

NEW MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

WHAT SHALL WE SAY TO ITALY?

BY AN OUTSIDER.

[Though widely differing in opinion from the writer of the following article on the Italian question, we know that he possesses excellent information on the subject; and conceive him, therefore, to be well entitled to a hearing. Our own views on the great European Difficulty will be found set forth in the February Number of this Magazine, and also in another part of the present Number.—
ED. N. M. M.]

FRACTION Italy is once more disturbing the tranquillity of Europe. Again and again she has been well beaten for the same fault, and told to be quiet. But she will not be quiet; the treatment adopted towards her has not answered, and now the other members of the family cannot pursue their avocations in peace because of her restlessness. Danger of universal disruption and conflagration of war is threatened from this cause. All men are running to and fro anxiously asking if Europe is to have war or peace. And statesmen are meditating, what *can* be done about Italy? so as to stave off the calamity of the former alternative. But supposing some poisonous Daffy's elixir to be once again administered in sufficient dose to still the fractious patient for a while, the question, what is to be done about Italy? would still press on the attention of Europe for an answer.

England and Europe are to a certain degree aware of this. We hear it admitted on all hands that the condition of Italy is a standing menace to the tranquillity of Europe. But there is great reason to think that in England, at all events, men are very far from being aware to how great an extent this is the case. When noble lords, whose position entitles them to be the leaders of various sections of public opinion, "trust that the Pope may be led to see the necessity of introducing ameliorations in the administration of his states," or remark that "if Rome were well governed the presence of foreign troops might be dispensed with, without the fear of revolution;" when "best public instructors," far better versed in the past history of Italy and the public law of Europe as set forth in treaties than in the daily and hourly miseries, basenesses, iniquities, and degradations which the operation of those treaties are working beneath a million roof-trees, opine that, after all, Austria is not more a foreigner in Italy than most of the other rulers to whom she has been time out of mind subject; that she is justified in so ruling as to make herself safe in the possession of what is duly hers, and that the Italian population have no great reason to complain of the burden of a government, the heaviness of whose hand is caused by their own unruliness,—when these are

the indications of the public opinion of England, the Italians may be excused for feeling, and very loudly saying, that England is talking of what she does not comprehend.

It would be easy to set forth what may be termed, in no disparaging sense, the sentimental view of Italy's quarrel with her master and owner, in such a manner as would better serve the purpose of a writer addressing himself to the *sympathies* of a free and prosperous people, but the following statements, which seek only to convince the *reason*, will be confined in the driest manner to facts and figures.

Firstly, then, let us see how the case stands with regard to the great subject of taxation.

When Austria entered into possession of the provinces assigned her by the Congress of Vienna, the assessed tax on real property was levied, in different parts of the empire, according to various old, imperfect, and dissimilar systems of survey and valuation. The German provinces were rated according to the survey made by order of Joseph II., the Venetian territories according to that of the old republic, and those of Milan and Mantua alone possessed a good and scientifically made survey, which had been executed under Charles VI. and Maria Theresa. But an imperial decree of the 23rd of December, 1817, ordered the formation of a new and universal survey and estimate of all the provinces of the empire, except the Milanese, to be made on the principle and plan of that already possessed by this latter province. The text of the decree having provided in the most minute manner for an entirely equitable method of arriving at the fair yearly value of all property, declares that "when the necessary rectifications shall have been made in the results of the measures and estimates, the annual amount of the tax on real property, which the emperor may have fixed on according to the necessities of the state, shall be so divided that each province, each circle, each district, each commune, and each proprietor, may have to pay to the public treasury "an equal proportionate part of so much per cent. on his income, proportioned to the whole of the impost exacted by the state."*

The operation of framing these new surveys and estimates for the entire empire was necessarily a long one, and certain regulations more or less equitable were laid down for the guidance of the finance department in the mean time, with which it is not necessary to trouble English readers.

In 1853 the new survey was completed in all the provinces, and 16 per cent. on the revenue of real property was the equalised result, which was and is accordingly applied to the German provinces of the empire.

Under these circumstances, it seems incredible to an Englishman that in the face of the law of 1817 the tax levied in the Italian provinces should be other than 16 per cent. But let us see what is the fact.†

* "Una egual quota parte di un tanto per cento del suo reddito proporzionato al totale dell'imposta esatto dallo stato." This decree is printed at length by Tegoborski, "Des Finances et du Crédit Public de l'Autriche. Paris: 1843.

† As it is the object of these pages merely to bring to the knowledge of the general English reader the broad facts of the case in as simple a form as possible, the incontestable results only of the Austrian finance operations are here given. The statistician, who is interested in the subterfuges and thimble-rigging of the figure grouping art, by which these results are reached, may find them set forth with admirable clearness in a pamphlet entitled "Sulla Necessità razionale e legislativa da accordarsi al Regno Lombardo Veneto la Perequazione della sua Imposta," &c. By Valentino Pasini. Venice: 1858.

It results from the statistic tables published at Vienna for the year 1845—and those for the succeeding years confirm the exactitude of the figures—that the gross revenue from the real property of the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom was 171 million of francs; and that from the other provinces of the empire 641 millions.* It would appear, therefore, that the respective proportions of the tax to be raised should be for the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom somewhat less than three-tenths, and for the rest of the empire somewhat more than seven-tenths of the whole; or, in other words, the two portions should stand to each other as 18½ to 70.

The tax levied, instead of standing in this proportion, stands in that of, as near as may be, 36 to 70!

To make the tax hold the same proportion to the gross revenue in Italy that it does in the German provinces, it should be reduced from 36 millions to 18½ millions; or, on the rated income, somewhat less than 16 millions.

But the plain fact is, that while the German provinces pay on real property a tax of 16 per cent., the Italian provinces pay the ordinary tax (for it must not be supposed that this is all they are loaded with; very far from it, as will presently be seen)—more than 28¾ per cent.

The amount of the wrong done to the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom by Austria, and accordingly of the implacable hatred of the sufferers for their oppressor, will be strikingly exhibited by the following facts and figures.

The amount of real property tax paid by the Italian provinces to the Austrian government, from 1814 to 1848 inclusive, was 33 millions of francs yearly; and thus in the whole period of thirty-five years amounted to 1155 millions!

In 1849 and 1850 the amount paid for the same tax was 100 millions in the two years!

From 1851 to 1858 inclusive, the rate paid for this tax was 44 millions yearly; and thus in the ten years, from 1849 to 1858, Austria drew from her Italian provinces 450 millions of francs!

Besides this, the tax-payers are charged with a multitude of other assessed taxes under various names, which partly are applicable to such purposes as are with us paid by local taxation, but in large part also to strictly imperial purposes.

Besides this, the burdens were enormously increased during the last of the above-mentioned periods by special war taxes, and notably by the memorable *national* and *voluntary* loan, which being forcibly imposed on the communes exposed them to heavy costs.

These different additions bring up the total to the appalling sum of 60 millions a year for the last ten years. And this sum was wrung from a people impoverished by the recent war, and by the failure of their great source of wealth, the silk crop.

Let us now look at the condition of the Lombardo-Venetian taxpayer as compared with that of the inhabitants of other parts of Italy. And let us compare the facts with the recent statements in the House of Lords by one of the first authorities in the House, to the effect that, "while

* In round numbers. The fractions are in no wise necessary to the argument.

admitting that the government of Austria weighed heavily on the minds of the people (in the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom), that the taxation was heavy, and that as to liberty the people had none, he must observe that those evils were common to the majority of the inhabitants of the Continent, and that ON THE WHOLE THE PEOPLE OF THOSE PROVINCES WERE BETTER CARED FOR AND BETTER OFF THAN THE PEOPLE OF ANY OTHER PORTION OF ITALY."!!!—See Earl Granville's speech on the Address, February 3rd. When such a man as Earl Granville makes such an assertion, in the perfect conviction, we may be very sure, that he is speaking pure truth, is it not fair to conclude that Englishmen in general are wholly ignorant of the real facts of the case?

On account of the same tax—

Piedmont (continent) pays	12,000,000	francs
Tuscany, little more than .	6,000,000	"
Naples (continental) .	25,000,000	"

These amounts are, in proportion to the extent of territory, for the square kilometre in—

Piedmont	285	francs
Tuscany	280	"
Naples	316	"

and, divided among the population, show that each individual pays in—

Piedmont	2 fr. 60 c.
Tuscany	3 fr. 30 c.
Naples	3 fr. 60 c.

while in the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom the same extent of soil, one square kilometre, pays 1000 francs! and each individual 8 francs!

The territorial extension of the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom is about one-fifteenth of that of the entire empire, and its population a little more than one-eighth of the entire population. And yet IT PAYS A LITTLE LESS THAN ONE QUARTER OF THE WHOLE PROPERTY TAX OF THE EMPIRE!

The amount of property tax which the Italian provinces would pay if rated in conformity with the law of 1817, equably with the rest of the empire, WOULD BE 24 MILLIONS OF FRANCS. THE AMOUNT ACTUALLY PAID IS 44 MILLIONS.

Lastly, the total amount of direct taxation of all kinds paid by the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom may be reckoned well within the mark at 140 millions a year!

The above facts have been stated simply as such, without any attempt at proving the correctness of them, because they are notorious and undeniable. The present writer makes no pretension to having discovered them. He limits his scope to bringing them from places where they are not likely to meet the eye of the English public, and soliciting a glance at them. Any one sufficiently interested in the matter to wish to verify the above figures, and to obtain a much fuller idea of the methods by which all this illegality and rapine has been practised, may find all he desires in Tegoborski, "*Des Finances et du Crédit Public de l'Autriche*," Paris, 1843; "*Staats-Voranschlag für die am constituivendem Reichstage vertretenen Länder der Österreichischen Monarchie für das Ver-*

waltungsjahr 1849," Wien, 1848; "*Tafeln zur Statistik der Österreichischen Monarchie für die Jahre 1845 und 1846*," Wien, 1851—für die Jahre 1847 und 1848, Wien, 1853—für das Jahr 1851, Wien, 1856;" "*L'Annuario Statistico Italiano*, Anno 1, 1857-8," Torino, and specially the above-cited memoir of Signor Pasini; "*Sull' Amministrazione Finanziaria dell' Austria nel Regno Lombardo-Veneto primo del Marzo 1848*," by the same author, Lausanne, 1850; "*Finanze Italiane: Annuario Economico-politico per l'anno 1852*," by the same author.

In the preface to the first-cited work by Signor Valentino Pasini, he writes thus:

"In the month of February, 1858, when reading a memoir before the Royal Imperial Institute (of Venice), I deemed it my duty to note the urgent necessity of—1st. Diminishing the taxes on real property, which burden agricultural industry; 2ndly. To equalise not only the provinces of the old Venetian republic with those of Mantua and Milan, but also all the provinces of the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom with those of the other parts of the empire; in which, notwithstanding a new census has been established in them on the same bases as those which rule our provinces, yet the ordinary property tax is levied at the very much milder rate of 16 per cent."

Now this memoir, as part of the "*Acts of the Institute*," was printed at the expense of the imperial government. "I wrote thus," says Signor Pasini, "in the expectation of finding an opportune occasion of giving the proofs of my assertions. This occasion was not long in presenting itself. In fact, in the following month of April a demonstration of what I had advanced was asked of me."

This demand, the writer is at liberty to state, was made by the Archduke Maximilian. And Signor Pasini had the honour of reading to him the paper, from the preface to which we have quoted, and which was written with the view of justifying and explaining the statements made before the Institute.

The impression made on his royal and imperial highness by the statements laid before him, and his reception of them, left, it may be added, a strong conviction on the mind of Signor Pasini of his earnest desire to ameliorate the condition of the provinces entrusted to his government, unaccompanied, however, by the smallest hope that he would have any power to carry out his wishes. At all events, it was something that his royal and imperial highness did not dream of saying, in the exactitude of his knowledge of the subject, that which Lord Derby (debate on Address in the House of Lords, February 3rd), in what can only be considered his utter ignorance of the subject, ventured to assert, that "HE BELIEVED THE LOMBARD PROVINCES HAVE LITTLE TO COMPLAIN OF IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE GOVERNMENT."!!!

If Lord Derby would for a moment contemplate the real condition of the Lombardo-Venetian population, even as it is most imperfectly set forth in the statements above printed, and would endeavour for an instant to realise to himself the effect which such words from him must produce on men so situated, he would surely stand convicted in his own eyes of stimulating those unhappy people to revolution more dangerously than any vulgar agitator or demagogue. Does Lord Derby know how the denial of justice operates on the human heart? Can he estimate the bitterness that is generated by finding a cry of prolonged

suffering rejected, ignored, disbelieved? Has he any knowledge of the workings of despair? Lord Derby may say that the people of Lombardy have not to receive their destiny from his hands, nor learn their hopes from his lips; that England cannot put lance in rest to ride at grievances throughout the world. But none knows better than Lord Derby all the weight of words spoken on such a subject by England's prime minister in the House of Lords. Perhaps he does *not* know that all Italy is as much aware of that weight as he is; and that the expression of his opinion on their position is eagerly looked for by Italians from the Alps to Otranto. If he knows this, and could see the bitter smile of derision at the ignorance of the great English statesman, when such as the above is the opinion he expresses of their condition, or the indignation provoked by the injustice of it, he would admit that such words are not calculated to inspire the people of Italy with patience and moderation.

The whole weight of the case of the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom against Austria has been rested in the foregoing pages on the inequality of the taxation. It is the grievance that can best be stated, because it can be expressed in the precise language of figures, and depends on incontrovertible facts. It is, moreover, abundantly sufficient for the purpose of proving the absolute necessity that there should be—nay, the absolute certainty that there will be—some means of exit found from the present situation. For the taxation shown in the figures cited involves absolute ruin to a large number of the people, painful privations to a still larger portion, and absence of anything like prosperity to all.

But it would be easy to enlarge on the vexatious spirit in which the administration is carried on, and to point out the peculiar hardships and provocations arising from some of the indirect imposts and the manner in which they are levied—as, for example, that on stamps—the “*carta bollata*”—and that on salt. It would be easy to draw a vivid picture of the truly infinite and specially demoralising evil consequences of the spy system, and the rule of practically irresponsible commissaries of police. And well authenticated anecdotes by the dozen might be related to prove that in truth the Lombard lives under a tyranny that would seem to an Englishman intolerable for a moment.

“The wonder,” say the Lombards, “is, that we have yet energy to resist, or even to complain; that we have not been long since crushed into the apathetic stupidity of cretinism.”

But it would be useless to encumber this brief statement, which in no way is intended to address itself to the passions, with piteous tales of individual wrong and hardship, however numerous and however sad. It would be impossible to authenticate them satisfactorily; and it is preferable to rest the case on incontrovertible grounds. The fact of the universal discontent of the population is but too incontrovertible. And those great statesmen, who assure England that the Lombards have no cause to complain of their government, and that they are as well or better off than the inhabitants of any other part of Italy, may be safely challenged to find any example in the history of civilised nations where universal discontent with the government existed without the coexistence of grave reasons for that discontent. Mankind are never unjust in masses millions strong.

But however grievous, however well-founded, however undeniable the complaints of the population of the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom may be,

—however iniquitous the rule to which they are subjected,—however dangerous to the peace of Europe,—say, rather, however evidently incompatible with the peace of Europe,—the continuance of that rule and of their sufferings under it may be, what is the use of saying anything about it when we know that these things are all so by virtue of treaties? Lombardy belongs to Austria by virtue of treaty. It is hers; and may she not do what she likes with her own? England would give much to see Italy prosperous, happy, free, and well-governed. But the treaties! Who shall dare to put their hand on the diplomatic ark?

Now, to an outsider, there seems to be two or three things to be said on the subject of these fetish treaties.

In the first place, there is the answer which every Italian makes, naturally enough, when these unattackable barriers against all hope for him are urged on his consideration. “Produce the bond,” says he, “and let me see the signature of Italy. If a nation is to be bound by such an instrument, can it be in the nineteenth century pretended that she is to have no voice in the agreeing to it?”

But, it may be said, even if the Italians, who had no voice in making the treaty, be not bound by it, England, which had a voice, is bound. Whether it were well done or ill done, England signed the bond, and must keep faith.

Yet, rejoins the Italian, your sacred treaty, as all Europe knows, has been broken again and again when it suited the views of the treaty-makers to break it. It is declared inviolable only when it serves to protect wrong and perpetuate iniquity. And it must be admitted that those who are consigned to hopeless ruin and degradation by its provisions can hardly be expected to feel much respect for the sincerity of those who are so ready to quote the letter of the bond against them, but have never (audibly) quoted it in their favour.

But it is high time that this matter of treaties and their indefeasible binding force should be examined a little on broader grounds. And it seems best that “an outsider” should venture on the perilous enterprise of doing so.

An old Spanish story tells how, when the king was seduced by certain rogues into riding naked through the city, fancying that he was clothed in a tissue invisible to the eyes of those born out of wedlock, and pretending for his royal mother's honour's sake that he could see the magic garment, and when all the citizens, while plainly seeing the nakedness of their king, maintained, from motives similar to his own, that they, too, perceived him to be admirably well clothed, the cheat endured till a poor old water-seller, caring little about his own legitimacy, assured his majesty of the fact that he was as naked as on the day he was born.

Now it is very natural that the great men who make treaties should have an exaggerated notion of the importance and indestructibility of their work; and very naturally, also, all the numerous classes of little men, who like to look like great men, or to talk like them, or at least to be supposed to have come sufficiently near to great men to know what is what about these great world matters, all pull a long face when public treaties are mentioned, and swear that they, too, see plain enough that the world would all go to ruin if “the faith of public treaties were not observed.”

It seems necessary, therefore, that somebody, whose position puts him

beyond caring for being supposed to have never been even within distant sight of a pair of diamond epaulettes, should speak the few plain words which are needed to end the delusion.

If the treaties made half a century ago by the last generation are still unattackable, how long is it supposed are they to remain so? To the end of time, of course, according to the theory. But what has become of all the treaties Martens has registered? What has become of all the various systems of laws, constitutions, and agreements by which mankind have in all ages sought to bind and rule the generations to come after them? One might suppose that the world had learned by this time that the attempt is a futile one, as impossible as it would be unreasonable and unjust. Mankind must and will be the arbiters of their own destinies in their own generation, despite whatever parchments may be produced to show that their fathers have signed away their inalienable right.

But is there to be no public law in Europe? Are the labours of the modern diplomatist to be superseded by the medieval barbarism of constant appeals to the sword and the anarchy of brute force?

By no means! All that is wanted is, that the Pharisees of statesmanship should persuade themselves that treaties are made for nations, and not nations for treaties, and that public law, like national, or any other whatever law, can be beneficially operative only so long as its provisions are in accordance with the most enlightened public opinion of the age. Treaties should be, and will be, respected as long as it seems to the best wisdom of the current time that their arrangements are those best adapted to the welfare of all the parties concerned in them. But it is surely absurd, even to the limits of the farcical, for the statesmen of Europe to say, "Yes! we see the evils of the present state of things; we lament them; and had we now to make arrangements for the regulation of these matters, we could manage things much better. But, alas! it cannot be—our hands are tied! We are bound by treaty. Treaty says that things shall be as they are, and so they must remain henceforward for ever!"

And this in the mouths of men whose fathers drove James II. from his throne! though his "title-deeds" were surely as good as those by which Austria holds Lombardy. "She is in possession of those provinces," said Lord Palmerston in the House of Commons on the 3rd of February, "by virtue of the treaties of 1815, which are the title-deeds of many other territories in Europe." The phrase indicates unmistakably enough the root of the old-world exploded idea that sovereigns have a right of property in the nations they are employed by, still lurking in the statesman's mind. Strange that it should so persistently cling to the mind of an Englishman! and only to be accounted for by supposing that the life-long associations of the great foreign minister have made the modes of thought habitual to the minds of his brother diplomats—the servants of right-divine masters—more part and parcel of his intellect than the Brown-Jones-and-Robinsonian views of such matters which prevail in these islands.

Title-deeds, indeed, in this sixtieth year of the nineteenth century! Title-deeds to the fee-simple of twelve millions of men! And Sardinia is reminded that her "title-deeds" have the same foundation! But Sardinia and Sardinia's prime minister know better. The title-deeds of her government rest, and are rested by her, on the conviction of her people, that they are well and advantageously governed.

Once for all, therefore, let the world have done with the treaty superstition, as it has abolished the right-divine superstition. Let treaties be respected as long as they can be shown to be generally useful. But if one of the contracting parties finds the treaty which its fathers made advantageous, while the other finds it pernicious, what then? Why, then the treaty will be torn. For the most devout worshipper of the fetish treaty will not maintain that any nation has ever consented to continue in an injurious position because bound to do so by treaty.

But, supposing it admitted that the sons of the men who made the revolution of 1688 can hardly have the face to tell the Lombards that they are bound to endure all the evils of their government unresistingly, because they were consigned to it by a treaty to which they were no parties, what then? Are we expected to take an active part in undoing what we helped to do in 1815, now that we find how much woe is worked by it? Do the Italians hope, ask, or expect, that England should go to war with Austria for their liberation?

Unquestionably not. It may be unhesitatingly stated that there is no section of public opinion in Italy which deludes itself with any such idea. Our part, should Europe be condemned to see war once more arresting the progress of mankind, would unquestionably be to preserve a strict neutrality. Italy would be perfectly contented with such a policy. But she did not expect to find the moral weight of English statesmanship thrown into the scale against her. She did not expect, and was very painfully surprised to hear, the highest authorities in the English parliament deny that she had ground for complaint; assert—what not even the Austrian government itself dreams of asserting, in the teeth of notorious facts and figures—that the Lombardo-Venetian provinces are better off than the rest of Italy; and throw the heavy weight of their blame and discouragement on any attempt which Sardinia may be able to make for their deliverance.

The monstrous falsity of assertions such as those which Earl Granville and Lord Derby hazarded in the House of Lords in the debate on the Address, lead the Italians, who cannot be expected to know, as every Englishman knows, that any extraordinary amount of ignorance is to be credited to those noblemen rather than the shadow of an untruth—Italians, I say, are led to doubt the sincerity of any of the opinions expressed on their affairs by our statesmen, and are driven to all sorts of absurd theories—such as England's fear of the rivalry of a prosperous Italy, &c.—to account for their manifest ill-wishes towards the cause of Italian liberation.

A few words as to the present hopes and views of the Italians may conclude these pages.

Some of the noble lords, who thought that the Italians had no cause to complain against Austria, were of opinion that a similar favourable opinion could not be extended to the Papal government. They held that the true seat of the malady which is killing the patient must be sought at Rome; that the efforts of the Italians should be directed with one accord to the removal of this evil, and specially of the treaty-breaking occupation of divers points of the Ecclesiastical States by foreign troops, all which unfortunate state of things would be put right, and everything made pleasant to all parties, if only the Pope would consent to "introduce reforms into his administration."

Now the Italians comprehend perfectly well that it would suit the statesmen of England admirably to make a lightning-conductor of the Pope for the preservation of Austria, and they are aware that the Utopists, who dream of a golden age under a reformed Papal Saturn, have the authority of Gioberti for their theories. But between the time when Gioberti indulged in such hopes and the present, there is a vast gulf not to be measured by the mere lapse of time. And with the exception of a few highly respectable, but quite isolated and wholly uninfluential theorists, his disciples, no party in Italy would listen now for a moment to any such advice.

In the first place, they know full well the utter futility of the dream of a reformed papacy. They know that the impossibility of such a thing does not depend upon the opinions, the wishes, or the good will of the reigning Pope. If John Bright were Pope to-morrow, the reform of the papacy would be as far off as ever. No man, who has any real knowledge of the working of the Papal government, can have any hope that new wine shall ever be held in those old bottles.

And, in the second place, the Italians of the present day understand, with a unanimity they have rarely hitherto exhibited, that if once the crushing weight of the material force of Austria were lifted from off their shoulders, all other such matters as perjured ferocious tyranny at Naples, and corrupt effete imbecility at Rome, &c., would very soon find a speedy cure. All Italy, with the exception of the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom, would, as far as they themselves are concerned, ask and wish for nothing better than the exact observance of those treaties, which statesmen insist on *breaking* for the enslavement of Central Italy, and *keeping unbroken* for the enslavement of Northern Italy. Central and Southern Italy would manage their own affairs satisfactorily enough if only ensured against foreign intervention in support of their tyrants.

The entire peninsula, therefore, now sees quite plainly that the expulsion of Austria is the one thing needful, and absolute *sine quâ non*. With Austria on her shoulders Italy can do nothing; liberated from that incubus, all that she requires would be within her grasp.

But "a united Italian nationality is a vision that never has and never will be realised. Old aversions, rivalries of states and capitals," &c. &c.; we know the *refrain*. But the fact is, that whether practicable or not, no influential party in the country is at present looking forward to the realisation of any such vision. The national programme limits itself to the simple formula, Out with Austria! and then constitutional government, with as few and as small territorial and dynastic changes as may be compatible with those two requirements.

These are the aspirations of Italy. And she feels no little anxiety to know whether English statesmen speak the feeling of their country when they attempt to put the extinguisher on such aspirations by asserting that Austria's Italian subjects have no reason to complain of her rule, and by insisting on the maintenance of treaties which consign them to misery, while they permit the same treaties to be broken for the enslavement of their neighbours to the south.