

EUROPEAN TOPICS.

The growth of modern Rome, the widening of some streets, and the making of new ones, are destroying old land marks. The English cemetery, which lies just within the walls of Rome and near the pyramid of Coius Cestius, is about to be removed, and transferred to another place near the gate of San Paolo. It is with peculiar pain that one hears that the last resting-place of Keats, of Dr. John Bell, the anatomist, of the family of Alexander von Humbolt, and of the sun-burnt remains of what was mortal of Percy Bysshe Shelley, to say nothing of the thousands of other English and American citizens placed in this peaceful spot by sorrowing and loving hands, is to be ruthlessly disturbed. A leading Roman journal makes the following announcement:

"The municipality of Rome has at length come to terms with the German embassy, which is proprietor of the Protestant cemetery near Monte Testaccio, to transfer the said cemetery to another place near the gate of San Paolo. The region of Monte Testaccio has become a large faubourg of Rome—indeed a little city by itself. The projection of new streets exacts this expropriation. The negotiations have been long and tedious, because the burial ground in question contains the remains of so many celebrated persons held in great reverence by the Anglo Protestant colony." It appears that the so-called "English Burial Ground" is under the protection of the German embassy. Probably this arose from the fact that from the days of Henry VIII. until 1870 Great Britain had no diplomatic representative at Rome. Those who visited Rome a few years ago will remember what rapid strides had been made in building up the waste land near Monte Testaccio, yet little would they dream that this quiet resting place of the dead, so filled with bird songs and so brilliant and redolent with daisies and wild violets, was so soon to have the ruthless pick and shovel at work amid the graves and the monuments of those who have filled a place in the world, or in the hearts of loved unknown ones. No new place will ever have the same associations.

Last week occurred the death of M. Mancini, one of Italy's most brilliant statesmen. He was a patriot who mingled in the struggles of Naples against the Bourbon prince nearly forty years ago. He escaped to Turin. Since Italy became a united kingdom he has always been in the front rank of her statesmen and lately held the position of minister of foreign affairs. His funeral was one of the largest seen in Italy for many a year, for Mancini was beloved by all parties from the king down. His wife holds one of the most popular places among the poetesses of Italy. When in exile at Turin she read Gladstone's celebrated letters to Lord Aberdeen, and her approving reply in patriotic verse "*A Gladstone par une Exilée Neapolitaine*," published at Turin in

1851, found an echo in every patriotic heart in Italy.

Is there or is there not an alliance between Russia and France? This is one of the questions that no one seems able to answer. It has been objected that a despotic Empire like Russia cannot pursue a common policy with a republic like France. But this objection is reduced to nothing when it is considered that foreign politics are dictated by a community of interests and not by forms of government. The steady support which the French press gives to Russian interests, and its readiness to adopt Russian views on all questions of foreign policy, testify to the probability of some unwritten arrangement between France and Russia. *La France* says: "The young Emperor of Germany has not succeeded in bringing about the disgrace of Count Taaffe, who directs the policy of the Austrian empire in a sense disagreeable to Germany. On the contrary, it is the German Prince Reuss who is obliged to return to Berlin. The success of the Russian loan, in spite of all the efforts of the German press, shows that this press is not as omnipotent as it imagines itself to be. This considerable event has had a *contrecoup* at Constantinople, where the Sultan, though solicited to enter the triple alliance, has decided to throw himself on the side of Russia and France." What a change has taken place in regard to the "Eastern question." Thirty years ago it was England, France and Turkey in alliance fighting the Russian Bear. Today it is Russia, France and Turkey who are in friendly alliance, while England is quietly establishing her power in the former dominions of the Sultan.

Is Germany trying to pick a quarrel with England? And if so, how far does she intend to push it? These are questions that are probably being considered just now by the British government. It is well known that the accusation against Sir Robert Morier could not be made without the consent of Prince Bismarck, and that the Chancellor seldom moves without an ulterior purpose.

An ambassador of England at one of the chief courts in Europe has been grossly insulted by the German government. England, pursuing her peace policy, pays but little attention to it. In the days of Lord Palmerston it would have been different. As matters now stand Sir Robert Morier may be left to fight it out with Herbert Bismarck. The German Chancellor has drawn England a good way into the East African alliance and he may be desirous of leading her still further. The Morier incident has had one singular effect, which was not perhaps anticipated by those who created it. It has served as a peg on which the Russian newspapers hang their denunciations of German diplomacy. These journals boldly declare that the Morier incident is simply a proof of the Chancellor's fondness for fishing in troubled waters, and for setting all his neighbors by the ears. When Russia takes up the cudgels in defense of the British ambassa-

dor at St. Petersburg, it can only mean that she wishes to be on good terms with England, and in diplomatic language to bring about a *rapprochement*. This does not seem to be exactly what Prince Bismarck wanted, as one of his principal diplomatic schemes is to maintain a permanent antagonism between Russia and Great Britain. "The country in danger." Such was the cry which rang through France the past year, and an echo of it now rings through England. Thirty millions are spent each year on the British army and navy, yet her practical men say that Great Britain is not prepared for war. We have not a sufficient navy says Lord Charles Beresford. We have not a sufficient army says Lord Wolseley. What then has become of the thirty millions a year? Large additional amounts will shortly be asked for. Coast defense committees are asking for many millions more. Lord Salisbury made some ominous remarks the other day. He said, "In foreign countries ministers are not absolutely permanent; they change not unfrequently, and no one who has not the gift of prophecy can foresee into whose hands the power over tremendous armaments may at any time be placed." This can only apply to France. No other country except England changes her ministries so frequently. It appears that Lord Salisbury is anticipating, not without some uneasiness, the success of Boulanger. He fears that there may then be trouble. Is the treaty of 1856 quite reconcilable with England's conquest in Soudan? Is Egypt to become a British dependency? Is this a reason why Turkey prefers a Russian to a British alliance? General Boulanger, if he came to power, might give a decided negative to some of their questions.

The mystery that has hitherto enveloped Boulangerism is now slowly clearing away. To use an American term, the latest "plank" in the Boulangerist "platform" is to live in peace with the Catholic Church. They pretend to have discovered that Romanism is not the enemy but the friend of the republic. This new doctrine will evidently have some weight in a country where the Catholic Church is still a power. The latest speech of Boulanger is quite a curiosity in its way. It declares that under the new constitution (that is to be) there will be no place for competition among deputies. Whether Boulanger is elected to represent Paris or not is not important. He is already a Deputy, and with a formidable coalition of Extremists, Bonapartists and fantastic Republicans, under the powerful influence of the Catholic party, is endeavoring to imbue the minds of the French with the ideas of dissolution of the present government and revision of the Constitution. J. H. WARD.

EUROPE, Jan. 21, 1889.

Falsehood, like poison, will generally be rejected when administered alone; but when blended with wholesome ingredients may be swallowed unperceived.