

pendent reason. “The doctrinal intolerance of the Church has saved the world from chaos,” he wrote, because the moment discussion of the sacred political, domestic, social and religious truths is permitted, “that moment the mind becomes unsettled, being lost between truth and error, and the clear mirror of human reason is obscured.”

“Reason has not been given to man to enable him to discover the truth, but only that he might comprehend it when it is explained, and perceive it when it is pointed out to him,” he wrote. “The misery of man is so great, and his intellectual indigence so lamentable, that he could not understand the first thing with certainty which he ought to comprehend, if the divine plan permitted that he should discover anything by himself. I would ask, if there exist any man who can exactly define what reason is; or who can tell why he is endowed with it; or in what way it is useful to him, and what are its limits.”

‘God Told Me To Kill!’

Donoso’s view is, in fact, strictly Satanic, for he argues that God granted Man the faculty of free will only to do evil. His liberty is only “to draw evil out of good, disorder out of order, and to disturb, even though it be accidentally, the perfect adjustment with which God has arranged all things. . . . Evil exists, because without it we cannot imagine human liberty. . . . Evil comes from man, and is in man, and, coming from and dwelling in him, there is in it a great agreement, and no contradiction whatever,” Donoso argued.

The culmination of Donoso’s philosophical treatise, is that “the institution of bloody sacrifices” is “the most universal” of all human dogmas and institutions. The most civilized nations and the most savage tribes believe in “a pure victim offered as a perfect holocaust,” he wrote. Without the death penalty, without “the purifying efficacy of blood,” all societal bonds would collapse. He even asserted that “the dogma of solidarity” between men is embodied in “the institution of bloody sacrifices”!

Donoso Cortes virtually bathes in blood:

“Since the day of the first effusion of blood, it has never ceased to flow, and it has never been shed in vain. . . . Mankind . . . has always believed these three things with an unconquerable faith: that the effusion of blood is necessary, that there is a manner of shedding blood which is purifying, and another mode which is condemnatory. History clearly attests these truths. It presents to us the narrative of cruel acts, of bloody conquests, of the overthrow and destruction of famous cities, of atrocious murders committed, of pure victims offered on blood-stained altars, of brothers warring against brothers, of the rich oppressing the poor, and of fathers tyrannizing over their children, until the Earth appears to us like an immense sea of blood, which neither the piercing breath of the winds can dry up, nor the scorching rays of the sun can absorb.”

‘Maritornes’ in Italy: Blackshirts and Bourbons

by Claudio Celani

A blackshirt neo-fascist militant in his youth, arrested and investigated in the context of right-wing terror activities in 1974, Francesco Maurizio Di Giovine is an Italian member of the *Maritornes* editorial board. He is today a historian of a paradigmatic counterrevolutionary event for Italy’s fascist and traditionalist swamp: the “Sanfedista” restoration of the Bourbon monarchy’s rule in Italy in 1799, through Cardinal Fabrizio Ruffo.

In a book published in 1998 (*Rivoluzione Contro Napoli*), Di Giovine celebrated Ruffo’s counterrevolutionary campaign, led in the name of the Holy Faith (“Santa Fede”), and took sides against the great Italian patriot Vincenzo Cuoco, a historian and a supporter of the American Revolution. Di Giovine slandered Cuoco, accusing him of misrepresenting the 1799 events from a pro-Jacobin standpoint. In reality, Cuoco, an eye-witness of that revolution, scientifically exposed the synarchist plot led by the Hapsburg monarchs and the British, first to ruin the Kingdom of Naples economically, and then provoke a revolution and a counterrevolution in order to crush the reformist party.

Hatred of American Revolution

Di Giovine’s intent is to promote Synarchist propaganda, aiming to conceal the truth about a key historical period, when the forces of the Hapsburg and British monarchies allied to crush networks of the European “pro-American” revolution. Those networks in Naples had flourished under King Charles VII, who ruled from 1735 to 1759, when he became king of Spain under the name of Charles III—the king who supported the American Revolution.

Under Charles, the reformist party in Naples took over the government and waged a successful fight against feudal and church privileges; started a land reform; introduced protectionism; and initiated manufactures. As a tangible result of these policies, the Kingdom of Naples experienced a great demographic development.

The recognized leader of the reform movement was Antonio Genovesi, who, in 1754, established in Naples the first professorship of Political Economy in all of Europe. Genovesi, the Italian economist most praised by the famous American System economist Friedrich List, thought that the

real source of wealth for the nation is manufactures, and the development of the productive powers of the labor force. Therefore, he pushed for education reforms, centralized government, the rule of law against feudalism, and protectionist measures.

Genovesi saw in the young America, the nation that would overcome old feudal Europe, and he forecast the French Revolution. He was able to hold his lessons for ten years, and he taught for the first time in Italian, as opposed to Latin commonly used in universities at that time—thus educating two generations of scholars.

Under Charles III, Naples became the cultural capital of Europe, especially famous for its music school, which produced geniuses such as Scarlatti, Porpora, Pergolesi, Paisiello, and Cimarosa. It was clear for the British and the Hapsburgs—as they also decided concerning France—that those networks had to be crushed.

They exploited the fact that Charles III's son Ferdinand was an ignorant fool, to give him Caroline, daughter of the Austrian Empress Maria Theresa and sister of Marie Antoinette, as a bride. Caroline became queen of Naples and started to plot to exclude the reformers from the government. She called in as prime minister, Sir John Francis Edward Acton, the grandfather of Lord John Emerich Edward Dalberg Acton, the founder of modern Catholic liberalism after whom the notorious Acton Institute is named. Acton started to dismantle all the reforms. He introduced free trade, issued debt titles, and launched useless expenses. He finally bankrupted the nation. Then, in 1799, the diabolical royal couple decided to wage war against France, whose army had invaded Italy and occupied the Papal states, but had no hostile intentions against Naples.

Cuoco described this action as if Ferdinand and Caroline wanted, from the beginning, to lose the war. They called in an Austrian general, Mack, who foolishly conducted a numerically superior army to ruinous defeat by Napoleon's forces. Then, Acton, Caroline, and the court, instead of organizing the defense of Naples, abandoned it to the enemy and fled to Sicily, under protection of Admiral Nelson's British fleet. The French entered Naples, established a revolutionary government, and raised taxes. The mob, the famous "Lazzaroni," had free hand to kill and rape, under the pretext of fighting the monarchical party.

Cuoco, describing those events, said: 1) that rumors are that the Queen's agents were inciting the Lazzaroni with the order of fomenting chaos and anarchy; and 2) that the revolution was a foolish idea, born out of Jacobin dogmas. Cuoco compared the American Declaration of Independence to the French Declaration of the Rights of Man, and praised the American one against the French. In no way did Cuoco take sides with the revolutionaries; rather, repeatedly quoting Machiavelli, he discussed how the revolutionary government should have proceeded in order to establish a real republic.

Admiral Nelson and Clerical Counterrevolution

One of Cuoco's concepts is that a revolution, in order to succeed, must be "active," i.e., must reflect a real national movement; instead, the Neapolitan revolution was a "passive" one, imposed from the outside, with foreign troops, abstract foreign ideas, and foreign institutions.

This is the point which today's *Maritornes* blackshirt Di Giovine attacks, ostensibly because his loyalty is towards the feudalist *ancien régime* which no type of revolution is allowed to overthrow.

In 1799, when the Bourbons betrayed their nation by abandoning Naples to the invading French army, Neapolitan patriots felt their responsibility to help in the government, to the extent that the French allowed it. However, Cuoco hints that his own suggestions and proposals were rejected.

Since the new government was just a tax collector for the French, it became immediately unpopular in the country side, where agents of Acton and Caroline stirred rebellion. It was easy to organize a counterrevolution. The man who did the job was Cardinal Ruffo of Calabria, who led a growing army of peasants from the southern tip of Calabria upwards towards Naples, under the slogan "La Santa Fede." It was a bloody civil war, because several cities had joined the new government and opposed fierce resistance.

At the end, the Neapolitan government, abandoned by the French army which was recalled into France, offered capitulation. Cardinal Ruffo accepted and granted conditions, such as exile for the leaders of the republican movement. But Admiral Nelson, coming in from the sea with king, queen, and Acton, after having promised he would respect conditions, tore up the paper and executed all prisoners. This is one of the gravest pages of infamy ever written by a military leader in history.

Cuoco was among those not executed, because he did not participate in the government, but was sent into exile. The revolution was crushed, but, more importantly, the reform movement started in Spain and Italy under Charles III, was extinct for many generations to come. Cuoco moved to Milan, where he was part of the republican government, founded a newspaper and wrote his report on the *Repubblica Partenopea*. He met France's scientist and "organizer of victory" Lazare Carnot, and gave him a copy. Cuoco then wrote a two-volume book, entitled *Plato in Italy*, which is a narration of a fictive travel by Plato in Southern Italy (Magna Graecia), aimed at identifying the origin of the Italian population with Classical Greece, as opposed to Rome.

Vincenzo Cuoco became one of the leading figures of the Risorgimento, the movement for Italian national liberation and sovereignty, which culminated in 1860 with the overthrow of the Bourbons and the national unification of Italy.