtue of rulers. Plato, in his work "The Republic (Περὶ πολιτείας [Peri politeias])", proposed a utopia in which philosophers would rule the rest of society, while Aristotle, in "Politics" (in Greek Πολιτικα; in Latin, Politica"), he argued that the best form of government is the one that seeks the common good.

In the Middle Ages, St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas were the leading exponents of Christian political theory. St. Augustine, in his work "The City of God (De civitate Dei contra paganos)", defended the idea that the State should be at the service of religion and that the ruler should seek peace and justice. St. Thomas Aquinas, in "Summa Theologiae," argued that political power derives from God and that the state must guarantee the welfare of citizens.

During the Modern Age, authors such as Machiavelli and Hobbes laid the foundations of modern political theory. Machiavelli, in his work "The Prince (Il principe)", argued that the ruler must be cunning and willing to do whatever it takes to maintain power. Hobbes, in Leviathan (Leviathan, or The Matter, Form and Power of a Common-Wealth Ecclesiasticall and Civil’), argued that the state must be authoritarian to avoid chaos and that citizens must cede their individual rights in favor of the common good.
During the Enlightenment, several authors such as John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and Montesquieu developed political theories that influenced the French Revolution and the United States Declaration of Independence. Locke, in his Two treatises of government, argued that political power should be limited by law and that individuals had natural rights that should be protected. Rousseau, in his work "The Social Contract (Du contrat social)", argued that political power should reside in the general will and that individuals should give up part of their freedom for the benefit of the common good. Montesquieu, in his work "The Spirit of the Laws (De l'esprit des loix)", argued that political power should be divided into different branches to avoid tyranny.

In contrast to Hobbes's absolutist political theory, authors such as Locke and Montesquieu defended the idea of the separation of powers and respect for individual rights. Locke, in "Essay of Civil Government," argued that the state must protect the life, liberty, and property of citizens and that political power derives from the consent of the governed. Montesquieu, in "The Spirit of the Laws (De l'esprit des loix)", proposed the division of political power into executive, legislative and judicial to avoid abuse of power.

3 METHODOLOGY

A documentary-critical review of Schmitt's influence on contemporary political pragmatism is made, considering the challenges facing twenty-first century democracy in terms of the defense of human rights and the inclusion of minorities. The research method used for this study was qualitative research. It is a method used to respond to the research problem related to the pragmatic ethos in the Machiavellian tradition, so the context of study in qualitative research is political theory as a branch of philosophy that is dedicated to the study and analysis of the organization and functioning of political power in society. The study starts from the opinion of authors qualified in the social milieu of power and is not limited to government control and political decision-making, but extends to the personal and moral sphere of individuals in Schmitt's traditional view.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In contemporary times, authors such as Marx and Rawls have influenced political theory. Marx, in Capital (Das Kapital), argued that the class struggle is the motor of history and that the state must disappear to make way for a communist society in which there are no social classes. Rawls, in "A Theory of Justice", defended the idea that social
justice should be the main objective of politics and proposed a distributive justice system in which equal opportunities are guaranteed for all citizens.

Another author who has influenced political theory is Foucault, who in "Surveiller et Punir: Naissance de la prison" questioned the logic that political power is exercised centrally and defended the idea that power is not a fixed entity and that it exists in isolation, but is dispersed and exercised by multiple actors and practices in society: It is a control, reverberance, etc. between subjective particles.

In the twentieth century, several authors developed political theories that focused on the idea of democracy. For example, Joseph Schumpeter argued that democracy was a system in which individuals competed for political power and that democracy worked best when there was broad citizen participation. For his part, Robert Dahl argued that democracy was a system in which citizens had the ability to make decisions that affected their lives.

Similarly regrouping all the discursive certainties of the most appropriate forms to organize society, this is how Wilhelm (1973) in the reconstruction of indicators that demarcate new paths for the constitution of a political theory or political philosophy, and generating a distinction of epochs in the procedures that concerned defining phenomena of the dimensional politicus argues that:

In the pre-modern tradition, political knowledge (…), belonged to the field of philosophia práctica sive moralis, which dealt with questions relating, ultimately, to human happiness. With regard to this Philosophia, political philosophy represented a concrete form; and not, a derivation or application. (p. 70)

To then separate and categorize the question about the modern, basis for the distinctions that concern Machiavelli and Schmitt, in the present analysis: In the modern era, subjects that had traditionally been integral parts of the common trunk of political philosophy -ethics, law, economics, education --, have been separated as separate branches, thus constituting autonomous sciences (p. 70).

The ethos of the political is a way of being in the world that implies a particular vision of the administration of forces and of the relations between individuals and political institutions. This way of being in the world is a social and cultural construction that develops over time and is transmitted from generation to generation.

It is in the ontological substratum of that being-for-others that one understands how the ethos of the political influences the way human beings relate to others and to the
world at large. Under this line, the political can be seen as a way of inhabiting the world of tensions-interests, in which subjects constitute and maintain relations with normative guarantees and manifest otherness. Importantly, the ethos of the political is not static, but is constantly evolving and transforming. The experiences and experiences of each individual in their political and social environment can lead to the modification and adaptation of their political identity and their way of inhabiting the political world.

Contemporary political theory has its roots in classical political philosophy, but has developed throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Today, the ethos of contemporary political theory focuses on interdisciplinarity, inclusion, and diversity. Interdisciplinarity refers to the ability of contemporary political theory to integrate different disciplines, such as sociology, psychology, and economics, to better understand political systems. As James Bohman argues, contemporary political theory must be "an interdisciplinary discipline capable of incorporating and synthesizing the theories and methods of other disciplines" (Bohman, 2004, p. 1). Inclusion refers to the ability of contemporary political theory to include different perspectives and voices in political discourse. As Iris Marion Young argues, contemporary political theory must be "a theory of democracy that values diversity of voices, plurality of experiences, and cultural and ethnic differences" (Young, 2000, p. 10). Diversity refers to the ability of contemporary political theory to include different cultures, groups, and ways of life in political analysis. As Chantal Mouffe argues, contemporary political theory must be "a political theory that accepts the plurality of ways of life, cultural differences, and struggles for recognition" (Mouffe, 1999, p. 4).

Machiavelli defines power (il potere) as the ability of an individual or group to influence the decision-making and conduct of other individuals or groups: it is the basis of any government and is essential to maintaining political stability. In his most famous work, "The Prince", he argues that power must be used with cunning, force and wisdom to maintain control and order in a state.

According to Machiavelli, power can be acquired in various ways, including inheritance, military conquest, election, and acquisition by force. However, power can also be lost if it is not handled properly or if serious political mistakes are made. Machiavelli emphasizes the importance of maintaining power and political stability, even if that means committing immoral or cruel acts.

---

In Machiavelli’s work, power is not limited to government control and political decision-making, but extends to the personal and moral sphere of individuals. For him, morality and religion should not interfere in political decision-making, and the ruler should be willing to do whatever is necessary to maintain power and political stability.

The importance of the concept of power in Machiavelli’s work has been widely debated by other political thinkers. For the German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche, power is the foundation of human existence and the driving force behind the will to power. Nietzsche states that power is the force that drives individuals to seek dominance and superiority over others.

Another influential political thinker who addressed the issue of power was the French philosopher Michel Foucault. In his work "The Will to Know", Foucault analyzes how power is exercised through social institutions and practices. Foucault argues that power is a diffuse and omnipresent force found in all social relations and cannot be controlled by a single individual or group.

On the other hand, and contrast of knowledge in political realism, for Schmitt, power (Macht) is essentially a game of friends and enemies. He asserts that politics is a struggle for power and that political actors are divided between those who are close to the intimacy of the self and those who are enemies: the others. For him, the definition of friends and enemies is the essence of politics and any other definition is superficial and misleading.

In his most influential work, "The Concept of the Political," Schmitt asserts that sovereignty is the key to understanding political power. For him, sovereignty is the ability to make final and indisputable decisions, and only the state can have this capacity. Schmitt asserts that sovereignty is essential to maintaining order and stability in a society. He argues that democracy is essentially a conflict between friends and enemies. This is only functional when citizens share a common identity and a common enemy. If democracy is extended to groups that have conflicting interests, it can destabilize the political order. Democracy has a purpose in itself, which would be the building of consensus through moral debates on the general and particular objectives of society (Rocha dos Santos, 2018).

Schmitt's political theory has been criticized by other authors, including Leo Strauss. Strauss argues that Schmitt's political theory is too limited and that his emphasis on identifying friend and foe can lead to a simplistic and dangerous view of politics.
Strauss argues that politics is much more complex and that modern societies need a more sophisticated political theory than Schmitt offered.

Another author who has been critical of Schmitt's political theory is the French political philosopher Jacques Derrida. Derrida argues that Schmitt's political theory is too based on the binary opposition of friend and foe and that it does not take into account the complexity of political relations. Derrida argues that political relations are much more complex and that Schmitt's theory cannot account for this complexity.

The German philosopher Jürgen Habermas has also addressed Schmitt's political theory. Habermas argues that Schmitt's theory is a dangerous theory and that it can lead to exclusion and violence. Habermas argues that modern societies need a political theory that is inclusive and takes into account the diversity and complexity of political relations.

Both Carl Schmitt and Niccolò Machiavelli are leading figures in political theory and have had a great impact on the way political power and international relations are understood. While they are authors from different eras and historical contexts, there are certain commonalities in their ideas about politics and power. What we propose here is to identify and analyze these commonalities and how they relate to contemporary political theory.

Both authors are known for their focus on political power and its impact on international relations. Schmitt focuses on the struggle for political power and sovereignty, while Machiavelli focuses on the acquisition and maintenance of power in the context of international relations. Despite these differences, there are several commonalities between them:

- Focus on human nature: Both Schmitt and Machiavelli believe that politics is a human activity and that human nature is fundamental to understanding politics. For Machiavelli, human nature (natura umana) is selfish and ambitious, meaning that leaders must be cunning and utilitarian to maintain power. Schmitt also focuses on human nature (menschliche Natur) and believes that politics is a struggle for the subjection of subject-object will that reflects the conditions of a nature in its manifest quest for power.
- The role of the state: Both Schmitt and Machiavelli believe that the state is the most important actor in politics and international relations. For Machiavelli, the state (Stato) is the main actor in the struggle for power and security in international relations. Schmitt also believes that the state (Staat) is the most
important actor in politics, and that sovereignty is essential to maintaining order and stability in a society.

- **The importance of violence:** Both Schmitt and Machiavelli believe that violence is an integral part of politics and international relations. For Machiavelli, violence (violenza) is necessary to maintain power and security in international relations. Schmitt also believes that violence (Gewalt) is an integral part of politics and argues that war is the most extreme form of politics.

- **The focus on reality:** Both Schmitt and Machiavelli believe that politics should be analyzed in terms of reality and not morality or theory. For Machiavelli, politics must be seen in terms of reality, and leaders must be able to adapt to reality in order to maintain power. Schmitt also argues that politics (Politik) should be seen in terms of reality and that leaders should be able to make pragmatic decisions based on reality.

The ethos in Machiavelli's theory focuses on the need for the ruler to act effectively to maintain the power and stability of the state. According to Machiavelli (1532), "A prince, therefore, should not worry of incurring the infamy of those vices without which he can hardly save his State, because, if one pays attention to all that I have said, it will be seen that some of the vices which make man despised are those which keep him in his State and preserve him the government" (p. 51). That is, the end justifies the means, which means that the ruler must do anything to maintain power, even if it involves violence and cruelty.

In this sense, this ethos has been criticized for being amoral and undemocratic. As Quentin Skinner argues, Machiavelli's political theory is "a theory of power that is based on the idea that the end justifies the means, leading to the justification of cruelty and violence in politics" (Skinner, 2009, p. 17). In addition, the ethos in Machiavelli's theory has been criticized for being elitist. As Étienne Balibar argues, "Machiavelli's political theory is elitist, because it values efficacy and power over participation and democratic dialogue" (Balibar, 1993, p. 10).

On the other hand, some authors argue that the ethos in Machiavelli's theory is realistic and necessary in politics. As Hans Morgenthau argues, "Machiavelli's political theory is realistic, because it takes into account human nature and the limitations of power in politics" (Morgenthau, 1960, p. 4). Performing elements such as the infamy of certain
vices or questionable actions, are the most effective arts to deal with between the mediations of the actors in dispute for common interest.

In addition, some authors argue that the ethos in Machiavelli’s theory is important in defending normative frameworks and managing territoriality in a specific nation-territoriality. As Carl Schmitt argues, "Machiavelli's political theory is important in the defense of the state and national sovereignty, because it recognizes the need for authority and force in politics" (Schmitt, 1927, p. 5).

For Schmitt, ethos is the ultimate source of political power, since it is what gives meaning and legitimacy to authority. "(...) Politics is a struggle for existence, for identity and for recognition. Ultimately, it is a struggle for survival. In this sense, politics is a matter of life and death" (Schmitt, 1996, p. 57). According to his theory, politics cannot be understood as a simple technique to govern, but must be analyzed as a struggle, a conflict, a debacle between groups that compete for power and collective identity for their permanence, subsistence, etc. In this sense, ethos is the key factor that determines which group has the ability to define and assert its interests and values.

In Schmitt's conception, ethos is something that is constructed and reinforced through political struggle, and that is why politics cannot be seen as something neutral or apolitical. The collective identity of a group is formed based on a set of shared values and practices, and it is through political struggle that these values are brought into play and defended.

In Schmitt's theory, ethos is also linked to the idea of sovereignty, which is understood as the ability of a community to make decisions that affect its identity and destiny. Sovereignty, in this sense, cannot be delegated or shared, but is an attribution that arises from the collective identity of the group.

Although Schmitt's theory of ethos has been criticized by other political theorists, its influence on contemporary political theory is undeniable. The concept of ethos has been used by other authors to reflect on the relationship between collective identity and politics, and on the importance of shared values and practices in the construction of political community.

5 CONCLUSION

Machiavelli, and his work "The Prince" has been a source of controversy and analysis for centuries. Born in the sixteenth-century Italian Renaissance, a period of great
political and social upheaval in an Italy divided into several city-states where wars were common. Machiavelli defended "the idea" that the end justifies the means, arguing that an effective ruler must be willing to employ whatever means necessary to maintain his power. In addition, it recognizes human nature and the corruption inherent in the human being, and held that the maintenance of power and the security of the state were more important than morality or ethics. In this way, Machiavelli's contribution to political pragmatism is important because he recognizes that politics is a practical activity that requires concrete decision-making and that morality can be a constraint on achieving political goals.

On the other hand, Carl Schmitt developed his theory of the political in a specific historical context, during the crisis of the Weimar Republic and the rise of Nazism in Germany 1930-1933 twentieth century. Schmitt argued that politics is based on the friend-enemy distinction, that is, politics is the struggle for power between friends and enemies. In addition, Schmitt defended the idea that sovereignty is a necessary condition for the existence of the state and that authority and force are fundamental to the defense of the state. Thus, Schmitt's contribution to political pragmatism is important because he recognizes that politics is a concrete activity that takes place in a context of conflict and competition, and that authority and force are fundamental to the defense of the state. Both authors have been the subject of controversy and analysis in modern politics. However, their contributions to political pragmatism are important, as they recognize the importance of the efficacy and practical outcome of political actions rather than abstract theory or morality. Moreover, both authors recognize the importance of authority and force in politics, although their positions differ on the importance of sovereignty and the friend-enemy distinction.

Twenty-first century democracy faces a number of challenges that call into question its ability to fulfil its purpose of ensuring freedom, equality and justice for all citizens. One of the main challenges facing democracy today is the need to reconcile the influence of Machiavelli and Schmitt's political pragmatism with the defence of human rights and human dignity. Finding a balance between the need for authority and power in politics, the defence of human rights and human dignity would be a mechanism to counteract imbalances. In this sense, it is necessary to critically take the influence of Machiavelli and Schmitt on political pragmatism and explore how their legacy can be reconciled with democracy and human rights. In this sense, current legislation encourages
citizens to freely choose measures to protect their rights and legitimate interests when they are violated (Hung et al., 2023).

One way to address this challenge is through dialogue and public debate. Democracy is based on the idea that citizens have the right and responsibility to participate in political decision-making. Civil society, political leaders and political theorists need to discuss how to reconcile the influence of Machiavelli and Schmitt's political pragmatism with the defence of human rights and human dignity. Another major challenge to democracy in the twenty-first century is the need to strengthen democratic institutions. Democracy is based on the idea that democratic institutions are the guarantors of human rights and human dignity. There is a need to strengthen democratic institutions, ensure the independence of the judiciary and promote transparency and accountability to avoid the concentration of power in the hands of a few and the violation of human rights.

Political scientist Chantal Mouffe (2005) has pointed out that it is necessary to understand Schmitt's work in the context of the crisis of liberal democracy and the increasing complexity of contemporary politics. For Mouffe, Schmitt's work cannot be reduced to a defense of authoritarianism or dictatorship, but is a critique of the idea of a neutral and consensual democracy that does not take into account the tensions and conflicts inherent in politics. In this sense, Mouffe highlights the importance of Schmitt's work to develop a political theory that takes into account the plurality and diversity of voices in society. For his part, the political scientist William E. Scheuerman (2015) has analyzed the influence of Machiavelli on contemporary political thought and its relationship with human rights. According to Scheuerman, Machiavelli's work should not be reduced to a defense of political realism or a justification of cruelty and violence in politics. Instead, Scheuerman stresses the importance of Machiavelli's work in developing a political theory that takes into account the complexity of politics and the limitations of power. For Scheuerman, Machiavelli's work can be seen as a defense of autonomy and political sovereignty, but also as a critique of tyranny and despotism.

Finally, political scientist Michael J. Shapiro (2013) has analyzed the influence of Machiavelli and Schmitt on contemporary political theory and its relationship with human rights. According to Shapiro, the work of both thinkers can be seen as a critique of the idea of a neutral and consensual politics that does not take into account the tensions and conflicts inherent in politics. In this sense, Shapiro highlights the importance of the work.
of Machiavelli and Schmitt to develop a political theory that takes into account the plurality and diversity of voices in society and recognizes the importance of human rights as a limit to political power. Civil society needs ideal regulations for the implementation of social responsibility in the context of human rights, governments need to adopt specific measures to effectively implement these laws (Alexander et al., 2023).
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