

TRACTS
OF THE
SOCIETY OF THE FRIENDS OF ITALY.

TRACT No. V.

“THE PLACE AND DUTY
OF
ENGLAND IN EUROPE:”

A Lecture

DELIVERED AT

THE THIRD CONVERSAZIONE OF THE FRIENDS OF ITALY,

On WEDNESDAY EVENING, April 28th, 1852,

Francis William
PROFESSOR NEWMAN.

TO WHICH IS ADDED

AN ADDRESS, DELIVERED ON THE SAME OCCASION,

Giuseppe BY
M. MAZZINI.

LONDON:

PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICES OF THE SOCIETY, 10, SOUTHAMPTON
STREET, STRAND;

And Sold by W. KENT and Co., Paternoster-row; EFFINGHAM WILSON, Royal
Exchange; CHARLES GILPIN, Bishopsgate-street Without; and all Booksellers.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

. Members of the Society may have quantities at a reduced cost, for distribution,
on application at the Society's Offices.

1852.

1869, June 30, 1869.

Ital 568.1

OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY.

- 1.—By public meetings, lectures, and the press—and especially by affording opportunities to the most competent authorities for the publication of works on the history of the Italian National Movement—to promote a correct appreciation of the Italian question in this country.
 - 2.—To use every available constitutional means of furthering the cause of Italian National Independence, in Parliament.
 - 3.—And generally to aid, in this country, the cause of the independence and of the political and religious liberty of the Italian people.
- *.* All persons agreeing with the objects of this Society can become members by paying a annual subscription of half-a-crown or upwards.

MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Alexander, Charles, Dundee
 Alexander, Rev. Dr. W. L., Edin.
 Allsop, T., Nottingham
 Andrews, R., Mayor of Southam.
 Armstrong, Rev. G., Bristol
 Ashurst, W. H., Muswell Hill
 Ashurst, W. H., Jun., London
 Baldwin, James, Birmingham
 Baxter, Rev. J. C., Dundee
 Baxter, W. E., Dundee
 Baynes, Rev. J. A., Nottingham
 Beard, Dr., Manchester
 Birch, W. J., Pudlicott
 Black, Adam, Edinburgh
 Bray, Charles, Coventry
 Browne, Henry, Lewes
 Brown, Dr. Samuel, Edinburgh
 Bruce, W. D., London
 Byles, William, Bradford
 Carleton, R. A., Waterford
 Case, W. A., London
 Christie, Rev. J., Dundee
 Clarke, Rev. Charles, Glasgow
 Collet, C. D., London
 Collett, John, London
 Coningham, W., Brighton
 Cors, J., Shorehithe
 Cook, Rev. David, Dundee
 Cowen, J., Jun., Blyndon-burn
 Cox, Robert, Edinburgh
 Crawshaw, G., Newcas.-on-Tyne
 Crompton, Rev. J., Norwich
 Crosskey, Rev. W., Derby
 Crossley, John, Halifax
 Davis, John, London
 Dawson, Geo., M.A., Birming.
 Dillon, Frank, London
 Donaty, T., London
 Doulton, Frederick, Lambeth
 Duncombe, T. S., M.P., Finch.
 Dunlop, A. Murray, Edinburgh
 Durham, J., Dundee
 Easson, Alexander, Dundee
 Epps, Dr., Boudoir
 Fife, Sir J., Newcastle-on-Tyne
 Forbes, Henry, Bradford
 Forster, John, Boddon
 Forster, W. E., Radwin
 Fowler, J., Sheffield
 Foxton, Rev. F. J., Cheltenham
 Froude, J. A., Plasnewydd
 Furtado, C., London
 Gaskell, F. Chelsea</p> | <p>Gemmell, Rev. R., Dundee
 Giles, Rev. Dr. Bampton
 Gilliam, Rev. George, Dundee
 Gill, T. H., Birmingham
 Goderich, Lord, London
 Grant, Rev. Brewin, Birmingh.
 Gray, Tho., Newcastle-on-Tyne
 Gregory, Dr. Wm., Edinburgh
 Greig, James, Edinburgh
 Hannay, Rev. A., Dundee
 Harbison, George, Edinburgh
 Harvey, George, R.S.A., Edinb.
 Hawkes, S. M., London
 Herford, Rev. W. E., Lancaster
 Hervey, T. K., London
 Hild, James, Leeds
 Holyoake, G. J., London
 Hooper, George, London
 Horne, R. H., London
 Horsburgh, James, Dundee
 Howard, W., Southwark
 Howitt, William, London
 Hunt, Leigh, London
 Hunt, Thomas, Hammersmith
 Hunter, John, Edinburgh
 Ileson, Henry, A.M., London
 Ifelhard, A., Manchester
 Jenner, Charles, Edinburgh
 Jerrold, Douglas, London
 Lander, Walter Sayage, Bath
 Larkell, Rev. E. R., Lincoln
 Lattimes, T., Exeter
 Leaf, William, London
 Lewes, G. H., Kensington
 Linton, W. J., Miteside
 Lonsdale, Dr., Carlisle
 Low, Alexander, Dundee
 Low, Rev. Andrew, Dundee
 Macdonald, Rev. A., Sheffield
 Mackay, Dr. Charles, London
 Mackenzie, R., Dundee
 Macrae, W. C., Sherbourne
 McGavin, Rev. J. R., Dundee
 McKnight, Dr., Belfast
 McLaren, Duncan, Edinburgh
 McLeod, Dr., Ben Rhydding
 McMillan, Rev. J. P., B.A., Bright.
 Marsden, M. E., London
 Marton, J., Westland, London
 Masson, David, London
 Math, Edward, London
 M'hee, F. B., Jun., Aberdeen</p> | <p>More, Professor, Edinburgh
 Morton, E. J., Halifax
 Moore, Richard, London
 Mowat, Francis, M.P., Penry
 Mudie, John, Dundee
 Newman, Professor, London
 Nichol, Professor J. P., Glasgo
 Oswald, H. C., Aberdeen
 Palmer, Rev. E. A., Dundee
 Paibet, Rev. James, Dundee
 Pate, William, Dublin
 Parry, J. H., London
 Pigott, E. F. Smyth, London
 Pillans, J. Wilson, Edinburgh
 Prout, Thomas, Westminster
 Raine, C., Newcastle-on-Tyne
 Ramsay, James, Dundee
 Reston, Rev. James, Dundee
 Rough, George, Dundee
 Russell, Francis, Edinburgh
 Russell, Dr. J. R., Edinburgh
 Schmits, Dr. L., Edinburgh
 Scholefield, W.M.P., Birming.
 Scott, W. B., Newcastle
 Shaen, W., London
 Simpson, Professor, Edinburgh
 Simpson, James, Edinburgh
 Simpson, W., London
 Slack, H. J., Brixton
 Smiles, Dr., Leeds
 Smith, Rev. W. A., Dundee
 Smith, Charles, Dundee
 Smith, William, Edinburgh
 Solly, Rev. Henry, Cheltenham
 Stansfeld, Hamer, Leeds
 Stansfeld, J., Jun., Brompton
 Stephen, George, Dundee
 Stuart, Lord Dudley C., M.P.
 Stuart, Peter, Liverpool
 Syme, Rev. G. A., Nottingham
 Syme, Ebenezer, London
 Taylor, P. A., Sydenham
 Tillet, J. H., Norwich
 Travers, N., London
 Trevelyan, Arthur, London
 Vincent, Henry, London
 Watson, Patrick, Dundee
 Watson, John, Dundee
 Weller, E. T., London
 Well, W., London
 Wilson, T., London
 Wright, Robert, Birmingham</p> |
|---|--|---|

TREASURER: P. A. Taylor.

SECRETARY: David Masson.

BANKERS: Messrs. Rogers, Olding, and Co., 29, Clement's-lane, Lombard-street, whom Subscriptions may be paid to the Treasurer's account.

Lecture.

THE PLACE AND DUTY OF ENGLAND IN EUROPE.

THE Third Conversazione of the SOCIETY OF THE FRIENDS OF ITALY was held on Wednesday evening, the 28th of April, 1852, in the Princess's Concert-room, Castle-street, Oxford-street, London. The room was filled by a numerous and select assemblage, including not a few Italians, Hungarians, Frenchmen, and Germans. The chair was taken at eight o'clock by W. H. ASHURST, Esq., of Muswell-hill, when Professor NEWMAN proceeded to read the following lecture, prepared expressly for the occasion, at the request of the Committee of the Society. In publishing the lecture, the Committee deem it hardly necessary to observe that they do not put it forward as a formal statement in detail of their own views as the managing body of the society. The points discussed in the lecture are numerous and varied, and may well admit of differences of opinion among those who are at one with the eminent lecturer in the general tenor of his views:—it is sufficient for the Committee to have been instrumental in bringing views so important and suggestive before the public at all; and to be able now, with Professor NEWMAN'S kind permission, to submit them through the press to that close consideration and examination which they so well merit. As the first public discourse pronounced in this country on the general question of our foreign relations as a nation,

and as treating this vast question in a manner so weighty, precise, and lucid, the lecture, the Committee believe, is better fitted than perhaps any other contemporary publication that could be named, to stir up the kind of thought most needed to place England right with regard to the rest of Europe.

PROFESSOR NEWMAN'S LECTURE.

FRIENDS AND COUNTRYMEN,—It is common to open an address by asking indulgence: but now, to profess diffidence would be to plead guilty of indiscretion. At the request of certain Friends of Italy, I have undertaken to discourse on a deeply important subject. I could not do so, unless I had strong convictions. But I shall try to adhere to great principles, on which one may be confident without arrogance.

It may be asked—by some pertly, by some seriously—“Why do you not leave so difficult a subject as Foreign Politics to Statesmen?”—and, as a preliminary, I think it well to give a direct and frank reply.

First, there is no topic which the House of Commons may discuss, on which it is not desirable that all should have exercised minds, who constitutionally elect that House, and who need to judge of the conduct of their representatives. * Secondly, the subject most intimately concerns us. As things have long been managed, our brothers, sons, neighbours, friends, are liable even in ordinary times to be sent abroad as soldiers or sailors, and become either agents of high justice or tools of cruel outrage. In extraordinary times such as these, our very laws and liberties, not to speak of our trade, our wealth, our taxation, are eminently suspended on European events. Thirdly, whatever the ability of statesmen, and whatever their superior knowledge of fact, I do not admit that they have more moral wisdom than private persons, and I fear they have generally less. All their most valuable wisdom was earned in private life; and the higher they rise, the more are they immersed in a corrupting atmosphere. I dare not utter fully my feelings on this subject: they might seem extravagant. I will barely say, that public history leaves upon my mind a most painful conviction that the morality of our foreign and colonial policy is exceedingly behind the morality of our home-political life. Crime is imagined to cease to be crime, because it is perpetrated on the most audacious scale.

I have now to discourse on the place and duty of England in Europe. I understand this to refer to the place which England ought consciously to occupy in the existing state of things. That state is surely unprecedented in all history. Never were the nations so intelligent, so industrious, so humane, so abhorrent from pillage, so peace-loving, so law-loving; yet never were so many great and powerful peoples pressed by mere military force under a yoke which they abhor. Never was so vast a soldiery kept up—kept, not against foreign enemies, but to insure that a few men, neither wiser nor more virtuous than their fellow-mortals, may exert irresponsible power over a hundred million of persons. This can only be a state of transition. How long the throes of birth will be prolonged; what amount of misery, destruction, and utter rending away of things new from things old shall precede the Order which is to arise out of the Chaos, may probably depend on England. Her insular position

gives her a peculiar security; but if this be interpreted to liberate her from duty to countries less happily situated, it will turn to her certain disgrace, and possibly to her ruin. What she *can do* for them, depends on what she *is* in herself, and what she *may become* in her whole empire, by the mere exertion of virtuous will. On this very grave subject, I fear I cannot be lively; I can only be earnest—and I entreat that its deep interest may sustain your attention, if I fail of being as concise as might be wished.

To prevent mistake, I will at once avow that I speak as a royalist to royalists. Whatever be the progress of republican theory among us, it would be absurd to expect a servant of the Crown to act on any but royalist principles. A permanent and consistent foreign policy hostile to English royalty, is unimaginable from British ministers without a previous revolution at home. No arguments are here admissible, but such as may be sincerely pressed on ministers of the Crown in either House of Parliament.

Again, I speak as an Englishman, and not from the ground of any one section of English politicians. Tory, Whig, Radical, are in this argument all one. No English statesman has done himself and his country more honour in recent days as to European politics than Mr. Gladstone, who is called a Tory. In fact, England has no party favourable to absolutism. Every possible ministry will avow that the glory of the crown consists in its reconciling freedom with subjection, by being itself subject to law. We may differ as to the *more* or *less* of active authority which may beneficially be assigned to a prince; naturally, for the problem varies with every internal change in a nation. But all England agrees, that legitimate and honourable royalty does not mean the supremacy of an Individual Will over Law, but means the consecration of an individual person or family to be the chief minister and representative of Law; and that the sacredness of royalty is only a natural efflux from the higher sacredness of Law.

Republicans have combined with Absolutists to deride constitutional royalty; and it is easy to deride every possible form of government, by exhibiting how it is managed by foolish persons. Foolish democracy, foolish aristocracy, and certainly foolish despotism, are ridiculous, as well as evil. No wonder, then, if foolish constitutional monarchy is ridiculous: let us be thankful if it be less evil. But I strongly deny the propriety of treating English statesmen as necessary hypocrites in their approval of our peculiar institutions. It is an insidious falsehood, sometimes unawares admitted by good men, that restriction on royal power is a recent humiliation. It is not recent, but was born with primitive royalty: it is not a humiliation, but is necessary to make the royal office one which a good and wise man could desire to accept. Legal limitations on the prerogative do not hinder a wise king from services to his country, such as *none but* a king can render. It might be well for the black population of the United States of America, if a constitutional king reigned there. In old England, the burgess, the freeholder, and the serf, found in the king a protector against the baron: yet our royalty was then as truly limited as now, though the limits were not all so well agreed upon. No royalty is in the highest sense legitimate, until all the institutions are secured by Law against the caprices of individual will.

LEGITIMACY is a word, which, like Order and Authority, has been claimed and abused by despots who had a most doubtful title to it. The *lowest* form in which it can be conceded to exist, is, where ostensibly willing obedience is paid to a sovereign whose will is Law. Such is the legitimacy of the Russian emperor in Russia proper. Such countries may be temporarily well governed: we rejoice when that is the case; but we know the arduousness of the problem. The state is one of transition, only as transitive is it legitimate. A *superior* form of legitimacy appears, where there is some division of powers between independent holders of authority, so as to make a double or triple system of antagonist forces, each likely to check the unjust proceedings of the other. Thus in our Indian Empire, the Supreme Tribunals are independent of the ordinary Executive, and all authorities alike are consciously amenable to the ultimate judgment of England. Such also is the legitimacy of Civil Despotisms which are limited by unchangeable Religion, or by extremely ancient Forms equally unchangeable. But here, the better Stability is provided for, the less is Progress possible. The *third* form of Legitimacy is, when Law is acknowledged to be human and changeable, yet changeable only by public debate and the concurrence of different Orders; when the magistrate can enforce law on the people, and the people on the magistrate. To work out unaided so complicated a problem, is tedious to all nations, and possible to very few; but human experience now has fully settled the conditions of success. This highest form of Legitimacy is generally called Constitutional Freedom. It provides alike for Stability and for Progress. The true classification of governments is not into Monarchical, Aristocratic, and Democratic, but into the Lawless, the Stagnant, and the Legally Progressive.

The history of the English Crown is itself a silent but eloquent protest in favour of this highest form of Legitimacy. The dethronement of the Stuarts, and election of the House of Brunswick, proclaimed that legal barriers must be maintained against the malversations of the Executive Power, and that a king who becomes notoriously lawless, *ipso facto* abdicates the Crown by violating his fundamental duties and engagements. On the contrary, nearly everywhere on the Continent, kings have used armies to overturn law, and have hereby desecrated royalty. Foreign invaders assume to be kings or emperors of nations which hate them, and which disown all allegiance. Noble families have gained kingdoms by hypocrisy and oaths, and have turned them into tyrannies by perjury and murder. Unless English royalty separates its cause from that of lawless wickedness, it is dishonoured by the pretenders to its likeness. What rape is to marriage, such is the sway of a usurper to that of true legitimacy.

In defence of absolute despotism it is often said, that the wisest king *cannot* give freedom to his people. But if he cannot do everything, he can do much; and if he desire to secure the supremacy of Law over Caprice, that will be seen in the direction of his endeavours. Few born despots have the knowledge or the genius, and still fewer have the will, to establish any power antagonistic to their own. But—what takes away all excuse from modern European despots—the despotism has not been necessitated by barbarism and ignorance, but has been facilitated by civilization and knowledge. Advantage is taken of the industry, peacefulness, and wealth of the people, to tax them largely, to raise a great soldiery,

and make Might the arbiter of Right. Bribery, Perfidy, Slander, Cruelty, all add their powers to support the rotten cause. The rule of the despot is now, beyond all contradiction, the rule of atrocity over moderation, of stupidity over intellect, of superstition over reverential philosophy. It is the prostration of genius, the extinction of literature, the suppression of debate, the fettering of commerce, the annihilation of law, the debasement of aristocracy, and the elevation of a ruthless priesthood.

The sentiment of every remaining royalist nation to its king must soon be undermined, if royalty and tyranny become confounded in one idea. Conspirators against law and right have a common interest as tyrants; but a legitimate crown has no common interest with them. England, in all her orders and ranks, has but one interest in Europe—and this coincides with her providential mission—to inculcate and promote the supremacy of Law.

RIGHT, indeed, and not LAW, is the true sovereign; but to distinguish these two is ordinarily a purely internal question for each nation. The chief exceptional case, which in modern days has been thought to justify foreign interference to protect whole classes of men from unjust law, is that of religions persecution. When fanaticism dissolves the ties of humanity, it destroys with them the ties of nation; but in less vital disputes, the very sufferers by evil laws would deprecate aid from abroad. Ordinarily, then, we salute Legality as the flag of Justice.

But the *illegitimacy* of power is sometimes clearly avowed by its own conduct. When a prince surrounds his person with a powerful foreign guard, when he garrisons fortresses, overawes the country with foreign troops, and carefully disarms the natives, he proclaims to the world that he is an invader heading an army of occupation, not a ruler administering law. It is manifestly a *state of war*, and as such alone ought we to treat it. A nation trampled down is surely as broad a phenomenon on the face of Europe, as the enemy who tramples on it. In ancient and in modern days alike, political observers have regarded it as an axiom, that a power is illegitimate—or, as the Greeks phrased it, *tyrannical*—when it rested on FOREIGN armies.

Even where the armies are *not* foreign, the events may be so glaring, that no sane man can doubt that power is illegitimate. If a magistrate, who was entrusted with legal and limited authority, corrupts the army, falsifies his oaths publicly, disperses civil assemblies by violence, slaughters, banishes, arrests, imprisons, at pleasure; dictates processes which give to his new position a formal authority; and then, assumes to be legitimate—the last step does but add hypocrisy to atrocious wickedness. To trust such a man is henceforth impossible. To exchange courtesies with him is to deprive our courtesies of all moral value. We either become partakers of his ill-repute, or are thought to act from cowardice. To be forced to salute such a monster with civility, must surely be a dishonour and a grief to any virtuous man. To send a fixed ambassador to court to him, appears to me a prostitution of our royal legitimacy. It puts forward our Queen as co-ordinate in authority with the vilest of criminals.

I say, then, the proper function of England in Europe is—by example and silent action *always*, by express words or forcible actions *sometimes*—to promote true legitimacy. A mass of human beings becomes a nation,

only when it is cemented into consistency and moral unity by law; by law, which is the same to-morrow as it was yesterday, and does not depend on individual caprice. But this function of England to promote legitimacy is mischievously caricatured when interpreted to mean that England must promote English institutions. Our particular *forms* of Legality is adapted to a nation which has a royal race, a peerage, and a commonalty, all socially independent, and therefore capable of playing an independent political part. If any of the three elements do not exist in a certain country, our form is there manifestly impossible; and if we urge its introduction, we do a mischief proportioned to our influence. Moreover, in order that the king may be a sacred person, irresponsible at law, and lifted above party disputes and attack, there must be a national reverence for him. This is a sentiment which cannot be created at will. As to force a husband on an unwilling widow is no honour to matrimony, so to force a king on an undesiring people is no honour to royalty. Nations which have no kingly race, or none that they can revere or trust, are essentially unroyalist. If we are proud of our old oak-trees, shall we urge foreigners to plant saplings and be equally proud of them? Shall we think to honour Queen Victoria by assuring her that royalty can be raised like a hothouse plant? True and legitimate royalty *may* rise again in Europe, as in old days, by high services which win a nation's heart; but the monstrous absurdity is, that whenever there appears any prospect of such an event—whenever in time of revolution a citizen overtops his countrymen, and the intense love of his nation seems susceptible of ripening into loyalty and allegiance—then forthwith our pretended royalists clamour against him, and impute this contingency as though kingship were horrid tyranny; wholly blind to the fact, that if ever royalty is to be again strengthened in Europe, it is by the election of such men to be kings.

In short, then, I avow: Royalty is made sacred by its being the organ of law; royalty becomes beloved when it visibly loves right and justice more than royalty. If Queen Victoria's responsible advisers urge her to manifest cordial sympathy with legitimate freedom, whether it appear in a form *more* or *less* like to our own, then the affections of the British people will be doubly riveted to her children's throne. This is true royalist policy, and this is the genuine English policy.

But many of my audience will say: "Enough of these truisms: come to the point, and say what we are *to do*."

Excuse me, that I regard these topics as nowise superfluous to Englishmen. Excuse me further, if I reply in a cautious order of my own to the question, "what are we to do?" England is a moral power, not indeed solely, yet primarily. The *indirect* result produced by our own use of dominion is, in the long run, far greater on Europe than any result from direct interference. If we are tyrannical in our own administration, naturally our ministers have bad consciences; they cannot deal with the boldness of innocence, they cringe to tyrants, they fear to establish precedents that condemn themselves; nay, their own conduct is quoted as precedent against them. I am hereby forced into an argument which I ear you may think out of place, on the government of English dependencies.

You will imagine I mean India. Not India in particular. And of

India, who shall speak shortly? The problem is immense: the moral embarrassments sewers. We have done many things eminently well. The tribunals and the press are free, arbitrary arrests and spies unknown, race has no distinctions, the ordinary armies are native. But bureaucracy is absolute, malversations obscure, the delays of the law distressing, wars frequent and on the greatest scale, taxation oppressive, the ingenious people poorer than ever (at least through vast regions), a political career impossible to natives, and discontent certain to increase with every increase of knowledge. If we sincerely desire good government, if we condemn official irresponsibility, we shall shortly be able to erect an Indian representative Assembly in England, authorized to demand publicity, to debate, and to address the Executive. This one splendid but cheap act of justice to India would produce great moral effect on Europe, and ultimately on Asia.

But I am thinking primarily of our Colonies. We are apt to be little aware how disastrous our glorious Revolution of 1688 has been to the English dependencies. Previously the Crown had no spare force to domineer over them, and did not attempt it. The doctrine of old prevailed, that every British settler carried a Constitution about with him. Our American plantations made their own Houses of Assembly, as soon as they found they needed them; and our Stuarts confirmed the procedure ministerially, as of course. But from the time when *bonâ fide* Parliamentary government was established in England, our Parliament began to act imperiously, and after the union with Scotland counted itself absolute over Ireland and the Colonies. In modern days we have invented a title descriptive of the usurpation: it is called the *Imperial* Parliament. Three Civil Wars have been caused to us by its encroachment:—that with the American Colonies; that with Ireland in 1798; and that with Canada in 1838. The Irish Parliament had claimed to be co-ordinate with that of England, and the determination of the English ministry to evade and overbear this claim led to the embroilments and severities out of which the war at length issued.* As to the war with Canada, into which the Colonial Office plunged the nation unawares and unwilling, it was so flagrantly unjust that our ministers, when successful, conceded to Canada all that she had wanted. Nevertheless, *since this*, in the last ten years, we have by similar claims of dominion alienated the loyalty of all our more recent colonies—in the Cape, Van Diemen's Land, Australia, and New Zealand. To judge by the past, we shall have new civil wars with these, and whether victorious or defeated, shall then at last concede that their parliaments are co-ordinate with our own; that British subjects do not lose citizenship by colonizing; that our colonists are to have a country, political freedom, and a political stage open to them; that a colony is not a mere field for our ministerial patronage, but is England renewing her youth.

Consider the weight of this topic on Europe. Only a few months ago, a coalition of the despots against English freedom was a danger not to be

* At its close, the Irish Parliament was annihilated, and Irish representatives introduced into the British Parliament. This has not benefited Ireland, and has enormously embarrassed England, in every respect, except that of giving to the king one ministry, and thereby (ostensibly) one policy in Europe. Its value, therefore, will be measured by the value of this result.

undervalued. It is now past. Why? Because Massachusetts hath roused America. The despots now know that we can get an ardent American alliance, whenever they drive us to ask it; and this is a risk they will never bring on themselves purposely. If America is still such a strength to our freedom, what would she have been if our Parliament had never usurped power over her—if she had been allowed by us to develop her strength, and had remained a co-ordinate support to English royalty? Canada now enjoys full freedom, and is rapidly expanding. If the Cape and Australia and New Zealand had the freedom of Canada, the world would soon swarm with young Englands, rivalling the mother's strength. Our Constitutional Royalty would no longer be a rare or weak phenomenon, but would encircle the earth and react on Europe.

We need only to return to old English freedom, enunciated in the excellent ancient fashion of *declaratory law*. Let our Parliament simply and plainly avow* that "the Colonies have a natural right to construct their own organs of self government; provided only that the inalienable freedom of individuals, the integrity of the empire, and the lawful prerogative of the Crown, be not compromised." By one such act we should cut the knot of all our colonial difficulties, return to our old freedom, renounce tyranny, and come with a clearer conscience to help legality in Europe.

I seem to remember an expression used by a late Minister, that the exchequer could not be relieved of the charge of colonial garrisons, because the troops were necessary for the retention of the colonies. If we dare not withdraw our armies, what is this but a confession that our sway is tyrannical? But to pretend that we dare not is a slander on the colonists, who hate only the bureaucracy of the Colonial Office. This alone it is which undermines their loyalty to our Queen.

But a more immediate effect on Europe is produced from our dependencies in the Mediterranean. Of our strangely arbitrary dealings in Gibraltar and Malta I have no time to speak, but the Ionian Islands is a truly grievous case. I do not refer solely to the government of Sir Henry Ward. The melancholy phenomenon is wider than one man's personality. Allow me to sketch the outline of the history. The Crown of Great Britain assumed the protection of these islands in 1816. A constitution was given them, for in those days the tide set that way. But our Government had no intention of making their parliaments co-ordinate with our own: they were to be nothing but a screen to conceal a really irresponsible bureaucracy. The islands learnt in time what English

* In old days, while our Parliaments were fighting the battle of freedom, they were fond of broad moral truths. But now, the instinct of absolutism teaches them to evade popular and general enunciations, which tie up despotic discretion. They now love to decide each matter on its own separate ground, in which case a lawyer-like subtlety can always justify whatever is at the moment convenient. It is thought to indicate an *unpractical intellect*, to settle more by a single Act than the point which is just then forced on for decision.

Thus a special Bill is needed to construct the machinery of freedom for each colony. Every such bill is tedious, elaborate, liable to fail of passing from numerous causes, and apt to displease the colony when passed! If this is to be the way that we legislate, it is to be feared that all the colonies will have revolted before the Bills which are to do them justice can have passed. Surely the only part which the Home Parliament should reserve to itself is that of *constructing* the organic work of the colonists. This would give it a veto on anything unconstitutional in new machinery.

freedom was, and found they had it not. Discontent and murmurs ensued. The press was not left free. Ill-will increased. Official people were displeased and suspicious. At length on occasion of partial and private crime, the Government proclaimed martial law. The press strongly censured the proceeding. The Governor arbitrarily banishes editors, publishers, and readers. And now, after thirty-five years, our despotism is thoroughly undisguised. The hideous mark of tyranny is permanently displayed, to the triumph of the absolutists—foreign armies and fleets crushing Greek liberty! Until we maintain the internal peace exclusively by native Greek forces, our case is caterisibly that of the Russians in Poland, and of the Austrians in Lombardy.

Our Parliament is under a fundamental delusion: it has forgotten its own origin: it fancies, like the kings of old, that its rights came down from heaven, and are not derived from men; but we know, the authority of the Commons is derived from its electors, that of the Lords from their baronies. Their inherent authority can only be commensurate with the soil of Great Britain. Our Parliament is indeed greater than, yet it is only co-ordinate in rank with, the Parliament of the Ionian Islands, which are united to England solely in the Queen. At present our Cabinet is constitutionalist in England, but absolutist in our dependencies.

How vital this subject is to the affairs of Europe appears in our heartless behaviour to Hungary. Early in the last century, when Austria was our ally, and we had aided her to the victories of Blenheim and Ramillies, we sent an ambassador to Hungary, with which she was at war, and we assisted in 1712 to make the peace of Satmar. In 1848, the Emperor of Austria abdicated in favour of his nephew. The Hungarian diet, on constitutional grounds, refused to accept the nephew as king, and a national war arose. (The details I purposely omit.) Did, then, our Ministry retrace their old precedent, and send an ambassador to Hungary, in order to mediate a peace? No. Did they receive the Hungarian envoy? No. Why not? Lord Palmerston assigned as his reason (you may read it in the Blue-book), that England knew nothing about Hungary except as part of the Austrian empire!—So, we had forgotten the peace of Satmar! We did not know that the kingdom of Hungary is eight centuries old, and that in Hungarian law Austria is a foreign country!* Why all this forgetfulness? Plainly because the usurpation of an Austrian bureaucracy on Hungary was too similar to that of English bureaucracy on Ireland, and still more recently on Canada, and on the Ionian Islands. Prince Schwarzenberg well knew that the men who had abetted the Canadian war might be insulted by him boldly if they would but have recognized Hungary as (what she manifestly was) a nation at war with Austria, and deserving from us simple neutrality. Kossuth could have commanded any supply of arms from England. I understand that a ship was laden and ready to sail. But they played into the hands of unjust aggression, and we have reaped from it insult and danger.

Our first business, you will admit, is to mend ourselves; but as the in-

* So able a man as Lord Palmerston cannot have been ignorant as to these matters. Indeed the able despatches of Mr. Blackwell laid open the whole controversy to the Foreign Office as early as February and March, 1848. It is manifest that the noble lord condescended to become the mouthpiece of incompetent colleagues.

direct benefit to Europe, thence to ensue, can come, but slowly, this duty does not supersede more immediate action. I shall endeavour to approach the question, "What we are to do," from its negative side, which is the safer course. After seeing what is absurd or unjust, the choice of conduct is exceedingly narrowed.

1. "We ought not to vacillate." Inconsistent effort destroys itself. Whig, Tory, and Radical, will agree, that England becomes contemptible if she does not know her own mind—if she holds different language in successive years—if she undoes to-day what she did yesterday. There can be no party among us who seriously approve of keeping up fleets and embassies for patronage to the Ministry, and for nothing else. But vacillation is far worse than nothing, it involves treachery and baseness. States and peoples (like the noble and unfortunate Sicilians) trust our strongly expressed sympathies, act on the expectation of our support, and find themselves cruelly abandoned. What allies, then, in future shall we get? What influence can we have, if we change from year to year?

All know in what direction Russia and Austria will act: these powers are at least consistent, and hence their success. But as for England, one needs to be a very deep statesman to know what she is aiming at. I can remember that Mr. Canning, as Prime Minister, sent a fleet into the Levant, which fought the Battle of Navarino; and that the Duke of Wellington, as Prime Minister, apologised for the battle as a mistake. We supported constitutionalists in Spain and Portugal up to a certain date, and then, in 1847, we crushed the constitutionalists of Portugal. We would fight against Naples in a quarrel about sulphur, but not to save the hereditary liberties of the Sicilians, of whom (when it was convenient) we had assumed the protectorate. While constitutional Hungary was triumphant, and was not yet embittered against all monarchy, we would not risk a war with Russia to hinder an intervention which we deplored; yet, when Hungary has fallen, we risk a war with Russia to save a few Hungarian refugees. Because we have offended Russia in the Dardanelles, we gratify her in Holstein, so far as to bring Austrian armies into Hamburgh, and give a stab to freedom and Protestantism in North Germany. Our envoy in Italy encourages Italian liberty in 1848—cautiously, yet so as fully to manifest English sympathies. Soon after, Rome, righteously and legally free, is unjustly crushed by France; her unhappy refugees are treated with rude inhospitality by our Maltese Governor, and our Prime Minister defends him by gratuitous slander on the exiles! Who would have suspected that anti-papal England would dread an unpopal Rome?

In fact, to what results in Europe can we point as won by our vast exertions and sacrifices? Which of all the nations is grateful to us? Which of all can be conscious that it would be the worse off if England for the last one hundred and fifty years had lain under the waves? Or how are we ourselves better off than if we had been strictly neutral the last seventy years?

All will allow the intolerable evils of vacillation; but few seem duly to take to heart that *it is the besetting sin of every free and mixed government*. We have no fixed and secret senate like that of old Rome, conducting all foreign affairs coherently, ordering armies, finances, commissaries, treaties, embassies. As the Sovereign cannot overrule the Ministry, there is also-

lutely no organ whatever to secure consistency in our action. On a change of Ministry, all foreign powers count that there will be a change in our foreign policy. Thus England stultifies herself. If this is inevitable, ought not Tories, Whigs, and every other order of statesmen, to agree that it is far better to withdraw our fleets and embassies? If a domestic occurrence, such as a change of Ministry, is to deceive our allies or friends, what else do we become but a snare and a nuisance to Europe? We entice, and almost compel, foreign states to intrigue in our internal affairs.

2. But again. "Nor ought our ambassadors to counteract one another." This now is to be calculated on, except when they all chime in with despotism. For the despotic courts, by alternate flattering and bullying, count that they can at last get a supple ambassador. Through the Hungarian war, it was notorious that the policy and tone of Lord Ponsonby and of Sir Stratford Canning were strikingly at variance. The only cure is to abandon *fixed embassies*, which belong to a past age, and in Europe, as a system, are now useless or mischievous. A fixed embassy in an aggressive despotic court is liable to be corrupted by the atmosphere, and undoes the influence of constitutional England. Those who live in daily courtesy with great criminals, learn to look gently or approvingly on gigantic crime. A fixed embassy should not be the rule, but the exception.

3. "Nor ought our Ministry to leave darkness over our principles and purposes." Secret diplomacy exerts no influence over bad men, except as a direct threat of war. It is weighed, not by truth and righteousness, but by cannon-balls. No secret letter can make a tyrant blush, nor stir a nation into enthusiasm. Besides, the secret system gives a most mischievous importance to the hints and mild phrases and (so to say) to the winks, and to the personality, of an ambassador: hence it is a dangerous vehicle of deception, and unsuitable to an honourable power and to a good cause. At present neither foreign nations, nor the British public, know the *motive* of our foreign proceedings, even after the facts are public: hence our past is no guide to our future. Of our recent European wars, that of Syria, in 1840, is the most famous: but how many of us know *why* we engaged in it? I have heard three reasons; but know not which to receive. Again: who of us could have guessed that our Ministry would plot with Louis Bonaparte to restore the Pope by force? and what Italian can assuredly assert *why* we did so? If the king of Naples were now to run away, and the Neapolitans and the Sicilians were to establish a government, as orderly and wise, as the present tyranny is horrible, the oppressed people is unable to foresee, or to know probably, whether we should join the French in crushing their freedom, or resolutely sustain it against aggression. What more severe can be said of a foreign policy which pretends to moral influence? And this flows out of the secret system. The same leads us to lose in peace all that we have hardly earned in war.

When the great conflict with Napoleon was terminated, we had forgotten for what *principle* we had been fighting;—which really was to restrain the tyrannous encroachment of a despot. We acted after victory as though no tyranny but Napoleon's was formidable; and we ensured to Europe despotism, oppressions, insurrections, invasion, all the past and

the impending struggles. When Ministers are allowed to wield a vast power, we ought at least to insist that they shall give public reasons for every act, as a judge does: Lord Castlereagh would not have signed the Treaty of Vienna had he been expected publicly to defend the details.*

Again: Secrecy makes it impossible to form public opinion beforehand; hence public enthusiasm is not forthcoming when the time of action arrives. Defenders of the late Ministry are heard to say, that it abandoned the Sicilians because it feared that the English public would not support them! Why, how could we? Who of us can possibly unravel the web of diplomacy? A blue-book comes out a year after the fact; and then, at last, a few persons who have much leisure get some insight (but a partial one only) into the case. The English public to this day is kept in total ignorance that we have any moral obligations to Sicily more than to France or to Sardinia; and then complaint is made of the apathy and selfishness of the public! If England is to be a moral power, publicity is essential for all her acts. Her state papers should be short, morally reasoned from broad and fundamental principles, and ordinarily published on the day of delivery, without any vote of Parliament; nay, most of all when Parliament is not sitting. The half-year's vacation is now a time of wholly unchecked despotism. The argument of "necessity of secrecy for the public service," must be reserved strictly for details of military movements. In negotiations, conspirators and tyrants need to be secret; but a great state, with an honourable cause, has nothing to gain by it, and everything to lose.

Publicity would not all at once secure, but it would conduce to, the habit of dealing on broad moral principles. No other can be right between nations. Lawyer-like subtlety is unjust and disastrous. A war or peace which cannot be popularly and concisely expounded, is assuredly a bad cause. Not till the popular intellect is the tribunal before which our statesmen plead, will our foreign and colonial be as moral as our home policy.

4. "Nay, ought we to admit, as a final criterion of international right the private decisions of a few learned men?" Many of our inconsistencies rise out of uncertainties concerning right principle. To recover a few hundred pounds for Don Pacifico we blockaded Athens, spent and destroyed a hundredfold of the sum claimed, and risked widespread hostility. Yet when an Englishman is brutally cut down in the streets of Tuscany we revenge him by meek notes that receive insulting replies. Here the principle is in controversy, whether a private Englishman voluntarily residing or travelling in a foreign country ought to be under the protection of British law. If there is a treaty to this effect, of course he is; yet such treaties may be ordinarily undesirable. If there is no treaty, one would think that no external jurisdiction should interpose, except in the extreme cases which justify intervention even on behalf of strangers. By claiming to enforce our own law for the protection of our subjects abroad

* The immediate consequence of our abandoning freedom in 1814 was, that the two nations for whom we had principally fought, and whose free constitutions we had solemnly acknowledged—Sicily and Spain—were both overwhelmed by despotic violence. Spain we aided to deliver from French armies in the great struggle against Napoleon, in order to see it subdued by French armies at the command of the Holy Alliance. This was to us an odious and dreadful sight: but we ourselves caused it, by not protesting aloud for Poland and Italy in 1814,

we involved ourselves in war with China, and are now again in war with Birma. These wars must be endless; and unless checked by abandoning our principle of interference, threaten ruin to our Indian empire by its own growth. Far more discriminating has hitherto been the conduct of the United States. Where their citizens trade or travel voluntarily, they have left them to the laws of the foreign country: but now they are bravely undertaking to enforce humanity on Japan, which murders or enrages sailors driven by tempests on her shores. The distinction between voluntary and involuntary approach to a country seems to me here the cardinal point. But pardon me this digression: I had meant to say, that all such questions ought to be solemnly and publicly debated by Parliaments, not settled in a private study by a learned jurist or historian. Where party spirit does not intervene, English assemblies have no lack of the highest wisdom. Did our Parliament leave to local authorities local and petty questions and the mere *application* of principles, and give more time to great moralities, it would be far more dignified, and do far higher service.

5. "Nor, if forced into war, ought we to attack neutrals." I do believe that many of my hearers will be amazed at my pretruding this axiom. Many are not aware that this is our habitual practice, and an avowed policy, to which no State of Europe has contributed so vehemently as England. I do not now speak of our having the other day attacked a neutral and inoffensive tribe of Kaffirs, and of having added them to our enemies by ravaging their country. This, no doubt, will be disowned as a *mistake*. But it was no mistake, when, having resolved to invade Afghanistan, we occupied the independent and neutral country of Sinde as passage-ground. That act of violence caused the Sinde war; and our conquest of Sinde precipitated the Sikhs upon India, with a long train of war, calamity, confusion of all moral principles, and infinite embarrassments to come.

See now how evil breeds its like. Our unjust occupation of Sinde to aid our Afghan war stopped the mouths of our ministers when Russia, in November, 1848, occupied the Danubian principalities with a view to the invasion of Hungary. We did not back Turkey in her resistance to this violation of her soil, for we had a bad conscience.

But it is from the seas that we principally attack neutrals. If we are assailed by France, we retaliate by capturing all merchant vessels which dare to trade to France. Thus neutral interests of indefinite amount are confiscated at the will and convenience of any one powerful belligerent. This enormity is politely called *the law of blockade*. By applying it in 1798 we starved to death 20,000 oppressed Genoese, men, women, and children, in order to capture a French army. It surrendered "with the honours of war," as soon as the innocents had been immolated. This is like stabbing a friend through the heart, in order to prick an enemy who runs behind him. The atrocious deed took nine months in perpetrating; and we persevered, when from our ships we saw the starving ladies gathering herbs and digging roots on the green embankments. Our two ferocious attacks on Denmark, a peaceful and friendly power, were a still more marvellous example how, when once in a war fever, we forget all moral principle, and, of course, with it all wisdom, in the struggle for immediate victory. As to this law of blockade, it is the nuisance which

makes war contagious, and forbids all real neutrality. War becomes too heavy a weapon to use. It turns our Mediterranean fleet into a sham. We fear to help an injured people—especially if it be small, like Sicily; for we cry, "Oh! it will cause a European war!" Yes, if we attack neutrals! and perhaps an American war, too, as in 1811 and 1812, when the United States joined our enemies because we fired into their merchant vessels. That American war was then our calamity. It is now our strength, if we are wise. It enables us to overturn this evil practice by uttering the word; for we know that America will join us.

6. "Nor ought we to volunteer extending a war beyond its most inevitable geographical limits." If Russia will attack Hungary, we may aid to repel Russian regiments from Hungarian soil; but by what moral, logical, or physical necessity does it force us to blockade or bombard St. Petersburg? In 1832, we made war on the Dutch forces in Antwerp; but we kept peace with Holland on the seas and everywhere else. If we wish to defend Sicily in Sicily, Rome in Rome, Hungary in Hungary, we are able to do something more or less effectual; and certainly with the least possible risk of moral principle. But the moment that we justify attacks on innocence, peace, and industry, by the mere plea that this conduces to victory, we go adrift on an unknown and incalculable ocean. Suppose that, in order to carry on war "more vigorously," we sail to attack St. Petersburg. It may be that the Emperor yields, to save his capital. Good! But it may also be, that he is fanatically obstinate. We then either retire abashed at our own empty threats, or we lay his city in ashes, enrage our good friends the Russian people, rouse their patriotism against us, and only do worse harm to the Hungarians. Moreover, to bombard St. Petersburg, is to ruin hundreds of English merchants, and would thus raise among ourselves a powerful party favourable to the enemy. It is as unjust to call the commercial class selfish because they deprecate having to pay for a war with their whole fortunes, as to expect provision shops to feed a town in famine. The ferocious Roman policy of habitually carry war to the enemy's heart makes war essentially immoral, as an unlimited retaliation for a limited wrong. It is energetic! Yes! as it is to stab a man, because he will not pay us five shillings!

7. "We ought not to be too timid to speak truth publicly." I admit that prudence may positively enjoin silence on weak states, like Belgium and Switzerland. If this is our case, it follows that we have no ordinary public duties in Europe. I do not treat that opinion as absurd. It might be urged that England is like a wounded warrior, whose first duty was to heal his own wounds, before encountering fresh foes. Our National Debt is our wound. From 1823 onward, when we did not dare even to protest aloud for the liberties of Spain, which we saved from Napoleon to abandon to the despots whom we had set up in power—our only wise policy (in my individual judgment) was to withdraw our fleets, economize, pay our debt, and nurse our strength for future service. If any one still says, *we are too weak to dare to speak truth*, this is the policy he ought to enjoin. But if, since 1849, it is too dangerous to be passive—if, wounded or unwounded, we must defend ourselves—if armed neutrality is more expensive than a decided secondary part in limited war—if on these grounds it is right to be ready for contest, it is cowardice and folly alike to shut our mouths through fear. The anger of the despots against an English

minister who speaks plain truth in our Parliament, is some measure of the formidable nature of the weapon which we hold against them. The speaking of truth in English public life would before long overthrow tyrannies in Europe. For freedom is an atmosphere, truth is a subtle spirit. It pervades foreign countries, it breaks through the barriers of despots; it invades their quiet, it overturns their elaborate plans. Therefore they hate it, they dread it, they persecute it; therefore they cannot afford Freedom to exist in their neighbourhood. But the ministers and statesmen who urge and entreat us not to speak truth too loudly, hereby confess that they are themselves already half enslaved. They warn us what will next come, if despotism be confirmed, and they point us to the wise course of doing the opposite of what they suggest.

Finally, to what positive conduct do these negations point? I know that if it be ever so right for England, in conjunction with the United States, to take an initiative in Europe, there is no time for the formation of a public opinion for that. Events must stir and guide opinion. But I will imagine a new revolution to neutralize the forces of France; and I then ask—What ought we to do, if some of the oppressed nations make insurrection? If National Independence be our own right, if Legitimacy is indeed of value, if we would not be accomplices in Tyranny, we surely cannot desire—none of the great parties in England could desire—to aid the despots. All will in word avow neutrality, as the least thing which we owe to the nations. But we are apt to profess neutrality, yet by an unjust interpretation, and through the odious Law of Blockade, practically to take part against the insurgents. If we would be truly neutral, we must recognise both contending parties alike, and defend our commerce to both alike, so as to enable both alike to traffic with us, whether for arms or for any other purpose.

At the same time, considering how great are our obligations to Sicily, and that we are at this moment accomplices in the oppression of Rome, we seem to me to have a deep debt to both these States, and that whenever we dare, we ought actively to restore them to freedom; but, as I said, without attacking neutrals or non-belligerents, or extending war beyond its most necessary limits. Moreover, if intervention of *other* despotic powers takes place, so as to manifest the conspiracy of despots, then beyond a doubt a league of free states to support liberty is just and expedient; and until it can be made, England should act alone. Do you ask what we *can* do? That is a military question, into which it is too late to enter: but I do not hesitate to avow a civilian's opinion, that if the forces of France were but neutral, it would only need a *strong will* in England, and she could, even without the aid of America, revolutionize Europe in three months, in spite of all the efforts of Russia and Austria; and to do this, at any imaginable expense of money and arms, would be to us a very economical and prudent proceeding.

Allow me one more topic. There are persons, I fear a class, among us, who love legal freedom by a sliding scale of geography. They would die for freedom in England, they abhor tyranny in France, they do not quite like it in North Germany, they are satisfied with it in Austria, they highly approve of it in Italy, and they are spiteful against freedom in Hungary. Like the ancient Persians, they value the dignity of nations by the inverse ratio of geometrical distance. To such I would

wish to say: "Gentlemen or Peers! if you desire to lead England, know your own race more wisely! Breeds of men do differ; but the highest are soon ruined wherever law is overpowered, unless they become martyrs in struggling for its restoration; and the lowest races are quickly elevated where law and freedom are secured by antagonist forces. You love, and are proud of, English legality, English security, and perhaps English progress. Yet Englishmen have not nobler natures than Italians, or Bohemians, or Hungarians. We have no intrinsic right to liberty more than other men: our island and a Dutch army, not our virtue, saved it from James II. Let us not be high-minded. Our freedom and laws will be exposed to a struggle of infinite danger if despotism make its conquests permanent over the breadth of the continent. The Hungarians and the Italians were fighting your battle, and you, alas! knew it not. You fancied them enemies to order, because they struggled against armed foreign oppression! But if there be anything certain in the future, it is, that despots will now conquer together or fall together. You cannot separate the cause of Louis Bonaparte from that of the Jesuits, from the misrule of cardinals, the brutal police of Naples, and the fortress-prisons of Austria. You cannot have liberty at home and contented slavery abroad. If ever the struggles for freedom on the continent begin to die away, despotic intrigue will cajole such Englishmen as *you*, and an ominous future will rise before England, which it may be too late for America to avert. We have no reasonable security that Europe shall not hereafter become what Asia is, if the forces of tyranny prevail in the present stage of events. Let the English friends of Austria look to the Eastern world, and to the old Roman empire, and learn, that despotism triumphing by soldiers is *conservative* of nothing but ruin and putrefaction."

After the conclusion of Professor Newman's lecture, Mr. Masson, the Secretary of the Society, addressed the meeting shortly on some points adverted to by the lecturer.

M. MAZZINI then came forward and addressed the meeting, amid marks of the deepest interest and attention, as follows:—

Amongst the many objections—arising in minds rather exaggeratedly cautious, and more inclined to tradition-worship than to reverence for the *unknown gods*—against any agitation which has for its object ideas or things to come, there is one with which I have very often met, especially applied to the Italian movement. It starts from good, though misinformed men, whose only fault is that of not taking trouble enough to get information; or from deeply convinced, though somewhat narrow, minds, misled by a fragmentary, incomplete conception of life. It must be answered. Lies are to be denied; personal attacks to be treated with due contempt; there is suicide in them; and they carry—thank all-powerful truth—their doom within themselves, as Cain was carrying God's curse on his brow. But objections, whatever they are, are sacred. They seek truth, and we are bound to help. A few days ago, the *Journal des Debats*, speaking, through one of the principal contributors, of the siege of Rome, was endeavouring to slander the noble Roman population, by coolly stating,

in the teeth of all official documents, that the four or five hundred prisoners whom we made in the first encounter, had been unconsciously, through some unheard-of unintelligible means, entrapped within the walls of Rome. Let the *Debats* and their foolish slander pass unanswered; theirs is a conscious lie. But if an honest, good-tempered, optimist "friend of peace" asks you candidly whether you could not manage so as to drive away by dint of inoffensive speeches and persuasive figures the one hundred and twenty thousand Austrians, who are trampling us down, answer him by all means. The man is decidedly mistaken, but only mistaken; and, as in many cases of mistake, there lies at the root an exaggerated misapplied truth. He is, in ten cases out of twelve, well worth being reminded that, far above the realms of human liberty or wishes, there is something which young Greece called fate, which modern times have rightly softened into Providence, and which, under whatever name it comes, is Law,—God's law, to be possibly ascertained, and irrevocably fulfilled: solemn, stern duty, necessity, which binds us to be real, true, just, and to crush, as speedily as possible, phantoms, untruth, and injustice; not for our own selfish interest, but for mankind's sake—for humanity, present and future.

This peace objection to which I am now alluding is twofold. It assumes two aspects: it has two camps, two sets of followers, carrying distinct flags, still preaching to the same intent: slow, peaceful progression substituted for sudden and violent revolution. The starting point is apparently different, the end is the same. They are the theory and the practice of the same principle. The one is absolute, exclusive, like theory; unflinching, unbending: the other is like practice, tolerant, yielding; it argues from possibilities, whilst the first, despising time and space, proclaims what is believed to be a truth, and wants it to be applied everywhere and in every case. I shall summarily answer them both—the one, an error of fact; the other, a sophism.

We have been often told, "Why do you want to throw yourselves into the stormy, perilous, uncertain, career of revolutions? Revolutions are bad things when triumphant; dreadful when unsuccessful. Try quiet, unassuming, unsuspected progression; intellectual and moral individual education; safe, though slow, popular improvement; schools, books, papers. Are we not conquering by such means, and in such a way, all that we believe to be righteous and true?" My answer is a brief one. We have tried, and did not succeed. We could try; we should never succeed. We tried in Lombardy, in Tuscany, in Piedmont, in the Roman States. We tried with unceasing care during the whole period from 1818 reaching to 1845. We tried by founding schools, by establishing literary papers, by erecting asylums for children, by summoning scientific meetings, by collective petitions, asking for mere internal reforms, by all possible means considered as legal in every civilised country. It did not avail. Schools were checked—opposed to the last—then, when individual constancy surmounted all difficulties, given up to Popish priesthood or government direction. Literary papers, always controlled by double ecclesiastical and political censorship, were finally suppressed, as soon as they evinced some general national tendency. Asylums for children, left entirely for support to private benevolence, were handed over for moral and intellectual direction, to soul-bending, passive-obedience-teaching jesuitical agency. Scientific meetings, deprived of all

national character, by some Italian power, Pope, or prince, invariably forbidding his subjects to attend, died a slow death, leaving behind plenty of indications for the black-books of the police. The collective petitions of 1832-33 from the provincial councils and magistracy of Romagna were suppressed by wholesale butcheries and Austrian bayonets. The originators of the educational Lombardy movement of 1818, Gonfalonieri, Silvio Pelico, Maroncelli, Borsieri, and others, had their own souls and bodies crushed under the chains of Spielberg. The promoters of the legal movement in the Roman provinces are even now wandering in exile. And it will always be so. The teacher in Italy is a marked man. Persecution will soon or late seize him, silence him for ever. And you, who still doubt our being ripe for freedom, and calculate the personal risks inflicted on our countrymen by insurrectionary attempts, how can you suggest, that instead of trying to conquer at once, by a supreme collective effort, liberty of education, we should heroically undergo the same amount of risks, imprisonment, and exile, for secretly circulating a copy of the Bible, or teaching a few children to read? To read—but what? There lies the great question, overlooked by all our friendly advisers. Except in Piedmont, where some liberty has been won—and won, remember it, by threatening revolutionary manifestations—there is no press in Italy.

Are we to rely for the regeneration of our country on a teaching which would enable our children's minds to oscillate between the "Austrian Catechism" and the "Cattolico" of Rome?—between the "subjects ought to behave towards their sovereigns like faithful slaves towards their master" of the former, and the "you must be poor, so that the wealthy may exercise charity" of the latter,—between the doctrine that "the sovereign's power extends over their property as over their persons" and the doctrine that no truth can flow except from the lips of the Pope? Like material wealth—like all faculties and forces given to man's activity, moral teaching, instruction, is an implement, a weapon, for good and evil, according to the direction in which it is called to work; it ministers to education, which is man's problem, our own revolution's problem. And education—true, good, God-like education—is out of question in Italy. Do you know that in a country where nothing is done by government to diminish poverty, a government decree shuts out of the elementary schools all rag-wearing children? Do you know, that by an Austrian measure, the direction of the schools, for which we are called to exert ourselves, and to pay, is yielded to the curate (parish priest) of the locality, to the commissary, to the government delegate? Do you know that they can, at their pleasure, dismiss the teacher? Do you know that, whilst mutual tuition is proscribed, *espionnage* is inculcated between the pupils? Do you know that the Hymn of the Emperor is sung twice a-day, superstitious catholic prayers recited four times a-day, in our asylums for children? Do you know that professors for the Lombardo-Venetian University are elected at Vienna—that from Vienna they receive their themes for instruction—that the student's answers, such is the contrivance to make man's free mind a machine, are required to contain the identical words pronounced from the chair, replies dictated by good sense alone being rejected? Do you know that Italian history and Italian philosophy are excluded from the course of studies? Ah! had I children of my own in Italy, and did I foresee that their life was to be spent in bondage, I would, rather than to cramp or pervert their in-

tellec· under such tuition, leave them unlearned, untaught, to the untutored spontaneity of their beautiful Italian instincts, to the inspirations that come from our own blue radiant sky, from our own Alps and sea, to the mighty ruins scattered around them—to the great, everlasting book of God—nature. There, at least, they would learn what their country has been, what it is called to be. In the schools which you urge us to erect, they would only learn bigotry, servility—passive, brute-like submissiveness: perhaps to curse or denounce their proscribed father.

And out of doors—out of the precincts of the schools—what can we teach that is not cancelled or distorted by the corroding action of the medium, in which they, the Italians, are bound to live? To be victims or conspirators? Yes, we can—we have done so. We have caused them to feel that they are slaves, and that they ought to be free; and, thank God, we have been so far successful, that one of these days they *shall* be free. But love?—love to a people surrounded, robbed, beaten by foreign soldiers or priestly *sbirri*? or mutual trust to men watched, dogged, denounced by spies, from the sanctuary of the family to the father-confessor's box? or simple, earnest, calm, religious truthfulness, with idol imposture enthroned at the top of the social edifice, surrounded by hypocritically-worshipping, clerical aristocracy, supported by hypocritically-obeying, materialist French soldiers? or devotedness, where, by all that seems association being looked upon as a dangerous offence, egotism, self-isolation is made the law of the land? or worship of heroic deeds and grand ideas, where both are unavoidably calling for persecution, and money, imparted to corruptible agents, is the only occasional safeguard against it? No. But drive back to their own homes those foreign soldiers who are a living shame to European diplomacy; stifle, like loathsome reptiles, the vile spies; take away the condition of things which causes Judas to sell his brother; fling to the dust, into nonentity, the veiled prophet who desecrates the city of the Capitol, and write on the gates of the Vatican, "We have only one Master in heaven, God—one sole interpreter of his law on earth, the people;" free the land from cardinals, primates, and all lying-by-trade, idly-consuming aristocracy of the clergy; let the wisest, the most virtuous man in every community be, under freedom of conscience and election, the priest, the guide, the comforter, the friend of the friendless; open widely all legitimate roads to man's activity, and point out to him higher aims, to be freely pursued, than those now left to him, of fattening himself and family with the moaning of his persecuted brother groaning at his threshold; tell your fellow creature: "You have an immortal soul, a mission to fulfil, a link with all that is living, a duty towards all, a right to love and help from all"; let the free air of God inculcate a new-life-giving spirit amongst those now chained and pestilence-breathing men; and let the free light of God—"light, more light," as dying Göethe was muttering—pour from all sides around them like a heavenly halo—you will see what a fine, energetic, quick-taught specimen of the human race this poor, oppressed, Italian race of mine is, and what now dormant, hidden, fruitless treasures of intellect, and heart's activity will reveal themselves to Europe. This is education. The slave has none, can have none. Jupiter, as old Homer says, takes from him, when he loses liberty, the half of his soul. You cannot bid the sick, restless, feverish patient be better whilst he breathes a corrupted atmosphere. You cannot ask the man

to walk whilst he is bound, fettered, manacled. Five months of liberty, three months of a noble struggle have achieved for the Roman people what none of you anticipated, what centuries of attempted slow progression and cramped instruction could never have produced.

Yes; revolutions are sad though glorious things. Every assertion of man's supreme strength of will is gloriously sad; gentle, soft, continuous unfolding of the life which is in us, smiling and smiled at, is all the happiness we can hope for. But can we have it? And are we to sink into inertness because necessity—stern-frowning, still providential necessity—is urging us to reach the aim through winds and storms? Are we to curse the infant's life and stifle it ere birth, because the mother is doomed to suffer through it? Ask the mother herself. Italy, our mother, bids us go on, through the path that has been chosen for us, sad and thoughtful, but firm and resolute. Impossibilities cannot be substituted by honest, good-tempered, optimist "friends of peace" for the realities of the Italian life. And then, our national aim! Time does not allow me to enter now into this question; but let every rational man think about it, never lose sight of it. Had we merely to conquer cheaper bread, an improved system of taxation, or a better system of roads and communications, I doubt very much the possibility of reaching such things, whilst we have foreign armies to feed, dismemberment to be kept up, and terrors of the future haunting the minds of rulers; still we could try—try again the peaceful means, and leave the burdens and responsibilities of a revolution to the generation to come. But nationality—a flag of our own—a compact, a common law, a common education of our own? The same political rights and duties for all that is Italian, from the Alps to the Sicilian Sea,—Rome as our metropolis? With an actual division of seven states; with a foreign government on the Lombardo-Venetian territory; and foreign armies occupying the half of the peninsula; and the Pope, the everlasting obstacle to unity, sitting in Rome?

Can any man of sober senses really suppose that the enterprise can be peacefully achieved? Can any man, looking earnestly, and not in mere *dilettante* spirit, to the Italian question, venture to say that this Gordian knot of ours can be gently, leisurely solved, and teach me practically how? For my part—and I do not say so triumphantly, but sadly, I do see only one way—the sabre. Blessed by God, the God of the oppressed, and in the name of our eternal rights, it shall be applied with something like Cromwell's energy to the knot. And it is especially for that time that I demand your active sympathies.

Others, who, from the height of what they call a principle, and I would beg to call a "crotchet," forbid our entering the contest, because life of men shall be, on both sides, taken away; I have scarcely now time or wish to answer. It would take me longer than I am allowed to discuss what seems to me to be their fundamental error, what I called a fragmentary conception of life; an unconscious materialist view pervading the whole subject, and losing sight of the work for the implement, of the soul for the body—a subjecting the formula to the living thought, the dead letter to the spirit of the law—a change in the terms of the problem of duty, salvation if you like, which leads to substitute self-worship to the worship of God, of God's providential will which may be fulfilled, through our own and others' sacrifice, if needed. Still, and intending to address you again

on the subject at some future time, I must remind you of a simple, sad, prominent fact,—that life is actually taken away, taken away by Austrian bullets, by slow Roman dungeon-fever, by misery of exile, by unavoidable consequences of often renewed martial affrays, which no moral preaching or friendly advice will ever suppress, as long as tyranny shall be hateful, and man be both for liberty; taken away since perhaps forty years, when our national struggle first began; taken away from the best, the purest, and bravest; taken away by the wicked.

Is the life of the pure and brave to be left for an undefined period at the mercy of the foul and wicked? Are we not bound to protect, by all means in our hand, their life, and leave to God to provide for the unavoidable consequences of this fulfilled duty? And if we can enthrone joyful lasting peace only through a short, decisive, final struggle; if to this long, cruel, half-potent, half-concealed war which exists, which we have not originated, which appeals to us for an end, we can substitute a single good loyal battle for the right—shall we not say, “Blessed be the battle which will cancel war during many generations to come,” and fight it bravely after a prayer, and in the broad daylight of God? Are they, the objectors, not men of realities? Do they not glance at the distinction between what we are to preach as a Gospel of the future, and what we are bound to act, in order to smooch, within the limits of our means, and under the necessities of facts which we have not created, and cannot at once destroy, the way to that future? Do they not pay taxes, whilst they write pamphlets or articles on a more fair system of taxation? Do they not obey laws which often they believe to be errors, or worse? Is not their practical life a continual choice between the least and the greatest evil? Let them ponder again. Perhaps they may be led to feel more deeply that life and death are both sacred: the two ministers of God for an end still more sacred and higher than they both are—which, too, we repeat it, must be progressively grasped and fulfilled by man: evolution, progression, enthronement of truth and justice, incessant realisation of the ideal which divine providence has pre-ordained for us: that mission of life, without which life is not sacred, but a degeneration—a mere physical, deviating phenomenon.

One thing I know, and feel delighted in being able to state to you. I would, and perhaps I shall, honestly and calmly sign my name under a few pages, asserting the gospel of peace as that of future times, at the very moment of unsheathing the sword for the last decisive Italian battle. The duty of all men, to whatever country they belong, who feel with us, will then be to help us, so as to make the battle as short as possible, and turn it to a victory for the right; without which peace is irony, and, thank God, an impossibility.

On the conclusion of M. Mazzini's address, the meeting separated about half-past ten o'clock.

FINIS.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE SOCIETY *For Sale.*

1. ADDRESS TO THE PUBLIC.
PRICE TWOPENCE.

2. TRACT No. I.—NON-INTERVENTION.
PRICE ONE PENNY.

3. TRACT No. II. — THE CHARGE OF
TERRORISM IN ROME REFUTED.
PRICE TWOPENCE.

4. TRACT No. III.—THE SICILIAN REVOLU-
TION, AND BRITISH INTERVENTION
IN SICILY.
PRICE TWOPENCE.

5. TRACT No. IV. — Mr. MAZZINI'S LECTURE,
DELIVERED AT THE FIRST CONVERSAZIONE
OF THE FRIENDS OF ITALY.
PRICE TWOPENCE.

6. MONTHLY RECORD OF THE SOCIETY OF
THE FRIENDS OF ITALY.

1. PROGRESS OF THE SOCIETY.

2. PROGRESS OF THE ITALIAN QUESTION.

Nos. for September, October, November and December, 1851, and
January, February, March, April, and May, 1852.

PRICE ONE PENNY EACH.

GRATIS TO MEMBERS.

LONDON:

PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICES OF THE SOCIETY, 10, SOUTHAMPTON
STREET, STRAND;

And Sold by W. KENT and Co., Paternoster-row; EFFINGHAM WILSON, Royal
Exchange; CHARLES GILFIM, Bishopsgate-street Without; and all Booksellers.

R. S. FRANCIS, PRINTER, CATHERINE STREET, STRAND.