

politics, and not a philosophy of monarchical, clerical or oligarchical government, is the question of what is proposed in respect of what we are to think of ourselves as human beings, who can share a mode of being which manifestly comprehends the inhuman as well as the human, both in the actual relations we have with one another and in what we think reflectively about ourselves.

Mr Thomas' account of the radical tradition of liberal democracy is grounded in what he has to say first and foremost concerning the principle of respect for persons. He identifies persons primarily with acts of choice which give actual expressions for "wants and preferences, wishes, tastes, beliefs and so forth", which define our personal interests. Respect for persons requires, Thomas maintains, acceptance, valuation and expectation of such choices in others and a disposition not to interfere with them and indeed to assist in their fulfilment.

What this quite fails to make clear is the way in which Kant conceived human beings philosophically. He did so in terms of a twofold mode of being, a pure mind related to a purely material body: that is, in terms of two systematic abstractions from the actuality of our experience of one another as living organisms, capable through our transactions with one another of developing, or *failing to develop*, active, expressive and reflective powers. Democratic purpose in political life requires that we and the governments we elect think in such human terms and not in terms of the systematic abstraction of the mainstream philosophical tradition in the modern age, represented by Kant, who would allow nothing ethical to human affections. 'Citizens' one moment, the 'workforce' the next.

(to be concluded)

Radicalism and the Risorgimento

Book Review
by Terry Cowley

Denis Mack Smith: *Mazzini*
(Yale University Press, 1994)

After Garibaldi, Mazzini is one of my favourite radicals of the 19th century in Europe; and this book confirms his importance as a revolutionary and political figure. Denis Mack Smith's thorough, clear, well researched biography provides us with a scholarly work that will retain an importance for many years to come. This work is essential not only for the historian, but for the general political engagé.

Some of the intriguing facts about our hero include his love of black cigars; that he lived in Fulham; read the works of Goethe, Byron, Shelley, and practically everybody else most avidly. He also just loved books.

This biography examines in some depth his relationships with Garibaldi and Cavour. In the history of Italy where corruptions and cynicism have been bywords in politics, it is

refreshing always to discover and rediscover a man like Mazzini, with such integrity, honesty, and a mind that was able to think far beyond expediency. He also had a great capacity for friendship, and counted among his English friends such personages as the Carlyles, John Morley, Dickens, Swinburne and Gladstone. In this study Cavour's general pseudo-Machiavellism becomes shabby as does his spite and envy. Also the spite and nastiness of so-called Moderates and Liberals who after reunification branded Mazzini as a terrorist, and banned him from living in Italy till only a few months before his death.

The irony was that Mazzini was - in the true sense - a moderate, a Liberal reformer, a social conciliator and a progressive thinker - with honesty, unlike many of his political contemporaries who were moderate in name, but conservative in deed, untrusting, and afraid of the Italian people. Garibaldi's shabby treatment of Mazzini is appalling and almost paranoiac in its obsessiveness, and certainly dents the halo of the secular saint of the Risorgimento. An excellent book - buy it, read it, digest it and see how many of its truths and observations apply to the political rag-bag known as the Liberal Democrats.

This book review first appeared in the magazine Liberator and is reprinted with their kind permission.

Reformulating Liberalism

Book Review
by Stewart Rayment

L.T.Hobhouse (edited by James Meadowcroft):
Liberalism and Other Writings
(Cambridge, 1994)

Collini, following De Ruggiero (reprint please) calls Hobhouse's Liberalism "timeless", "a classic", "the best twentieth century statement of Liberal ideas" and "one of the constitutive works of the canon". Quite so. Thus we are indebted to Cambridge University Press for making this work available again. Yet De Ruggiero was writing in 1927 of a book penned in 1911, and Collini in 1979. Does Hobhouse's Liberalism really hold for the end of the Twentieth Century, still more the Twenty First?

It is not sufficient for a magazine like *Liberator* which would see itself in the intellectual tradition of Hobhouse to answer "Yes". Most of Hobhouse's other writing, with the possible exception of *The Metaphysical Theory of the State* (a handy one for laying into those Marxists), is largely forgotten. However the claims made for Liberalism at the start of this review stand. First, following John Stuart Mill, Hobhouse wrote in an everyday language; his thoughts are accessible to all.

Second, and this is a factor in his books generally, Hobhouse wrote from a philosophical standpoint. His journalism, much of the writing of his colleagues, J.A.Hobson, the Hammonds, down to Keynes, Beveridge, Grimond and Michael