G. O. GRIFFITH

MAZZINI

YESTERDAY AND TO-MORROW

A. M. I.
ASSOCIAZIONE MAZZINIANA ITALIANA

GWILYM O. GRIFFITH

MAZZINI

YESTERDAY AND TO-MORROW

1954
ASSOCIAZIONE MAZZINIANA ITALIANA

Stabilimento Grafico IMPRONTA - Torino, via Morgari 23

It was Matilda Blind who said that to meet Mazzini was to understand something of that transcendant power which mythical personages or founders of great religions, like Moses or the Buddha, exercised over their fellow men in ages past. To a generation such as ours, which has had a surfeit of hero-worship, such a statement may seem extravagant, yet there is much that could be cited from other sources to confirm it. John Morley (Lord Morley), in his Life of Gladstone, describes Mazzini as the most morally impressive man he had ever known, or that his age knew, and adds, « he breathed a soul into democracy ». William Lloyd Garrison, the great American reformer, speaks of being « drawn to him by an irresistible magnetism » and of finding him a « full-orbed soul » without a trace of egoism, narrowness, or self-inflation. At his first meeting with Mazzini the poet Swinburne fell on his knees before him and kissed his hand (« which », Swinburne records. « I really meant *not* to do, if I could help it »);

and he describes him as « the man for whom I would very gladly have given all the blood of my veins and all the power of my heart and mind and soul and spirit ».

The present writer was acquainted with one of Mazzini 's English friends - Eleanor Hamilton King, the poet. Her book, *The Disciples,* celebrated the Mazzinian heroes of the Risorgimento and the Maestro affectionately called her his « Poet Laureate. » In later years she became a devout Catholic (and a vehement despiser of Lloyd George!), but her devotion to Mazzini remained a constant flame. In her conversation she would apply to him Wordsworth 's apostrophe to Milton: « Thy soul was like a star and dwelt apart », and in her book she sings of him as « working miracles upon the wills of men and live confederations yet unborn ».

One thinks, too, of the tribute of Margaret Fuller (Countess Ossoli), the American Transcendentalist and friend of Emerson. « In Mazzini », she wrote, « I revered the Hero and owned myself not of that mould. Gladly would I die for him, only bargaining for a quick death. » And one might cite, too, the tributes of foreign contemporaries like Alexander Herzen, George Sand, Lamennais, and even Nietzsche. But most impressive of all, perhaps, is the testimony of Thomas

Carlyle, for Carlyle was not given to eulogising his contemporaries, particularly if they were revolutionary democrats. (As Mazzini said, a revolutionary or a man of action had to be dead for two or three centuries before Carlyle could see any good in him!) Yet it was Carlyle, in his famous letter to the London *Times,* who wrote: « I have had the honour to know Mr. Mazzini for a series of years, and.... I can with great freedom testify to all men that he, if I have ever seen one such, is a man of genius and virtue, a man of sterling veracity, humanity, and nobleness of mind; one of those rare men, numerable unfortunately but as units in this world, who in silence piously in their daily life, understand and practise what is meant by that. »

Our own disillusioned generation must make of these things what it can. To-day we may prefer to psychologise our great men rather than venerate them, and our modern psychological biographers have given to Oedipus a new and esoteric vogue. The fact remains that Mazzini had become a myth even within his own life-time, and that to-day, in this new and strange world in which we find ourselves, he re-emerges as a thinker and a prophet whom we cannot ignore. St. Simon, Comte, Fourier have subsided into obscurity; Louis Blanc, Bakunin, Kossuth are figures of interest only for the period-historian;

Nietzsche has his memorial only in the pathetic effigy of his preposterous Superman, and Bismarck's work has fallen into ruin; Carlyle's gospel also is discredited, and though Lincoln survives as the homely paragon of his nation and epoch, his work and his vision belong to the age that is past. Only Karl Marx remains to challenge Mazzini's supremacy as the prophet of the future; but if, for a while, it seemed as if Marx's materialistic philosophy was to conquer the world, it seems so no longer. To-day the Europeanism of Mazzini seems nearer than the Marxian dream — nearer not only to the moral realities but also to the practical actualities. And not only in Europe but in the East also Mazzini's influence is potent. Communist armies may overrun China, but he would be strangely deluded who regarded this as a victory for the Marxian Utopia. In India and Pakistan the spiritualism of Mazzini lies nearer than the materialism of Marx to the Eastern mind and soul, and this may be found to be true of China also. As Professor T. C. Choo of Yenching University has recently said, Communism in China is not doctrinaire Marxism but an inchoate desire for the « concrete transformation of the country into a place where all may have their livelihood assured to them. » In China, the conflict between fundamental conceptions of life — between Marxist materialism and any form of spiritual faith and culture — has not yet been envisaged..

What, then, was the character of Mazzini's faith and what were its sources? F. W. H. Myers, in his noble essay on the great exile, enlarges upon the fecundity and indeed the self-sufficiency of his genius. Without an appeal to revelation and with only the afterthought of an appeal to history. Mazzini (he says) discovered and lived by a faith of his own. He became, in Myers' own words, « the apostle and martyr of a view of the sum of things which simply occurred to him, of dogmas which no one taught him. » But this is a rhetorical over-statement. Mazzini's thought, it is true, was dominated by certain sovereign fixed ideas excogitated in solitude. By the time he was thirty — by 1835 — he had organised these ideas into a religio-political system, and that system, save for a few economic elaborations, remained fixed, unaltered, perhaps unalterable, to the end. But it would be absurd to regard these sovereign conceptions as no more than private intuitions, — ideas which « simply occurred to him », dogmas which « no one taught him ». His genius was in fact appropriative and assimilative, as all genius is apt to be, and it is not difficult to trace the sources of his thought. His originality lay in his unerring instinct of *selection* and in the power by which, weaving the strands of his thought into an ideological unity,

he was able to steep them in the mystic, fervent element of his own soul and *ignite* them, so that they became, all together, the flaming torch of his great crusade.

Let us glance, then, at the sources of his teaching.

We must rate very high the formative influence of his Christian upbringing. So far as his religious affinities were concerned, Mazzini has sometimes, and mainly by English writers, been classified as a Unitarian (Socinian) Protestant. In fact he had no affinity with Protestantism in any form: and here we have the fundamental religious difference between him and his friend Thomas Carlyle. Both men were outside the orthodox camps, but whereas Carlyle's thought was dominated by Protestant individualism, Mazzini's thought was dominated by Catholic collectivism and universalism. To Carlyle « conscience » meant supremely the moral sense of the individual man, to Mazzini it meant, in its ultimate reference, the moral *consensus* of mankind. It is true, of course, that he had no sympathy with the hierarchical Papal system, nevertheless he was essentially Catholic in his habit of mind — in his craving for a world-unity founded upon a world-faith. Catholicism, he would argue, at least had a *social formula* — it envisaged society and civilisation as a whole; Protestantism had produced only a formula for the individual man, a gospel of personal salvation; and to that extent the Lutheran faith (he contended) was tainted with cynicism, for it abandoned society to the Devil. No doubt Mazzini's Protestant friends had some right to point out that Lutheranism was not the whole of Protestantism, and that the Genevan tradition of Calvinism, like the Cromwellian tradition of British Puritanism, was not so individualistic as to be without a « social formula ». The fact remains that Mazzini's affinities were Catholic.

But since Calvinism has been mentioned it is right to observe here that there was in Mazzini's thought a distinct Calvinistic strain, so much so that Alexander Herzen's name for him was « the Calvin of Italian liberation ». Nor is it difficult to account for this. Calvinism was mediated to him through Jansenism (Giansenism). The Jansenists were an heretical Catholic sect who, in their moral rigorism and their emphasis upon Scriptural doctrines of Divine sovereignty, Election and Predestination, came very near to Calvinistic evangelicalism. Mazzini's mother was a devout Jansenist, and his first tutors were Jansenist priests. How the Signora Mazzini instilled this faith into her son we may learn by reading her letters to him during his Swiss exile. She appeals to him not to let his father's notions and prejudices upset him. He must follow his own mission in life courage-

ously, assured that God is aiding him. Let sceptics and cowards croak (she exhorts him); they are only obeying their own nature; but they will never be able to block the path of God's elect. « You are the elect of God. Your name is destined to shine for ever among the benefactors of mankind.... For me it is an article of faith. It is decreed. » How this seed, early sown, bore fruit, we may learn from the entire *corpus* of Mazzini's writings — from, say, his early essay on « Fatalism and the European Drama » to his last (or almost his last) on « M. Renan and France ». Shakespeare, he says in the earlier essay, translates the Greek idea of *ananke* into a conception that somewhat relaxes the bonds of Necessity without denying the fact of it; Schiller Christianises it into the idea of a sovereign fatherly Providence: nevertheless the over-ruling sovereignty remains. Men and nations may betray their mission, but the sovereign Divine Purpose cannot be deflected; instead, recreancy and rebellion are made to serve the very ends they would deny.

It goes without saying that another major Mazzinian source was Dante. If we turn to Dante's *De Monarchia* we discover Mazzini's doctrine of God and of Humanity in its medieval form. God is One, says Dante, therefore Humanity, made in His image, is One. God's will is the one uni-

versal law and mankind must observe that Law. But the ideal oneness of Humanity, he recognises, has yet to be constituted as an actuality, and in order that this oneness may be realised in thought and action the world requires universal peace. But peace, he argues, requires universal order and government, and this can best be secured and perpetuated by a system of government in which Justice is combined with Liberty. These propositions of *De Monarchia* are the cardinal conceptions of the Mazzinian philosophy. When he was no more than twenty-one the young Genoese was already exhorting his Italians, instead of analysing and glossing Dante's text « like medical students dissecting a corpse », to seek out his living ideas and try to be worthy of them.

And then we have Vico and the German philosophers of the Enlightenment (Aufklärung). In the preceding century Vico had reinforced Dante's major conception in the *De Monarchia* by elaborating the thesis that all languages, customs, religions, laws, and governments are under a general natural Law of Development — of Progress — which can be traced and verified in the history of peoples. Vico, it is true, perceived no more than a certain necessary biological correspondence in the historical development of the various nations; but German philosophy — notably that of Herder — carried this conception further and

argued for an organic *inter-relation* between the nations themselves, so that they constituted a biological whole. Lessing developed this theme on the religious side. God, he taught, is the Father and Educator of the human race. The history of religions is the history of a series of Divine revelations proceeding on an ascending scale, with Christianity as the highest in the series, and itself a preparation for some still greater unfoldment of the one eternal gospel. All these conceptions we find Mazzini taking up and building into his own edifice of moral and political philosophy. We may question his ability to read German in those earlier years; he never became proficient in that language; but he had access to French reviews and translations, and even in his Genoa days, as a youth, he could read (though not speak) English. Thus, through these media, he familiarised himself with German thought.

And so we come to Emmanuel Kant. Much of Mazzini's religious teaching is a direct interpretation of Kant's philosophy of the Categorical Imperative, albeit it is presented with a prophetic force and fervour that Kant could not command. Kant begins with man's sense of *oughtness,* of moral accountability and obligation — the echo in the human soul (as he says) of the categorical imperative of the Moral Law. According to Kant, the existence of this universal

moral law is not something to be determined by metaphysical argument, it is something of which the moral man is immediately conscious. We are obligated so to act that it would be good for mankind if the maxim of our act should become a universal law.

Now, if the Law exists and I am conscious of this *oughtness,* of this sense of moral responsibility which derives from it, then two things (says Kant) are necessarily implied: first, God exists, for there cannot be a supreme Law without a Supreme Being behind it; and second, I exist as a moral *person* and not an automaton: for if I have an immediate awareness that I *ought* to do this or that, it follows that I have an equal awareness that I am *free to choose* to do so and am responsible for my choice. And what follows? Duty — the Duties of Man. We are to rise above the interlocking mechanism of our egoistic instincts and appetites into the region of moral *ends;* we are to rise above the animal and develop the human and seek its perfection. In this sense, then, life becomes a mission with Duty for it ruling principle. Moreover, this consciousness of Duty, Kant argues, not only certifies to me that I am a *person,* it also certifies that my fellow-men, being under the same imperative, are *persons* too, and are therefore « ends » to be reverenced, not « means » to be exploited. And it certifies, or at least indicates,

more. The Categorical Imperative points us forward to a limitless Good and implies the possibility of limitless progress toward it. But this limitless progress must mean immortality — the perpetuation of personal existence: for limitless progress cannot be achieved in the brief span of earthly existence. It is in this way that Kant maintained the fundamental conceptions of his moral philosophy: God, the Moral Law, Duty, Freedom, Humanity, Progress, Immortality. All these great concepts were re-interpreted and re-vitalised by Mazzini.

One other word must be added before we leave the subject of Kant. He wrote a treatise « On the Possibility and the Means of Attaining a Lasting Peace. » What were the principles and methods which he advocated? They were almost a complete anticipation of Mazzini's ideas in the apostolate of *Young Europe*. For what this Prussian philosopher advocated was a voluntary federal union of European States which should serve as the nucleus of a future World Commonwealth. He pleaded that the union should be democratic and thus be broadly based upon the popular will, — an alliance in fact of the *peoples* and not of despotic rulers; and he argued that when *all* States were willing to subordinate their independent sovereignty to a World Republic, then, and not till then, peace would be secure. Until then, independent national sovereignty would continue to

mean potential war; and meanwhile the only practicable substitute for the Great Republic was a continually expanding Union of States. It was thanks to the prophetic genius of Mazzini that these great conceptions were drawn from the cloudland of philosophic theory and forced into the arena of political revolution.

Lastly and most obviously, we can trace in Mazzini's thought the influence of the French Revolution itself. His father, Professor Giacomo Mazzini, had himself in earlier years dreamed the revolutionary dream, and French propagandist books and papers remained on his library shelves for young Pippo's appetent mind to discover and devour. What he found and assimilated was not alone the captivating notion of Revolution itself, but the supremely engaging notion of revolution *through educational propaganda,* through a popular « apostolate of ideas » (as he himself phrased it), and not merely through subterranean plots and conspiracies. And we must add to this the influence of the Greek rising under Hypsilanti, and the thrilling legend of the *Hetaeria Philike*.

On the other hand we must note the unerring critical instinct that led Mazzini, fascinated though he was by the drama of revolutionary France, to reject the ideology of the French movement. He saw that, by emphasising the Rights of Man rather than the Duties which alone could

justify those rights, and by emphasising Liberty without a due recognition of Law, which is its foundation, the Revolution lacked a true moral initiative. To cry up Liberty, Equality, Fraternity and to mean no more by that formula than « I claim the right to be free, the right to be treated as an equal and as a brother » meant that a man was still left in the bonds of his own egoism.

We might go on to refer to Mazzini's debt to Foscolo, to Byron, to Lamennais and many others, but in fact from these he drew no ruling ideas, no creative conceptions. When we have spoken of the Bible and the Christian Faith, of Jansenism, of Dante and Vico, of Herder and Lessing and Kant, we have touched upon the main sources upon which he drew for his own religio-political philosophy. Yet though he drew from these various sources, the influence of other thinkers, so far as he was concerned, was *maieutic*, and the total result was less a logically constructed propositional system than a living faith, a faith so fused with his own personality that he himself was its incarnation. In this sense the saying of F. W. H. Myers already quoted is less hyperbolical than it appears to be — he was the apostle and martyr of a view of the sum of things which was expressly and distinctively his own.

Having, then, noted its sources, let us examine the salient features of this faith.

The English scholar, Benjamin Jowett of Balliol, found Mazzini a noble genius « a little overmuch preoccupied with two abstract ideas » — God and Nationality. Jowett might better have said seven ideas — God, Duty, Progress, Humanity, Nationality, Democracy, Association! Whether or not Mazzini was « overmuch » preoccupied with them is another question.

Certainly the idea of God was fundamental — not a religious luxury but a moral and even political necessity. « Senza Dio, voi, a qualunque sistema civile vogliate appigliarvi, non potete trovare altra base che la Forza cieca, brutale, tirannica. O lo sviluppo delle cose umane dipende da una legge di provvidenza che noi tutti siamo incaricati di scoprire e di applicare, o è affidato al caso, alle circostanze del momento, all'uomo che sa meglio valersene. O dobbiamo obbedire a Dio, o servire ad uomini, uno o più non importa. » « Without God there is no other rule than that of Fact, the Accomplished Fact, whether its name be Bonaparte or Revolution. » So he taught his Italian working-men. « When men no longer believe in God », he says, « God avenges Himself by making them believe in Cagliostro or in the Comte de St. Germaine, or in the table-turning ». The alternative, he would say, is either God or

some kind of ideological quackery; either « the sentiment of the Infinite » or some apotheosis of materialism, some principle of Irony or Tyranny or Determinism. And he would have agreed with the dictum of the modern English historian, Arnold Toynbee, that the love of men has been a force in history only when it has been a by-product of the love of God.

Springing, then, from his belief in God is his belief in Humanity. Like Auguste Comte, he saw Humanity as the collective Being of the race, but, unlike Comte, he was prevented by his theistic faith from propounding the *worship* of Humanity as the future world-religion — a religion which would indeed have condemned the race to the inflated egoism and perpetual self-reference of the insane.

The nexus (he says) between God and all His worlds, and therefore between God and Humanity, is the Law of life, which is the Law of Progress toward the fulfilment of the creative and providential design. Whatever of true authority exists in any human law or system of government derives from the Divine Law which governs human life as a whole and imposes upon man the eternal obligations of Duty. What gives meaning to human existence is not, therefore, the pursuit of happines or self-gratification or power, but the progressive interpretation, application and fulfil-

ment of the Divine Law; and this is a task which demands for its accomplishement the associated faculties and energies of all mankind.

Related to this conception of Humanity is Mazzini's doctrine of Nationality. He has been accused of extolling that militant nationalism which, since his time, has become the bane of Europe; but the accusation is based upon a misunderstanding of Mazzini's thought. For him, the nations have an organic function *in relation to humanity as a whole,* and in the exercise of that function, in service rendered to the whole, each nation finds the justification of its own existence. In other words, Humanity is not a simple but a complex unity, like the unity of the family, which is composed of many individual members. The nations are the individual members of that comprehensive family of peoples which embraces mankind, and, as such, each nation is obligated to render, or seek to render, the life of the whole more vigorous and harmonious. This conception is the very antithesis of that popular « nationalism » which sees the nation as an end in itself, a law to itself, a self-contained entity, living to indulge its own « sacred egoism », its own will to power and aggrandisement, and spurning the idea of any sovereignty superior to its own. In this sense there is a world of difference between the « Nationality » which Mazzini inculcated and the « Natio-

na*lism* » of modern ideology — just as there is a difference between individuality and indivi-dua*lism*.

And here also arises Mazzini's doctrine of Democracy. It was a saying of John Bright, the famous Quaker orator, that « England lives in her cottages », that is, in the homes of her ordinary folk; Mazzini held that Humanity lives in the people, all the peoples, and to them is committed, ultimately, the interpretation and progressive fulfilment of the Law of life. It is, Mazzini recognize, the vocation of the prophets and seers of the race to make new discoveries of truth and duty, the immediate result of which is usually the persecution of these witness-bearers: but not until, through martyrdom it may be, the new Word attests itself in the conscience of mankind and receives the amen of the *people* — not until then is the revelation confirmed, and thus a new line, so to say, is added to the progressively revealed Law.

Thus, as Mazzini would have us understand, we see in the progressive emancipation of the people the Providential purpose which is our clue to the meaning of history. The people are destined inevitably to rise because they are the ultimate custodians and interpreters of the Divine Law on earth; and in this fact and function we have the religious sanctions of Democracy. For, according

to Mazzini, Democracy does not mean the *right* of the poeple to make laws according to their sovereign will and pleasure, but the *duty* of the people to interpret, apply, and act out the universal Law, not of man's making. And therein lies also the justification of Liberty. The liberty of the people is sacred because it is a necessary means to this end. When, instead, it is extolled as an end in itself, it becomes a vain idol whose worship leads through anarchy to tyranny, and thus to liberty's destruction.

What were the practical implications of these postulates? First, they led Mazzini to the uncompromising acceptance of Republicanism as Democracy in its most logical form. Second, the democratic programme meant for him the abolition of all arbitrary and artificial privileges and the recognition of « one sole class, the People ». Third, it meant the gradual reconstruction of society on the basis of Labor, — that is, the democratisation of industry and the economic reconstruction of the State as a co-operative commonwealth. And, in order to achieve all this, it meant, as the first necessity, the conquest by the people of political power, for apart from political democracy, social and economic democracy was impossible. We must note however that Mazzini's doctrinaire democratism never committed him to *solidarism* — to One Party rule with its absurd intolerant

maxim, « No opposition outside the Party, no opposition inside the Party. » The protection of the rights and liberties of minorities was fundamental to his political philosophy, which recognized that all progressive movements begin as minority movements.

And so we are brought to the consummating principle of Association, which pointed to the ultimate constitution of Humanity as a living fellowship, acknowledging one Law, one sovereign aim, through the fraternal union of all the democracies. Such was the Mazzinian faith and the Mazzinian programme. And, comprehending but transcending all, like an overarching sky, was the hope, starred with the promises of Eternity, that, beyond all the crises and vicissitudes of history, beyond the world and time, all things would be brought at last to perfection in God. Therefore — « God and the People! », « Thought and Action! », « Faith and the Future! », « Now and For Ever! ».

So we have reviewed the Mazzinian testament and its sources. And now, in this new age, which, at the moment, is an age not of hope but of fear, not of romantic democratic vistas but of disillusionment and suspicion, what shall we think of it all? Some of us have the inestimable privilege of having been born a long time ago! We remember Queen

Victoria and Gladstone: some of the friends of our youth fought in the American Civil War; our fathers and grandfathers spoke to us of Wellington and Palmerston and Garibaldi as we should now speak of Eisenhower and Eden and Montgomery. And to us, therefore, the world of Mazzini is no strange world, nor is the language of his faith an alien tongue. He still speaks to us in an idiom which is intelligible to us and which deeply moves us. Even his religious conceptions impress us as being reasonable; to us they are sublime but not bizarre, transcendental but not fantastic; for we interpret them as he himself did, in the context of the accepted faith of Christendom. But to-day even « Christendom » itself is a term which is « dated »; like « the Holy Roman Empire », it belongs to the past.

We began by saying that, even amid our present confusions, Mazzini re-emerges as a thinker and prophet whom we cannot ignore; but how difficult it must be for the present generation to understand him, and how irresistible the temptation to dichotomise him, retaining the practical revolutionary and rejecting the trascendental thinker and believer!

And then (it may be asked) is it not evident that he was deluded? « Mazzini came to see us the other day », wrote Elizabeth Barrett Browning in 1852, « with that pale spiritual face of his, and

those intense eyes full of melancholy illusion.» (Mrs. Browning's own melancholy illusion at that time was Louis Napoleon.) Was Mazzini not deluded? If he could return to Europe to-day, what would he think (our interrogator may urge) of that Mazzinian gospel which he preached with such apostolic confidence a century ago? The Austrian Empire has been dissolved, as he predicted, into its constituent elements, but is Europe a penny the better for it? The principle of national self-determination which he advocated was liberally applied after the first World War, but who has benefited? The liberation of Poland, for which he and Worcell laboured, was achieved, but it proved to be only the prelude to a new and worse bondage. Kaiserism has been overthrown in Germany and Czarism in Russia — to what end? And Italy....? It was in the 30's of the last century that the Professor Giacomo Mazzini declared to his son that Europe might turn Cossack but it would not turn Red. Within the present century Europe has turned both Cossack and Red, not to speak of Black and Brown; but it has not turned Mazzinian.

Yes, these may be uncomfortable reflections. No doubt both Mazzini and Marx, if they could return, would agree that the course of human events is unpredictable. And perhaps even Marx might now be constrained to admit that it is unpredictable precisely because man is more that an automaton — because the reactions of the human mind and will and soul involve factors that are quite incalculable. As Bertrand Russell has remarked, Julius Caesar could not have foreseen, in his day, the emergence of a new phenomenon so disturbing and world-transforming as Christianity or the Catholic Church, nor could Marx have foreseen the Soviet Union. But in the case of Mazzini, perhaps the reflection with which we concluded the last paragraph would to-day provide a text for a new apologia.

Europe has not turned, and never did turn, Mazzinian. When it elected to strive for objectives which he himself advocated, it did so by means of un-Mazzinian methods and for un-Mazzinian ends. Therefore, it may be said of Mazzinianism as it has been said of Christianity, not that it has been tried and found wanting, but that it has been found difficult and has not been tried. Therefore also our present confusions and calamities are not chargeable as the failure of Mazzinianism; they are the failure of Humanity.

Moreover, if he were indeed concernend to make a personal *apologia* to the present generation, Mazzini would be entitled to remind us that the reaction and collapse which we have suffered in Europe were evils against which he forewarned

his own generation — evils which he foresaw as an inevitable consequence if the Revolution which he proclaimed were captured by the opportunists, robbed of its principles, and exploited as a profitable *bourgeois* enterprise. It would mean, as he declared, that the working-classes, defeated in their hopes and embittered by betrayal, would turn to the false prophets of materialism and to counsels of wrath, and thus that the popular movement, instead of being a fertilising river, would became a devastating flood; and it would mean, further, that, menaced in this way by inundation and chaos, the Governments of Europe would presently surrender to reactionary forces and thus introduce a new cycle of despotism and violence. And was he not right?

But now if we glance back once more at Mazzini's *faith,* at his fundamental postulates, at what point would we break away from him? Reviewing his creed in the light — and darkness — of our own time, and with (let us suppose) the superior wisdom of an added century of experience, at what point should we wish to correct his beliefs? We are not thinking now of those who would expurgate Mazzini's teachings of every metaphysical reference. Materialism begins to be discredited, and it is still permitted to us to believe in God, in the world transcendent and eternal,

and in the spirit of man. When he teaches that man finds himself in a world which he did not create, and subject to a moral law and a moral order which he did not invent, Mazzini stands in the Great Tradition from Moses to Plato, from Plato to Kant, and from Kant to Berdyaëv in our own day. To deny Spirit is to deny not only God but Man also.

But we can no longer believe, as Mazzini and his contemporaries believed, in the almost mechanical inevitability of Progress. We believe in Progress, but not as they believed in it. We know we *ought* to progress, we know it is *possible* to progress, but we can no longer believe that, in human affairs, progress operates as an irresistible law. Even in the sphere of biological Evolution progress is not inevitable. Nature has her failures and cul-de-sacs; and in the moral life of man factors emerge that are distinct from the impersonal operation of the evolutionary process. Man's evolutionary history as an animal may be charted by an upward graph, but the history of man as a moral being is by no means a record of continuous advance.

We may believe that, if he returned to-day, Mazzini might wish to revise his doctrine of Man. To-day it is not easy for us to regard man as the essentially reasonable, virtuous and aspiring being

that the optimistic humanism of Mazzini's age conceived him to be — a being who needed only right education and a suitable social environment in order to achieve perfection. To-day we recognise, as Mazzini did not, but as Dante did, the element of moral perversity and tragedy in human history. Man does not of necessity « love the highest when he sees it », as the Victorian poet believed he must: he may spurn the highest. This Dante understood, for he stood farther from the dogma of Progress and nearer to the Christian doctrine of Sin and Redemption than Mazzini did. In this respect we have to re-think our doctrine of Democracy in terms more consonant with moral realism than the humanitarianism of the last century was disposed to recognise.

But when ever did Mazzini claim infallibility? He preferred the humbler, saner and more apostolic confession, « We know in part and we prophesy in part.... We see through a glass darkly». Not as an oracular superman binding the minds and souls of his followers with inerrable judgments and decrees — not so does he stand before us, but as a prophet pointing us away from himself to Truth, Duty and the Eternal Law. « How right he was! » we once heard Mr. Lloyd George exclaim, and he went on to contrast the transient military empire of Napoleon with the imperishable creative

influence of the Great Exile. And it is even so. It has been his immortality to have worked upon

> The hidden germs of fresh humanities.
> Of live confederations yet unborn.

He died in Pisa in 1872; in Italy, in the world, in history, he will never die. He best monument, not to his memory, but to his immortality, will be the democratic Federation of Europe.

Mr. Gwilym O. Griffith has dedicaded this work to the late Mrs. Bice Pareto Magliano — who had translated his book « Mazzini Prophet of the moderne Europe » (Published by Laterza in 1939. A new edition is expected in a short time).

A.M.I. is grateful to Mr. Griffith for his permission to reproduce this work.

ASSOCIAZIONE MAZZINIANA ITALIANA (A.M.I.) - National Direction - Casa Mazzini, via Lomellini 11 - Genoa.

National Secretariat - Corso Concordia 12 - Milan (All correspondence should be addressed here).

The Associazione Mazziniana Italiana, was founded in 1944, within the Resistence Movement. Consecutive Presidents: Mr. Nello Meoni, Professors Luigi Salvatorelli and Giuseppe Chiostergi. - A.M.I. is formed of local branches and groups abroad.

A.M.I.'s scope is the perfection of the Italian Republic and the achievement of the republican federal unity, European and of the world. To this effect A.M.I. divulges everywhere the thought of Joseph Mazzini, who was the unremitting apostle and earnest agitator of the European republican and social democracy.

A.M.I. welcomes the adherence of anybody willing to cooperate for the achievement of its purpose.

IL PENSIERO MAZZINIANO, montly issue of the A.M.I., editors Messrs. Terenzio Grandi and Giuseppe Tramarollo - Via Oddino Morgari 23 - Turin.

Reporting informations and free debates, this magazine supports every initiative which endeavours, in Italy or abroad, to interpret in modern terms Mazzini's legacy in the field of education, of culture and of social regeneration.

LIBRERIA DELL'A.M.I. - Mazzini House, via Lomellini 11 - Genoa.

It can supply every type of published literature about Mazzini and about contemporary history and politics.

EFEMEROTECA DELL'A.M.I. - Via Oddino Morgari 23 - Turin.

Collection of reviews and magazines concerning history and politics. Founded in 1949, it has now-a-days more than a thousand years of periodicals magazines: all those which are sent to *Il Pensiero Mazziniano* and to which presents and legacies made by individuals and institutions must be added. Furthermore, it has also collections of first numbers, special issues, political placards and calendars.

ISTITUTO MAZZINIANO - Mazzini House, via Lomellini 11 - Genoa.

Founded by the City council of Genoa in the house where Mazzini was born on June the 22nd 1805, it has now Prof. Arturo Codignola as managing director. It has a library, very rich in historical works in general and especially about Mazzini; an important collection of authographs; a notable museum open to the public.

DOMUS MAZZINIANA - Via Mazzini - Pise.

Institute founded under the sponsorship of the Italian Republic in Rosselli's House, rebuilt after having been heavyly damaged during the last war, where Mazzini died on March the 10th 1872. It contains a mazzinian museum, a Library continually encreasing, a very important collection of manuscripts.

CENTRO COOPERATIVO MAZZINIANO « PENSIERO ED AZIONE » - Senigallia (Ancona).

Founded and presided by Professor Giuseppe Chiostergi formerly vice-president of the Chamber of Deputies. It is a cooperative society that has built its own residence, and an international institute for studies on cooperation. Series of lectures are held. There is also a specialized Library.

SOME EDITIONS OF THE ASSOCIAZIONE MAZZINIANA ITALIANA (A.M.I.)

JOSEPH MAZZINI, I DOVERI DELL'UOMO. Bound vol., with 4 illustrations.

— DES INTÉRÊT ET DES PRINCIPES, with notice of Giuseppe Tramarollo. 1954.

TERENZIO GRANDI, MAZZINI FUORI D'ITALIA. Essay for a Mazzini's bibliography abroad.

JOSEPH MAZZINI, DEVOI DE LA HOMO. In esperanto language.

— LA DEMOKRATIO. Four pages in esperanto language.