



A HINDU COTTON-SPINNING AND -WEAVING MILL AT BOMBAY.

It is worked by modern machinery, run by steam. The huts in the foreground are the houses in which the operatives live.

INDIA'S COTTON MENACING OURS

THAT GREAT BRITAIN wishes to "use India simply as a stick with which to beat down American (cotton) prices" is the deliberate conclusion reached by the *Parsi*, an English organ of the community whose name it bears, which, tho only about 100,000 strong, is counted to be the richest and most enterprising among the congeries of races and creeds which compose the population of Hindustan. India is becoming more and more important as a cotton country, and is to be kept in mind by American cotton-growers and manufacturers.

With whatever motives the British may be getting India to grow a larger amount and better quality of cotton, the fact remains that the cult of cotton-culture is making headway in the Peninsula. Some time ago a deputation of the British Cotton-growing Association waited upon the Secretary of State for India—the Englishman who is the final arbiter of the destiny of the Oriental dependency—and learned from that authority, as reported in *The Statesman*, Calcutta, that:

"Twelve or fourteen years ago the Indian cotton-crop represented three and a quarter million bales, and the acreage was 15,000,000. Within the last few years, the acreage has increased to 20,000,000 and upward, and the yield in a fair average year is well over 4,000,000 bales. . . . The Indian cotton-crop is now the second largest in the world."

Side by side with the increase of cotton-cultivation, there has been a phenomenal growth of cotton-factories in Hindustan. Sir Theodore Morrison, a member of the Council of the Secretary of State for India, and an authority on Indian economics, said at a recent meeting of the London Chamber of Commerce, as quoted in a brochure issued by that body, that despite the fact that no less than 2,670,000 men weave cotton-cloth on hand-looms in various parts of the dependency, "India has, in the last quarter of a century, quadrupled her capacity to spin and weave by steam-power." In the table which we reproduce, somewhat abridged, this marvelous growth is seen at a glance:

	1880-81	1900-01	1909-10
No. of Cotton-mills	55	177	216
No. of Looms	12,739	37,210	74,585
No. of Spindles	1,434,364	4,679,648	5,773,824
No. of Persons employed	46,530	144,983	215,419
Pounds of Yarn produced	figures not available	342,777,547	593,206,855
Pounds of Woven Goods		95,844,590	215,360,604

But in spite of the fact that Hindustan has succeeded so well in adding to its facilities for spinning cotton, a great deal of cot-

ton goes out of the country, one of the principal buyers being Great Britain. The Secretary of State for India tells us that "the average exports during the ten years ending 1900 were 1,300,000 bales, but the average exports of late years have been over 2,000,000 bales."

It is this cotton export which enables Great Britain, as the *Parsi* puts it, to "use India simply as a stick to beat down American (cotton) prices with," and which all patriotic East-Indians wish to stop so that the raw product will be converted into finished goods at home, thereby giving work to native wage-earners, and profits to Indian capitalists, instead of filling the pockets of English workmen and mill-owners. The East-Indian would very much like to have things in his own hands, and managed in his own way; but that is not possible in a country governed by foreigners. The natives have no voice in tariff-making, and have to submit to the taxing of the products of their looms so that the cheap labor may not prove instrumental in keeping Lancashire piece-goods out of the markets of India. Another disadvantage under which Hindustan suffers is that great fluctuations in cotton-growing are occasioned by the failure of the monsoon, whose fickleness, in the absence of irrigation facilities commensurate with India's gigantic needs in this respect, plays havoc with the fortunes of the Indian farmers. Just at present, famine conditions being prevalent in several parts of the Oriental dependency, this year's cotton-crop will not be of so large a size as that of previous seasons.

The *Parsi* wishes to show the natives of Hindustan that the great clamor which the British are making to increase the output of cotton in the eastern dependency is not for the good of the brown man, but solely for the benefit of India's exploiters—the English. To prove his case, the writer caustically declares:

"The British Cotton-growing Association consists of people who have always profest the keenest interest in India. Out of the fulness of their knowledge, they decided that it was not worth while to spend money on cotton-growing experiments in India, so they spent immense sums instead on its cultivation in any wilderness they happened to find between Tripoli and the Cape. Roseate reports were issued; Sir Harry Johnston (the great British authority on African matters) assured everybody that the African native positively loved work if it were only presented to him in a gentlemanly manner. . . . But the cotton problem remains unsolved.

"Meanwhile the Indian Agricultural Department continues its experiments with varying success. The Sind Egyptians, so promising the first year, were so disappointing the second that

they had to be temporarily abandoned. Greater success appears to have attended the cultivation of Georgian cotton in Tinnevely, and 3,000 bales have found their way to Oldham.

"The Cotton-growing Association immediately cries out that the Government of India is starving its Agricultural Department, and that more land in the south of India must be put under Georgian cotton immediately.

"The association loses sight of two important facts: the first is that the Indian farmer is free to grow whatever he likes, and the Agricultural Department can make no further inducement than the provision of seed and instructions how to grow it; the second is that India does not exist only to help Lancashire out of her difficulties. A slump in American cotton would mean the rejection of all Indian-grown cotton except at a price that would not pay for cultivation.

"Sir Sassoon David has lately given eight lacs of rupees (about \$267,000), a part of which will probably be spent on the improvement of cotton-culture; but we may be sure he did not anticipate that the result of his beneficence would be that Lancashire would use India simply as a stick to beat down American prices with. The Secretary of State may be persuaded by the political weight of Lancashire, but the Indian cultivator wants the assurance of regular custom at a decent price—as the Bombay Mill-owners' Association has found out already."

This is not mere rhodomontade, proceeding from an irresponsible reporter. It comes from a paper which represents a community that controls many of the cotton and other factories at present existing in India, and which is published from the headquarters of the cotton industry and the cotton-distributing center of Hindustan. Consequently it has a force all its own.

ENGLAND'S LOST PLACE IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

ADMIRAL LORD BERESFORD has recently pointed out in a book that the weakening of England's Mediterranean squadron, by naval concentration in the North Sea, was in danger of leaving Gibraltar, Malta, Cyprus, and Egypt unguarded. England has already forfeited her prestige as ruler of the waves in what the Germans call the Middle Sea, declares a writer in the *Grenzboten* (Berlin). England has dissipated her power in those most important waters once considered the field of glory and prize of conquest by Phenicia, Carthage, Greece, and Rome successively, and for more than a hundred years overawed by the Union Jack. In short, Britain has been a kind of *King Lear* among the nations and has given away its predominance in the Mediterranean. France, Italy, and Russia, we are told, now hold what was once won by the guns of the English Navy. Weakly yielding to the claims of so-called "friendship," John Bull, that soft-minded old gentleman, has given all away in a spirit of amiability and a desire of peace. Not that there is any reason for doubting, we are told, the absolute candor and honesty of the Power that was once supposed to control Europe's central sea from the Dardanelles to Gibraltar. To quote the words of this thoughtful organ:

"We do not know of any reason why we should doubt the uprightness and disinterestedness of that policy of England which is directed toward an understanding with Germany, since the *entente* with France is a witness to England's unselfishness. England has always been content that her friendships and *ententes* should cost her dear. They have, in fact, cost her so much that it does not seem easy for her now to live without their support."

Instancing the case of France, as having wheedled the British Government in the matter of Morocco and of Italy's pulling the wool over the eyes of the British lion in Tripoli, this writer proceeds:

"England has practically given to France the coveted opportunity of strengthening herself on the northwest coast of Africa, and has at the same time found her former place in the Medi-

terranean compromised by Italy's annexation of Tripoli. Lord Rosebery was the only English statesman who publicly warned his countrymen of this. Beyond the strategic advantages which his country sacrificed in giving France full swing in Morocco, all commercial opportunities were sacrificed, while Germany was allowed to reap the benefit of such a surrender."

England's decline in the Mediterranean, declares this writer, is only parallel with her decadence everywhere. Russia has gained through her valuable treaty rights in Tibet and Afghanistan, as well as a sphere of influence and of practical annexation in northern Persia. On all sides her Indian Empire is invested, and "the dream of an Indian Ocean as well as of a Mediterranean Sea under the British flag has become utterly Utopian."—*Translation made for THE LITERARY DIGEST.*

RUSSIA'S PROTEST AGAINST US

WHAT IS DESCRIBED by the Russian papers as the first public demonstration in Russia in connection with foreign politics took place at a meeting recently called by the "Pan-Russian National League," to protest against the action of the American Government in revoking the treaty of 1832. It was a most peculiar gathering. While its object was to show the world at large and the United States in particular Russia's spontaneous outburst of popular resentment, the "people," according to the reports in the Russian press, were conspicuous by their absence. The audience was composed of extreme reactionary partisans and looked gay with the uniforms of many high officers. By an order of the Minister of War, officers under the rank of general were prohibited from attending.

Motovilov, a member of the Imperial Council, presided, and among the speakers were two Nationalist members of the Duma, Protopopov and Bobrinsky. The audience were treated to some pretty accurate information about American conditions and the American Government, and Von Eggert mentioned the fact, seemingly unknown in Russia, that we have Jewish governors, judges, senators, and congressmen. He admitted, however, that the Americans were a cultured and sympathetic nation. But the next speaker, Lavrov, did not care much what the American people were like, and cried:

"America has insulted us, and I protest. Russian patience, gentleness, and mildness are all very fine Christian traits and deserve the kingdom of heaven, but I say they are stupid! I once saw two women fighting, and I shall never forget the impression it made on me. One woman had said that the other woman's husband was a drunkard. Tho he actually was a drunkard and a good-for-nothing, the wife would not stand for the insult and struck the other woman. That's the way people should act. My husband may be a drunkard and a loafer, but don't you dare to insult him."

Lavrov then went on to say that the treaty of 1832 does not permit every American citizen to enter Russia; that there was a clause in it expressly stating that all Americans visiting Russia are "subject to the laws and regulations of Russia," and he concluded:

"The complaint of the United States that the Jews are oppressed in Russia is a piece of monumental hypocrisy. To understand the hypocrisy of the United States, remember the condition of the negroes there. The negroes in the United States are full citizens, but no negro can obtain the right, no matter how much money he may be willing to pay, to ride in a first-class railway-coach. A government minister of the Republic of San Domingo had to travel third-class in a steamer because he was a negro and was not permitted among the clean people. In the State of Virginia a few years ago a Russian was arrested and put in jail for a month because as a mark of protest he sat in a Jim Crow car and talked in a comradely way with the negroes. As for lynching, I need only mention the news published in to-day's St. Petersburg papers telling of a case of three negroes who were shot by the mob at the very time they were on trial in court."