CHAPTER VII

SWAMI VIVEKANANDA'S NATIONALISM AND IMPERIALISM
Although Western nationalism, in course of time, has developed into imperialism, nationalism as such and imperialism have oil and water relationship. As antithetical to each other, they cannot co-exist. If nationalism seeks to build nation, imperialism on the other hand, seeks to build empire, imposing the will of one nation over the other. Hence "Imperialism" as it is said, "is a policy which aims at creating, organising and maintaining an empire; that is a state of vast size composed of various more or less distinct national units and subject to a single centralised will."

Since it is opposed to nationalism or self-determination of every people, Charles A. Beard has condemned it as "the engines of government and diplomacy to acquire territories, protectorates or spheres of influences occupied usually by other races or peoples and to promote industrial, trade and investment opportunities." (2) Parker T. Moon, a well-known authority on the subject has similarly condemned it as "the domination of non-European native races by totally dissimilar European nations." (3) George Lichtheim with same tone has also said, "What counts is the relationship of domination.
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and subjection, which is the essence of every imperialism. 

But 'Domination of one nation over another' said Prof. Laski, 'is politically inexpedient, logically unsound and morally wrong.' Hence imperialism, as an institution must therefore necessarily collapse, making way for nationalism of all peoples - big or small, powerful or weak. Such collapse will not only place all nations on equal footing but make their peaceful co-existence feasible on earth. It too, will be a blessing for the whole of mankind, who, having trodden the path of peace, progress and prosperity, will reap the harvest of a wholesome civilization for the world of succeeding generations.

II. NATURE AND VICES OF IMPERIALISM

While some condemn imperialism for its economically exploitative and politically dominating nature, other extoll it for its humanitarian nature, i.e. the role of the advanced countries in civilizing the backward nations. This is what they call 'white man's burden'. But it is not a travesty of truth to say that humanistic nature of imperialism is only an eye-wash to hoodwink the world opinion. It is nothing but a sugar-coating to conceal the ugly bitterness of the policy of territorial
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annexation and exploitation by imperial powers. Subscribing to such view Hobson has observed, "It can not be too clearly recognised that ... ... the notion of educating and civilizing the lower races ... ... is discredited and only survives for platform purposes when some new steps of annexation is urged upon the country." (6) It is also said, "White man's burden is a mask to clothe the enslavement of others." (7) Exploitation of weaker nations by the stronger ones, through the use of force and violence is the very essence of imperialism. It is completely devoid of any humanitarian consideration or any civilizing mission. As Prof. Schuman has rightly pointed out, "Imperialism is the imposition by force or violence of alien rule upon subject people, despite all moralising and pretentions to the contrary." (8) As he has further observed, "It is no more the purpose of imperialism to confer benefits upon its victims than to confer benefits upon the home country." (9) Prof. Hodges has also remarked, "The objective of imperialism is to affect the destinies of the backward people in the interest of the more advanced from the standpoint of the world power." (10)

---
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In ancient times imperialism was only political in nature. It meant physical control over foreign territory. It is of course true that the empires were also "tax collecting and recruit raising" agencies. However political predominance of the imperial powers were more prominent than any other feature. But as time changed the imperial powers changed their policy to suit the need of the time. They have, of late, diverted their primary attention to economic and strategic gain rather than mere political control or political preponderence. The political power that the imperial power acquired over their empire were utilised by them for the promotion of their international trade and investment of their surplus capital. Thus the most prominent nature of imperialism is extention of political power over the weaker states for the sake of economic gain only. Hence Prof. Laski has observed, "As power extends, nationalism becomes transformed into imperialism. The latter is most generally an economic phenomena."(11) In the same light Morgenthau has also remarked, "When ever a country ..... sets out to increase its power... ...it is a stepping-stone to world conquest; that is manifestation of an imperialistic policy."(12) He has
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further observed, "A nation... whose foreign policy aims at acquiring more power, more wealth than it actually has ....... pursues a policy of imperialism." (13)

Criticising the economic policy of British imperialism in particular, Knowles has said, "The English are not an assimilating race, their motives of expansion are almost wholly economic." (14)

The nature and inherent vices of imperialism is rooted in the predatory instinct of man. This predatory vices were found even in the early phases of human history. Different races during the time of their movement from one part of the world to another, in search of pasture and food, were compelled by this predatory nature to fight and subjugate other races. History bears ample testimony of ruthless aggression and bloody wars, carried out by different races for winning new lands.

This predatory instinct of modern man instigates him to conquer new land and expand its territory. This thirst for conquest ingrained in the human nature, compels him to indulge in competition and struggle for new lands. The inordinate desire for conquest of new territory and mastery or power over the people of other races is one of the most powerful incentives to
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the building up of modern imperialism. As Prof. Schuman
has observed, "Modern imperialism is a new expression
of the will to power and the drive for conquest."(15) It is
precisely this instinct of conquest and power that made
Alexander, Cecil, Rhodes and Napoleon think for conquest
of the world. This desire for conquest and power is
evident in the Fascist theory of Mussolini and Nazi theory
of Hitler. Mussolini himself declared in 1932 'the fascist
state is a will to power and an empire.' So they emphasised
on the expansion of their nations and glorification of
war. In this context Morgenthau writes, "The outstanding
historic examples of ...... imperialism are the expansion-
ionist policies of Alexander the great, Rome, the Arab in
7th and 8th century, Napoleon-I and Hitler. They all
have in common an urge towards expansion, which knows no
rational limits ...... Their urge for power and mastery
over the lands will not be satisfied so long as there
remains any where a possible object of domination - a
politically organised group of men, which by its very
independence, challenges the conqueror's lust and power."
He further writes, "The most obvious the most ancient
and also the crudest form of imperialism is military
conquest."(17) This predatory instinct for conquest and
power also led Machiavelli to stress that Republic and
Monarchies both must have to expand their territory as
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According to him territorial aggrandisement is of vital importance because if they don't expand they will expire. Hence predatory nature is most fundamental in imperialism of ancient and modern time.

This passion for territorial aggrandisement was treated as a sort of super-patriotism and principle of nationalism. Prof. Schuman has observed, "Patriotism and economic nationalism have contributed to policies of territorial aggrandisement on the part of the nation-states. These policies have, until recently, led to most spectacular result in the backword regions of the globe, where native governments, have been unable to offer effective resistance to great powers. The latter have succeeded in partitioning most of the non-European world among themselves, some times by peaceful bargaining, some times by war." (18)

Imperialism was considered as a foremost nationalist doctrine. Power and dominion characterised the principle of nationalism of the imperial states and territorial possession was considered as a foremost national pride. As Bertrand Russell has put it, "National pride, as it exists now, is almost exclusively concerned with power and dominion, with the extent of territory that a nation owns and with its capacity for
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enforcing its will against the opposition of other nations.\(^{(19)}\) Hence imperialism assumed a patriotic and nationalist nature in the process of its growth and development.

Intoxicated by the imperialistic vision, some nations in the recent past embarked upon an expansionist and annexionist policy with the argument that colonial possession was necessary for their surplus population. Japan took up this plea till 1941, because she wanted to dominate over foreign territory. Italy also claimed new territory as the narrow peninsula was unable to accommodate the teeming millions. This led to Japanese occupation of Korea, Formosa, Machuria, and the Italian conquest of Libya, Abbysinya and the Italian Somaliland. But the futility of this argument has been proved as in actual practice, a very small number of people leave their home country for settling in a colony. English men have gone to the Dominions in great numbers, but they have shown less interest in moving to colonial possessions. Of nearly 20,000,000 Europeans, who emigrated between 1880 to 1940, nearly 17,000,000 went to free nations of Western hemisphere.\(^{(20)}\) Between 1925 and 1933 while Japan was trying to justify her cause on China with the population pressure argument less than 4% of her
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population increase of that period migrated to her own colonies.\(^{(21)}\) During the last decade of her colonial empire, 1904-13, Germany sent only one out of 24,000 of her annual population increment to her colonies - in absolute numbers, about thirty persons a year.\(^{(22)}\)

Prof. Schuman writes, "Since most of the empires are located in tropical and subtropical areas, unsuitable for residence by the Europeans and since emigrants prefer to go to congenial lands of easy economic opportunity, there has been no appreciable out-flow of population from the nation-states to their colonies.\(^{(23)}\) He further writes, "The surplus population argument for imperialism has played its part in convincing patriots of the necessity of expansion, for reason, facts and logic are usually conspicuous by their absence in the mental process of emotional nationalists. It has therefore been utilised effectively by imperialists as a means of securing popular support for their policies. But in view of the results, it can be regarded as an honestly and consciously formulated purpose behind the quest for empire only on the assumption that statesmen are imbeciles or mad men.\(^{(24)}\) Thus annexionist nature of imperialism with its vices of exploiting and oppressing the subjugated people is quite evident from

---
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A critical analysis of the history of European imperialism shows that heavy industrialisation of the Western nations gave further impetus to the ugly nature of imperialism and its inherent vices. As indicated in the earlier chapter, industrial powers wanted raw materials to run their industries and side by side they also wanted to dispose off their industrial products. As Prof. Schuman has written that industrialisation led "the states to have colonies for the surplus goods and for the purchase of raw materials." (25) He has further written that 'the great markets of Orient and Latin America soon become spheres of keen competition among the rival rational groups of entrepreneurs and exporters. The rich natural resources of Asia, Africa and Latin Americas were demanded in ever greater quantity to feed the seemingly insatiable hunger of the god of the machine.' (26)

Keeping in view, the two problems - import of raw materials and export of finished products - the industrial powers wanted to establish colonies in the backward countries. The search for colony led the Western nations to pursue imperial policy towards the weaker and backward nations of Asia, Africa and Latin American
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Dr. Shacht, German financier had pointed out, "The fight for raw materials played the most important part in the world politics and even greater role than before the war 1914." Of course Parker Moon holds a contrary view. He contends that no imperial country, with the possible exception of Great Britain, can solely depend upon its colonial possessions for the supply of major portions of her raw materials. There is no truth in the fact that an imperial country receives most of the raw materials which its colonies produce. As he has written, "Raw materials in general are colour-blind. They recognise no national flag. They follow the law of supply and demand and of distance and transportation costs. They obey economic rather than political control." (27)

However the great imperial powers made it their state policy to establish hegemony over the under-developed areas of the world and lord over the subject people for industrial and commercial gain. As Prof. Schuman has pointed out, "The backward areas of the earth - rich in resources or in labour power or in consumptive capacity, but poor in capital and under-developed industrially and commercially became happy hunting grounds for profit seekers of Western capitalism. From Western Europe, from the U.S.A. from Western
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Japan, there poured forth a deluge of ships, goods and money, inundating the rest of the world.  

Parker Moon has also observed, "Imperialism affords...... marketing facilities for an industrial nation's good."

An empire is required not only as an outlet for surplus goods but also as an outlet for surplus capital in the backward countries and make huge profits. As it is said, "It is not only or primarily trade that is desired, but opportunities for investment; finance is more concerned in the matter......" Government agencies and diplomatic channels were used to persuade the backward countries to borrow money from advanced countries. The U.S.A. exerted a powerful influence over Central and South America as well as over other parts of the world by means of her vast investment. This kind of policy known as dollar diplomacy, was almost as effective as a foreign army of occupation. It is said that 'if money talks, American dollar shouts.' Almost all the backward countries of the world became the worst victims of this "doller diplomacy" in modern times. Through the investment of huge capital, the European nations sought to control the economic and political institutions of the underdeveloped countries of the world. Speaking of this Western influence through capital investment,
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Morgenthau has observed, "Its outstanding modern example is what is called 'doller diplomacy'. It has also played an important role in the history of British and French imperialism. British influence in Portugal since the beginning of the 18th century has been powerfully supported by economic control. British supremacy in the Arab world was the result of economic policies for which the term 'oil diplomacy' is not misplaced...
The predominant influence that France exercised in countries such as Rumania, in the period between two World Wars to a considerable extent, based upon this factor. (31) Condemning it the same writer has also remarked, "Capitalistic societies..... are unable to find within themselves sufficient markets for their products and sufficient investment for their capital. They have, therefore a tendency to enslave even larger non-capitalist..... areas in order to transform in to markets for their surplus products and to give their surplus capital opportunities for investment." (32)

Of course it is argued that to satisfy the economic needs, the modern industrialised nations found no other alternative than pursuing imperialistic policy towards the backward countries of the world. Had they got these economic needs like place for investment
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of capital, markets for raw materials, fulfilled by other nations, they might not have pursued such imperialistic policies. It is said, "In our time we have heard it said that..... German, Italian, and Japanese imperialism was born out of economic needs, these countries would have refrained from imperialistic policies had they received loans, colonies, and access to raw materials."(33)

However it is a fact that imperialism at this stage assumed a beastly nature of falling upon the backward peoples of the globe and exploiting them in course of hunting markets for purchase of raw materials, sale of finished products and investment of surplus capital. This exploitation, the most heinous inherent vice of imperialism became a glaring phenomena of the period. Hobson, an uncompromising critic of imperialism has condemned such nature of imperialism as "rapacious and immoral."(34)

Apart from the economic nature of imperialism, as described above there is still another nature of imperialism which has received impetus from the false or vain prestige or glory of a nation. This nature of imperialism may be branded as vain-glorious or vaunted nature of imperialism in which national prestige, obviously unwarranted and unreasonable has
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played a significant role. Until World War-II prestige played an important role in the annexation of other people. Annexation or possession of colonies became a hallmark of respectability in the international world. It was believed that a state must achieve its "manifest destiny" or its "place in the Sun." Generations of English men gloriied in the boast that "the sun never sets on British empire." The English people were intoxicated by the dimension of the British empire. It is said, "Benito Mussolini loved to move his hand over the map of those expanses of African desert and hill-land that he had brought under the Italian flag. His chest expanded with his dominion." Americans applauded the acquisition of territory that, at the turn of the century, made their country a world power. The European imperial powers held that land for flag flying may mean responsibility and expense rather than grandeur. But an analysis of imperialism shows that the desire for land and still more gold is the very essence of imperialism, which is embedded in the heart, from which the imperialists get optimum pleasure and pride. So their statement is nothing but a false show to hide the apparent vices, that are latent in their imperialist character. This national prestige, above all factors stimulated French imperialism.
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of vaunted nature, in the Eastern Asia. As it is said, "The taproot of French imperialism in the Far East from first to the last, was national pride - pride for culture, reputation, prestige and influence. This was the constant factor which ran through the kaleidoscope of episodes of missionary dedication and daring, of naval coups and of private adventures." (37)

Speaking of the vices of imperialism Hans Kohn harped on the psychological distortion that the people of imperialist powers suffer from. As he has observed, "Besides the economic urge, psychological motives played a great role in imperialism - the lust for adventure and for power, the added prestige and glory which seemed to accrue from a vast colonial empire not only to the governing classes but even to the masses of the colonizing nations, the new sentiment of pride and superiority which animated even the lowest members of the white races in their dealings with the backward races." (38) Thus vainglorious or vaunted nature of imperialism, which had its sway till World War-II can not be over looked.

To effect their ugly imperial design, the imperial powers mostly took recourse to war and
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aggression. They went on increasing their military power and fortifying their arsenals to reach their imperial goal. It is hence, befitting to say that imperialism is based on militarism. Hobson has rightly remarked, "The basis of imperialism is force and its instrument is military power. Imperialism and militarism support each other." (39) It has been further observed, "Militarism and imperialism clearly constitute an identical pattern of thought and behaviour." (40) This aggressive and military nature of imperialism has brought havoc to this world keeping world peace and order at stake. Laski has rightly said, 'Imperialism necessarily involves war and an effective international order is incompatible with it.' (41) Thus aggressive and militaristic nature of imperialism with its war and devastation, as its innate vices that has posed a severe threat to modern world, is a matter of grave concern.

Racial nature of modern imperialism, that involves the vices of hatred, illfeeling and jealousy between the imperial powers and the subject peoples cannot be overlooked. The imperial powers look upon the subject people with much contempt and violence. To them, native races are uncivilized and barbaric. Out of such feeling they, obviously get prejudiced against the native races and feel ill at ease amidst them. The fact is evident from the statement of Elgin, "It is a terrible
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business, this living among the inferior races. I have seldom from man or woman since I came to East, heard a sentence which was reconcilable with the hypothesis that Christianity had ever come in to the world. (42)

Referring to the contemptuous attitude of the white races towards the subject people, Hans Kohn writes that the sentiment of pride and superiority animated white races in their dealing with the backward races. (43)

The policy of Apartheid or segregation, as pursued by the white races of South Africa, has driven the Negroes, Indians and other non-whites to the ghettos. The situation worsened considerably since the end of World War - II. A few universities which were formally open to nonwhite races became increasingly closed to them. In 1958 there took place the Sharpeville massacre when 67 Negroes were shot to death in cold blood and many were seriously injured when Negroes protested against the law which compelled them to carry pass cards.

This racial policy of the imperial powers turn the native people hostile to them. In their attitude, the subject people become disrespectful and stubborn towards the white or imperial people. This was the main cause of all disaffection towards the British in India, for which a British people in India is said to have
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reported, "It is true that English are not loved by the native subjects in India." (44) Hence racial nature of imperialism, the source of all vices of disaffection and hatred between imperial power and the colonial people have divided the world into two enemy camps, leading to bloody wars, and violence.

The pseudo humanitarian consideration that the imperial powers claimed to express through the hackneyed phrase 'the white man's burden' or the 'imperial responsibility' as described earlier in this chapter was responsible for the rise of vices of imperialism. In 17th century, the missionary motive was an important factor of imperialism. The name of David Livingstone in Africa is the most outstanding name in the history of missionary empire builders. The London Missionary Society was closely linked up with the spread of British imperialism in Africa. Even Calvin Colidge, a former president of the U.S.A. said, "The legions which America sends forth, are armed not with the sword but with the Cross." (45)

General Mac Arthur advocated a similar policy in regard to Japan after the military defeat in 1945. Joseph Chamberlain, perhaps Britain's leading exponent of imperialism next to Disraeli declared in 1893, "It is our duty to take our share in the work of civilization
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in Africa." (46) Albert J. Beveridge, often regarded as the ablest defender of imperialism in the American Senate while explaining American responsibility said, "God has made us adepts in government that we may administer government among the savage and servile people to civilize them."

But an analysis of imperialism today has revealed the fact that humanitarian programme of the imperial powers is nothing but a mockery to befoul the anti-imperialist forces which became very active subsequently. It is often argued that the imperial nations opposed the work of humanitarian missionaries, for it might give the subject people a new dignity and consciousness against the Western imperial powers. Sometimes the missionaries were open or secret allies of imperialists as they received a warm welcome from the empire builders. It is also argued that humanitarianism was certainly not the original cause of imperialism but it is only an after thought. It is, in fact a programme of lip-service and dry sympathy to befoul the anti-imperial section of the world. Visualising the glaring vices of pseudo-humanitarian imperialism, Prof. Schuman has observed that in imperial states profit motive and power motive are skillfully concealed in terms of humanitarianism, civilizing mission, religious conversion, and material benefits conferred upon the backward people. (46)

(46) Quoted in Palmer and Perkins, International Relations, P.186
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It is held that the imperial powers spent huge sum of money on humanitarian programme. But this is only to screen over the vices of imperialism of the Western powers. If they spent huge sums of money on humanitarian programme—on education, sanitation and general improvement of the subject people, why as per Julian Huxley's report, African infant mortality ranges from one in four to one in two, why every adult Negro is infested with one or more deadly kind of worms, usually including hook-worm and often with malaria? Why in some areas about 90% of the population suffer from venereal disease—a disease imported by the whiteman—gross malnutrition as well as vitamin deficiency? Why not even 1% of children of Africa do attend school? In the light of all these one can not but agree with Prof. Schuman's remark that it is no more the purpose of imperialism to confer benefits upon its victims than to confer benefits upon the home country. Raymond L. Buell also held the same view and declared, "It would be gross perversion of the fact to say that European and American imperialism was originally inspired by a desire to better the lives of the people, whom it forcibly subjected."(50)

Hence, despite all attempts to conceal its vices, imperialism, as a whole, stands for ruthless
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exploitation and political domination. Due to imperialistic design of the Western nations half the world's land area and one third of human race had a colonial status in the mid 1920's. Prof. Schuman condemned it saying "the new epoch entered upon the phase of armed combat among the empires for world supremacy."

Since the sole motive of imperialism is profit, the imperial powers degrade the native people to the position of labourers and slaves with least consideration for them. As profit from colonies usually depended upon the use of native labour, imperialist powers force the natives to till the soil, dig for gold, gather rubber, hunt for ivory or collect coconuts. As it is said, "The colonial powers........through slavery, forced labour, heavy taxation, and the confiscation of land, succeeded in the mission of their profits." It is also said, "Some times the natives were forced to give a share of the crops, some times the troops directed forced labour, some times a hut-tax or pol-tax was imposed, payable only in labour on in certain products. Some times native chieftains were rewarded according to their success in mobilising their tribes-men for labour. Various types of punishment was inflicted on the native like lashing, mutilation, death, separation from wife.
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and family, confiscation of land or exclusion from hunting grounds.\(^{(54)}\)

The colonial people are virtually treated as slaves. The maintenance of an army and construction of prison houses are given top priority rather than the health and education of the colonial people. Raymond L. Buell has pointed out, "\ldots the expenditure on education and health in the colonial areas are pitifully small\ldots.%)

The white-settlers enjoy all protection and privileges to the exclusion of the local people. They occupy high military and administrative post and are paid high salaries. They too, take away the lion's share in every thing and the colonial people lead a life of slavery and starvation. If the subject nations resist and revolt, they are suppressed ruthlessly. As it is remarked, "Government can only be carried on by force and tyranny. If its subjects view it with hostile eyes, they (the imperial powers) will so view\ldots.\(^{(56)}\)

Hence despite all defensive arguments, imperialism with its nefarious nature and hideous inherent vices, is a glaring phenomena of "domination and subjection\(^{(57)}\) leading to oppression and exploitation of the backward peoples. It is a gross violation of the canons of humanism and justice that has tarnished the
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pages of the history of human civilization. We can best sum up its nature in the words of Hobson, who said, "... notwithstanding the benefits conferred by imperialism..., by its very nature is incompatible with democracy and self-government and little disposed to self-liquidation. The basis of imperialism is force and oppression."(58)

III. BRITISH IMPERIALISM AND EXPLOITATION OF INDIA

Among all the imperial powers, the British had by far the largest imperial domain during the last two centuries. It did spread over six continents and seven seas and included within its frontiers something like one-fifth of the land area of the globe and one quarter of its population. It was then said that the British conquered an imperial domain upon which the sun never sets. The richest and the most populous unit of the empire was India,(59) which the British began to exploit without any regard for the interest of the Indians. Bipin Chandra Pal has pointed out, "The British were treating India as "Kamadhenu" or the milch cow of England."
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Early in the 17th century, trading ports were established along the coasts by the British East India Company, an organisation of private merchants, that received a Charter from the British Crown, giving it the monopoly of British trade with India and authorising it to rule over the natives within the sphere of its commercial operation. Since the disintegration of the empire of the Great Mogul, India had been divided into warring principalities in quarrels among whom the Europeans found an excellent opportunity for intervention. The British East India Company and the French East India Company became rivals for commercial and political supremacy, the former triumphing over the latter in the seven years war (1756-63) and taking over the functions of government in the portions of the country under its control. The British power gradually extended by conquest. In 1818 the Maratha Confederacy of Princes was overthrown and the Maratha dominion in the central and western India was annexed by the Company. In 1849 the Sikhs of the Punjab were similarly conquered and brought under the British rule. A series of wars on the Eastern frontier culminated in the annexation of Burma in 1886. Beluchistan became a province of British India in 1903. This is how the British Empire grabbed India and made it its own crown.

As "India is by far the greatest market ever acquired as a colony by industrial empire,"(61) the
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British made enormous profit out of it. But she paid no heed for the material development of the people of India. She pursued a nefarious economic policy which was very regressive towards India but highly progressive for England. The whole economic set up of the country was upset. The economic development of India, particularly its masses was completely ignored. It was a period of abject poverty and starvation for India; but for England it was a period of tremendous progress. Hence during the very years after 1760 when the Britain was developing into the leading developed capitalist country of the world, India was developing into the leading backward colonial country of the world. In fact the two processes were interdependent in terms of cause and effect. The entire system of economic relationship between Britain and India involving trade, finance and technology, continuously developed India's colonial dependence and underdevelopment. India was bleeding under the British rule and whatever the British government did, did with a selfish motive. (62)

The military policy of the empire was more concerned with the security and stability of the British empire than with the maintenance of peace in India. The Indian army conducted a series of expeditions some times beyond the territory of India and the
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policy of expansion caused a constant rise in the military charges which was charged upon Indian exchequer. Hence it has been rightly observed, "India suffered in silence the military policies of Great Britain .... the glaring fact was that much of the military needs of the whole British empire was met from the Indian resources". With this extravagant military expenditure India's public debt was also mounting up. Hence, Dadabhai Naoroji, expressing his concern on India's public debt observed, "The Public debt of India increased mainly due to English conquest in India and English wars abroad in the name of India..... The burden of all England's wars in Asia has been thrown on India's shoulder."(64)

The maintenance of English army in India was highly expensive. This subject was discussed in the Congress Sessions and a comparative analysis reveals, "the German soldier costs Rs. 145/-, the French Rs. 185/- and English in England Rs. 285/- but in India Rs. 775/- a year."(65) This caused a continuous rise in India's debt.

Hence the British rule in India could never promote increasing wealth and prosperity, industrial expansion and rich harvests; neither it could provide even a full meal to each and all. Forty millions of

(63) M.N.Das, Indian National Congress Vrs. The British, Vol-I, PP.6-7
(64) Dadabhai Naoroji, Poverty and UnBritish Rule in India, P. 185
(65) Pattabhi Sitaramayya, The History of Indian National Congress, Vol-I, P. 13
people had only one meal a day and "the government (66) did almost nothing to halt the growth of poverty." Inspite of their poverty under a very low per capita income, the people were, heavily taxed. There was a wide gap between India's per capita income and the per capita income in other countries by the end of 19th century. When the per capita income in Canada and Great Britain was £ 48 and £ 42 respectively in India it was officially estimated as £ 2. The Government did not evolve any systematic method of taxation and it went on levying new taxes, the worst being the salt tax. Dadabhai Naoroji commenting on this said, "........The people were in such a wretched plight that they had nothing, the government could tax, and that government must therefore tax on absolute necessaries of life to an inordinate degree." (68)

Though the poverty of India was ascribed to many factors, such as decay of handicrafts, destruction of pre-British economic structure, disintegration of traditional social order, arrested nature of India's industrialisation, lack of enterprise etc, military policy and over taxation were the main factors. (69)
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"Agriculture" says R.C. Datta, "as a source of income has not been widened under British administration". Yet as the government could not tax commerce at ease, the entire burden fell on agriculture. There was absolutely no improvement in agrarian relation nor in methods of production. The cultivators were heavily taxed, and were always on the brink of famine and starvation. (70) Moreover the method of assessment was defective. Hence it has been rightly observed, "The land tax, which was the most important source of revenue and the sheet anchor of Indian finance, was unpopular because of the mode of assessment." (71) The government even could introduce new taxes. The rise of revenue assessment in one sub-district showed that from 66 P.C. in 1891, it was raised to 99 P.C. in the next year and 116 P.C. in the next. (72) The British introduced Zamindari and Royatwari system in India. As a result the ordinary land owner was ruined by a triple burden, i.e. tax to the government, to the Zamindar and to the money lender - in the form of interest. Colonialism evolved a new structure of agrarian system where a number of intermediaries flourished and the cultivator at the bottom

(70) R.C. Datta, The Economic History of India, Vol-II, P. 10
(71) M.N. Das, Indian National Congress Vrs. The British, Vol-I, P. 9
(72) Pattabhi Sitaramaya, The History of Indian National Congress, Vol-I, P. 43
was squeezed.

Industry was equally suppressed.

Weaving was the main industry before the advent of the British. But here too, British interest dominated. The Indian interest was subordinated to that of Lancashire. The East India Company made a law that the silk weavers were to work for the Company only, which strangled the silk cotton industry of India.

The growth of Indian foreign trade was neither natural nor normal; it was artificially fostered to serve imperialism. "The production of raw material for British industries and the consumption of the British manufactures in India were the two-fold objects ......." of British commercial policy. The Indian markets were flooded with British goods. India became an exporting country of raw materials. The government to promote British interest, encouraged British export to India and discouraged Indian exports. Free trade was introduced between India and Britain. Dadabhai Naoroji commenting on this policy declared that there could be no free trade between India and England and observed, "It is like a race between a starving exhausting, invalid and a strong man with a horse to ride on." The difference between export and
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import which was something between three and four millions a year became 20 millions sterling after seventies and within 12 years of the change from company to the Crown, the economic drain from India became four-fold. Hence Ranade observed that India had come to be regarded as a plantation, growing raw-products to be shipped by the British agents in British ships, to be worked into fabrics by British skill and capital and to be re-exported to the dependencies by the British farms in India and elsewhere. The infant industries of India had to compete with British products and the government did not give any protection. It was the tariff policy which convinced Indian people that British policies in India were basically guided by the British interest.

After 1850 a very large amount of British capital was invested in railways and loaned to the Indian government. To render this capital secure from economic and political dangers, the British tightened its rule over India firmly than ever, which resulted in the further exploitation and oppression of the country. Not only this; the British also tried to perpetuate its rule over India to ensure repayment of its capital. This was frankly confessed by a contemporary civil servant of Bombay who wrote in 1880
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that England "must keep India . . . . because a vast amount of British capital has been sunk in the country, on the assurance of British rule being, humanly speaking, perpetual."

The government was very keen on the expansion of Railways which were claimed as an index to economic development. But the Railways were not at all beneficial for India as the money invested, were borrowed from London market and the interest was charged on Indian revenues. Moreover, railways "facilitated penetration of Indian markets by foreign goods." Hence it has been rightly observed, "foreign capital in Indian condition was not developing the country but exploiting it."

Continuous famine added to the misery of the Indians. India passed through a series of famines, between 1897 and 1900 except in 1999. It is illustrative here to mention that between 1848 and 1878, the loss of population due to famine was nearly 20 millions.

Thus when government became callous day by day and was merely talking of the bliss of the British rule, the poverty and misery of the Indian people reached the point of no return. Dadabhai Naoroji declared, "The chief cause of India's poverty, misery and all
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material evils is the exhaustion of its previous wealth, the continually increasing, exhausting and weakening drain from its annual production by the very excessive expenditure on the European portion of all its services and the burden of a large amount a year to be paid to foreign countries for interest in the public debt, which is chiefly caused by the British rule.

The British government always followed a policy of economic exploitation, racial discrimination and autocratic administration towards India. Though the Queen's Proclamation laid much stress on "equality," in 1885, out of 900 civil servants only nine were Indians. The covenanted services were of course open for Indians; but the prospects of pay and promotion were gloomy. Hence, educated Indians usually entered in to the profession of law or became school teachers and clerks.

The government of India having the interest of cotton manufactures of Manchester in view, abolished the cotton duties on imported textiles. Although the Manchester Chamber of Commerce alarmed by the growth of Indian cotton industries, during the Vice-royalty of Lord Northbrook pressed its demand for the abolition of such duty, it met with resistance from the government.
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of India. The government of India, not prepared to sacrifice the revenue, contended "It is our duty to consider the subject with regard to the interest of India, that the removal of the import duty on cotton manufactures is not consistent with those interest." Even Lord Northbrook protested against the insistence of the Home government to abolish it and resigned. But during the Vice-royalty of Lord Lytton, the cotton duty was ablished to the detriment of Indian interest. In this case the Viceroy over-ruled the majority decision of his Council. Sir Erskin Parry has condemned the Viceroy's action as "unconstitutional and dangerous precedent." Section 41 of Indian Council Act 1861, endowed the Viceroy with the power of over-ruling the Council decision only if the safety, tranquility or interests of the British-India or any part thereof, were or apprehended to be essentially affected.

The Vernacular Press Act or the Gagging Act of 1887 is another instance of anti-Indian and anti-people stand of the government of India. In order to contain, rather silence, the critical tone of the Vernacular Press that had become vociferous in publishing anti-Indian and anti-people policy of the government, magistrates were empowered with the previous
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sanction of the provincial government to demand of a
printer or a publisher either to deposit security or
to enter in to a bond binding himself not to print or
publish any thing which is likely to incite feelings
of disaffection towards the government. The govern­
ment was even endowed with the authority to confiscate
the plant and the deposit in the event of publication
of materials that can be considered undesirable by it.
Sir Erskin Parry branded it as a "retrograde and ill-
conceived measure injurious to the further progress of
India." S.N. Banarge discribed it as "a bolt from the
blue." (89)

During Lord Lytton's time another
anti-Indian Act was enacted, i.e. Indian Arms Act, 1878.
As per the Act, as far as Indians were concerned, to
keep or bear or traffic in arms without licence, was
considered a criminal offence, accompanied with punish­
ment ranging to imprisonment up to a period of three
years. In case of concealment or attempt at concealment,
the term of imprisonment could be extended to seven
years. Thus a discriminating policy in respect of
Indian nationals was pursued inspite of the spirit of the
Queen's Proclamation.
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The Ilbert Bill controversy also revealed the discriminatory policy indulged in by the British government, and the British people in India. A bill was introduced on February 2, 1883 in the Legislative Council with the approval of the Home government to remove the racial discrimination in the matter of trial of Europeans by native judges such as district magistrates and Sessions judges outside the Presidency. Sir Ashley Eden, the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal realised, "There seems to be no sufficient reason why convenanted native civilians with the position and training of a District Magistrate or Sessions Judge should not exercise the jurisdiction over Europeans as is exercised by other members of the service."

Yet there was opposition to it from the side of the merchants of Calcutta and planters of Bihar. Parties and entertainments, hosted by Lord Ripon, the then Viceroy, were boycotted by the British nationals. A 'Defence Association' was formed and donation to the sum of rupees one and half lakh was raised to fight against the enactment of the Bill. Protest meetings were held and the Anglo-Indian Press notably the Englishman became hysterical. They argued, "Shall we be judged by the Nigger? Shall he send us to jail? Shall he be put in
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authority over us? Never, it is impossible! Better that British rule in India should end than that we should be obliged to submit to such humiliating laws." Ultimately, the bill was modified to the effect that the European offenders, when tried by the Indian District Magistrate or Sessions Judges could claim trial by a jury of which at least half the members should be Europeans or Americans.

Thus Indian masses rotted under the autocratic and despotic rule of the British. Justice and fairplay for the Indians became a far cry. In every sphere of life they were looked down upon. Whenever they sought any relief, they met with utter gloom and despair. It has been rightly observed, "......the British India was ruled autocratically. At all levels from the Viceroy's Council down to the district, the system spurned any recourse to representative government..... while inveighing against oriental despotism, the British had enacted one of their own."

SWAMI VIVEKANANDA ON THE VICES OF IMPERIALISM

Swami Vivekananda's world outlook went against the nefarious practices of British imperialism in India. He was not a politician, or a political
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philosopher but a great humanist. His humanistic bent of mind made him anti-imperialistic. The horrors of British imperialism in India overwhelmed him. Out of sheer agony he cried, "We three hundred and thirty millions of people have been ruled for about one and half centuries by a handful of foreigners who chose to walk over our prostrate bodies." (94) Again he cried, .... these few, standing on the necks of the masses of the people want to rule them."

As a doyen of humanism and universalism, he believed in the basic principle of equality of all men and all nations and rejected outright domination of any nation by another. He wanted sincerely to awaken the whole mankind from ignorance and lassitude to the supreme height of divinity. As he said, "I am no preacher of any momentary social reform. I am not trying to remedy evils. I only ask you to go forward and to complete the practical realisation of the scheme of human progress .... I only ask you to work to realise more and more the Vedantic ideal of the solidarity of man and his inborn divine nature. (96)

Swami Vivekananda discerned divinity in all men, irrespective of race, religion and sex. To him every man is imbued with divine nature. Divinity is
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inherent in man, however degraded and low he might appear to be. As he said, "The more I live the more I became convinced every day that every human being is divine. In no man or woman, however vile, does that divinity die."(97) Addressing man again he said, "There is no God separate from you, no God higher than you. All the gods are little beings to you. All the ideas of God and Father in heaven, are but your own reflection. God Himself is your image. 'God created man after his own image.' That is wrong. Man created God after his own image. That is right. Through out the universe we are creating gods after our own image."

Swami Vivekananda was far above the dark hedges of racialism, sectarianism and personal Godhead. He, rather believed in the absolute and impersonal Godhead, as the only way, leading to world peace and human progress. He has said, "The idea of the impersonal Godhead gives the best rationale of ethics. The highest ethical doctrine teaches that we must love all men as ourselves. Now the idea of impersonal Godhead teaches the solidarity of all life, the oneness of the universe and thus gives the reason why you should love all. Besides, it equips man with great strength, because he is made to stand without dependence - in the
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glory of his own soul, the infinite, the eternal and the deathless." Hence Swami Vivekananda, condemned the narrow selfish motives like territorial expansion, racial segregation, colonial and imperialistic establishments. His aim was to submerge the whole world with the idea of oneness of soul of the universe and bridge the gulf among men and nations of the world. Unity of the universe, despite the diversity of race, religion and culture that he described as, "the highest point in every science - physical or spiritual," and "the mission and destiny of humanity" was his prime concern. As Dr. I. Chelishev has rightly observed, "Vivekananda's impassioned call to the general fraternity and unity of India's people, to the abolition of religious and communal discord and of caste prejudices, were combined with an appeal for peace and friendship among all the nations of the world, which is the corner-stone of Indian tradition, the main content of Indian national character.

Urging people to be fearless and bold to fight the dark forces for their happiness and better future, Vivekananda declared that it was hopeless and useless to try and rule the world by force of arms. Vivekananda called for establishment of friendly
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relations between all nations, based on love of man for each other... (102)

The outward glamour of the Western civilization, initially captivated his eyes. He thought of the West as the mine of human progress and centre of human civilization. But such high notion of the West soon turned pale and bleak, the moment he began to see the Western civilization from close quarters and in its clear perspective. In the words of Sister Nivedita, "When he (Swami Vivekananda) first landed in the West, he was greatly attracted, as his letter shows, by the apparent democracy of conditions there. Later in 1900 he had a clearer view of the underlying selfishness of capital, and struggle for privilege and confided to some one that Western life now looked to him like hell." It is further pointed out, "Vivekananda's searching mind noticed many things, that were hidden under the outward glitter of the Western civilization. In his public statement, Swami Vivekananda relentlessly exposed bourgeois chauvinism, capitalist competition, the quest for profit, the fabulous luxury of a handful of exploiters and disastrous impoverishment and rightlessness of the millions of toilers, religious and racial discrimination, intrigue and violence." (103) (104)
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In contrast to some Indian leaders of that age, who believed in the miracles of Western civilization, Swami Vivekananda realised its deficiencies. He pointed out that the wealth and power in the European countries are in the hands of a few, who do not work, but manipulate the works of millions of human beings. By this power, they deluge the earth with blood. "That class of people, in the name of politics" said Swami Vivekananda, "rob others and swell themselves by sucking the very blood of the masses."(105) He also pointed out that Western capitalistic system of economy provides tremendous impetus to imperialism. It tends to enslave the masses of mankind. This tendency to enslave humanity finds its fullest manifestation in imperialism. Hence he condemned capitalistic system of economy saying that 'in Western capitalistic system if one becomes rich, thousands at the same time become poorer and poorer. It makes, ultimately, mass of human being mere slaves, crushed under the heels ....'. He boldly declared that the constitutional government, the individual right and liberty and parliament are nothing but a farce or a mockery in the West. Behind everything there is but slavery of the masses. Therefore he said,
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"No greater upheaval for the establishment of right and liberty can be imagined than the war for abolition of (107) slavery."

During his first visit to United States, Swami Vivekananda proclaimed it to be the home land of freedom. But coming to known more intimately the order of things in that country, underneath which the force of imperialism was latently active, he realised the shallowness and hollowness of such freedom. With his microscopic eye as he discovered the strong under-current of imperialism in the whole system of the country, he was soon disillusioned. He was indignant at the power of money, the unlimited rule of the financial plutocracy and its uncurbed drive for riches and political supremacy. He declared openly "Old conception of America as the future hope of emancipated mankind, were (108) wrong."

Swami Vivekananda condemned out right the Western imperialistic greed for wealth and power, their cruelty and brutality, their competition and rivalry. He said, "Europe is trying to solve the problem as to how much a man can have, how much more power a man can possess by hook or crook, by some means or other. Competition - cruel, cold and heartless - is the law of Europe." He also said, "......in the West (109)

(107) Lectures From Colombo to Almora, P.119
(108) Swami Vivekananda, Studies in Soviet Union, P.216
(109) Lectures From Colombo to Almora, P.109
the old order of things is vanishing, giving way to a new order of things, which is worship of gold... the worship of Mammon,...........competition and gold...."

He warned the Western states that all centres from which such ideas as amassing wealth at all costs and carrying on government by force, sprang up, will very soon become the centres to crumble and fall. He also warned that "no nation, however strong can stand on such foundation and the history of the world tells us that all that has such foundations, are dead and gone." He further warned that no civilization can flourish with greed, violence and brutality or on the blood of man. Bloodshed has never served as foundation of any world famous civilization. Love and charity, on the other hand, have served, in all ages, as the foundations of all great cultures and civilizations of the world. "Unless we look charitably" said Swami Vivekananda, "no civilization can lift its head." 'The first step towards that' said he, 'is to look charitably and kindly upon others.'

The imperial powers, always sought to promote their own racial or national interest. Blind to the interest of the universe, they seek their individual or personal interest in all cases. But Swami Vivekananda's world outlook and cosmopolitanism was so high
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that he always thought beyond his nation and race. He called upon the nation-states of Europe to feel concerned about states and races beyond their national boundary. As he said, "The solution of any problem can never be attained on racial or national or narrow grounds. Every idea has to become broad till it covers the whole of this world, every aspiration must go on increasing, till it has engulfed the whole humanity, nay, the whole of life within its scope."

As a lover of mankind Swami Vivekananda decided to devote all his energies to emancipate the Indians from the slavery of the British imperialism and lift it to the height of its own glory. As a Sannyasin, he felt it to be his sole responsibility to elevate the poor and downtrodden masses of India and bring about their social, political and spiritual welbeing. As he said, "For the good of the many, for the happiness of the many, is the Sannyasin born. His life is all vain, indeed, who, embracing Sannyasa, forgets this ideal. The Sannyasin, verily, is born in to this world to lay down his life for others." He thought that the yellow robe of a Sannyasin is the armour to put up a fight against the evils of imperialism for ameliorating the lot of the down-trodden masses.
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"Our yellow robe" said he, "is the robe of death on the field of battle."

Swami Vivekananda realised that Western imperialism is the root-cause of all India's misery and misery of mankind as a whole. It is the foremost cause of poverty and starvation of the native people of the world. This developed his anti-imperial attitude towards the West. The Western imperialistic civilization was his main target of attack. He did not like to attack Western imperialism directly firstly because it would go against the images of a Sannyasin like him and secondly, it would draw the attention of the British imperial power, to arrest him. However his policy was to arouse the people of India and the world as a whole and make anti-imperial forces very active against the West, behind the scene as a monk than openly on the stage as a politician or a political philosopher.

As he has said, "We are to put the chemicals together, the cristalisation will be done according to the law of nature. Work hard and be steady....keep the motto before you: Elevation of the masses."

Swami Vivekananda felt that century-long foreign domination and oppression had taken away the strength and fearlessness from the body and mind of the Indians. Their back-bone is broken and they are
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like down-trodden worms. Fear and weakness had gripped them and they succumbed to British imperialism. If they overcome their fear and weakness the mighty edifice of Western imperialism that overshadowed the glory of human life, shall crumble. Only then can Indians enjoy the dawn of a new life, full of liberty and right. He was intensely devoted to the cause of the emancipation of the poor and the down-trodden, and wanted to arouse the leonine spirit in man by encouraging the concept of strength and fearlessness. This concept of strength and fearlessness according to him was to serve as the greatest weapon against all the evils of Western imperialism. He exhorted his countrymen that strength is life, strength is felicity; weakness is constant strain and misery, weakness is death. (118)

Again he said, 'Fear is the source of degradation. It is fear that brings misery, fear that brings death, fear that breeds evil.' He also exhorted that strength is the best antidote to all tyranny and oppression. It is the best medicine for all world's diseases. So he fervently called upon his people, 'My children, what I want is muscles of iron and nerves of steel, inside which dwells a mind of the same material, that of which the thunderbolt is
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made. Strength, manhood, Khatriya-Virjya + Brahma-Teja -

This is what I want." He also said, "We want faith in our own selves. Strength is life, weakness is death. We are the Almighty, deathless. It is by losing this idea that the country has gone to ruin."

As a spiritual man Swami Vivekananda not only stood for spiritual freedom or emancipation of soul from the bondages of Maya, but also wanted the political emancipation from the clutches of imperialism. To him this political emancipation was an essential condition for spiritual freedom. So struggle for freedom is a conditional feature of his concept of freedom. Hence he stated, "There is to be found in every religion, the manifestation of this struggle towards freedom. It is the ground work of all morals, of selfishness, which means getting rid of idea that men are the same as their little body." Thus for Swami Vivekananda political emancipation from the grip of imperialism was the basis of spiritual freedom and for the sake of spiritual freedom people must be politically free from imperialistic domination.

Swami Vivekananda's concept of strength and fearlessness along with his concept of freedom and
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right instilled a sense of vigour and energy in to the minds of the people of India to rise against Western imperialism. They thought in terms of emancipation of their nation, shaking off the morass and prostration that beset them. In the words of I.P. Chelisheve, "... Vivekananda objectively helped to popularise among masses the idea of liberation and imparted to these ideas the nature of sacred religious duty." (124)

In the words of Sister Nivedita, "India was the queen of his adoration". Naturally, therefore Swami Vivekananda preferred to make India, suffering under the fetters of Western imperialism, the first step for the liberation of the world. His reaction against British imperialism is his reaction against the Western imperialism as a whole, that gripped the colonial people and debased the whole mankind. All his writings and speeches, therefore have tremendous relevance not only for India, his own country, but for the whole world as well. Not only India, but the whole world was his concern. As he once said that he belonged to the world as much as he belonged to India. Again he said, 'the universe is my country.'
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Swami Vivekananda's comprehensive personality could well understand the cause of India's misery and hardship. The imperial power, always guided by the profit motive, did not pay any attention to the miserable plight of the native people. He fully believed that "When a modern state asserts its title to a backward region, the property of the inhabitants is .... exploited by the conquering state for its own private profit." Swami Vivekananda condemned the British as the blood-sucker* and said that no good can be expected when the main policy is blood-sucking. Criticising bitterly the exploitative nature of British imperialism he also wrote "The British in the past achieved her prosperity by cutting the throat of her fellow-men in Spain and in modern time she achieved her prosperity by keeping her feet on the neck of millions of poor and innocent Asiatics."

He felt that the earlier regimes were better for the people as it did not seek to take away everything they had. There was some justice and liberty in it. But British regime, on the contrary became ruthlessly and mercilessly exploitative. Justice and liberty were misnomers under British regime. Referring to history
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he said, "There never was a time in the world's history when there was so much robbery, high-handedness, tyranny of the strong over the weak...."

The British imperial policy was to make England prosperous at the cost of India. British industries flourished and all the indigenous industries collapsed. Crores of ruppes flowed to England and India became impoverished day by day. An English official graphically summed up the situation, "Our system acts very much like a sponge drawing up all these good things from the banks of the Ganges and squeezing them, drawn on the banks of the Thames."

For example, from 1770, the Company sent out of Bengal nearly 35% of its net revenue in form of goods. Moreover, the officials of the Company sent out large sums of their illegal incomes, extorted from Indian merchants, officials and Zemindars. The wealth, drained out of India, played an important part in financing Britain's imperialist development. It has been estimated that it constituted nearly 2% of Britain's national income at that time. Swami Vivekananda reacted to it severely and cried out "They have sucked out blood, they have carried away with them millions of our money, while our people have starved." In a fit of anger he also
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cursed the British: "... ... now the Chinaman is the vengeance that will fall upon them: if Chinese rose today and swept the English in to the sea, as they well deserve, it would be no more than justice." (135)

Swami Vivekananda realised that the white-settlers enjoyed the protection and privileges to the exclusion of the native people. They occupied high military and administrative posts and were paid highly. They took away the lion-share in everything. If at all the Indians got any economic benefit, they paid it back in terms of taxes to the imperial treasury. Thus prevailed perpetual poverty among the people. Swami Vivekananda felt agitated against the British barbaric imperial policy and poured out the venoms: "By their cruelty they degraded the populace ..... If a man can not believe in the vengeance of God, he certainly can not deny the vengeance of History. And it will soon come upon the English: they have their heels on our necks; they have sucked the last drop of our blood for their own pleasure." (136)

Keeping the British in view, he also said, "God will have vengeance. You may not see it in religions, you may not see it in politics, but you must see it in history, and as it has been; it will come to pass. (137) If you grind down the people, you will suffer."
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Inspite of the terrible famines, that engulfed India from time to time as the fatal consequence of the British rule and its policy of exploitation, India was still a populous country. But the British imperial government paid no attention to their welfare at all. The bulk of wealth of the country was diverted to the West rather than benefitting the masses. As a result, people of India remained half-starved and half-naked. This poverty resulted in poor health, low life expectancy and infant mortality. The poverty of the people found its visible manifestation in the series of famines which ravaged the country during the second half of 19th century. Twenty years from 1860 to 1908 were the years of famine. Nearly 29 million people died during famines from 1864 to 1901. These famines revealed that poverty and chronic starvation had taken firm roots in colonial India. Swami Vivekananda criticised this inhuman policy of British imperialism and said, "Indian labour and produce can support five times as many people as there are now in India with comfort, if the whole thing is not taken from them." (138) Thus he blamed the British for all the famines that took away heavy toll of innocent Indian lives, is their deliberate creation.

British ruthless exploitation left the poor masses of India under the monstrous jaws of poverty and hunger. Under such perpetual strain of poverty and chronic stress of hunger, people lost their manhood, all worth and importance of life, and succumbed to slavery at the feet of the British people. Referring to it Swami Vivekananda said, "They have been compelled to be merely hewers of wood and drawers of water.... they are made to believe that they are born as slaves, born as hewers of wood and drawers of water." (139)

The maintenance of imperial army and construction of prison houses were given top priorities rather than health and education of the people. War expenses were justified. These were charged upon the Indian heads on the ground that such wars were waged in the interest of India and her territory. In his speech at Mansion House on November 9, 1978, Disraeli justified the 2nd Afghan war and its expenses on the ground that "the frontier of India was haphazard and not a scientific one." (140) No attention was paid to remove illiteracy and promote education in the country. Expenses on education and health of the people of India was insignificant. Illiteracy and lack of proper education killed the incentive of the people of India in all spheres of
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life and they succumbed to dullness and servitude. Swami Vivekananda deplored it saying, "We have been slaves forever, it has never been given to the masses of India to express their inner light." Suggesting rejuvenation of the spirit of the Indian masses as a measure for regeneration, he said, "The only service to be done for our people is to give them education to develop their lost individuality." He further said that education is the primary need of the Indians as "through education comes faith and strength in one's ownself."

The British government provided only such type of education that would enable Indians to keep the imperial machinery running. Criticising such education Swami Vivekananda said that the whole system of British education in India is "bent upon getting a thirty-rupee clerkship, or at best becoming a lawyer—the height of young India's ambition ......." Pointing out the futility of British education in India, he further said that "fifty years of such education has not produced one original man in the three presidencies. Every man of originality, that has been produced, has been educated elsewhere and not in this country, or they have gone to the old universities once more to cleanse themselves of superstitions."
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The British crushed the native resistance by force, resorted to dishonest tactics to break their unity and make them loyal to the Empire. It made a farce of popular participation in the imperial government and took every care to retain the real power in its own hand. Native culture and language were replaced by those of the West to establish and maintain their racial superiority. Dadabhai Naoroji resented it severely and expressed, "British rule was an everlasting, increasing and everyday increasing foreign invasion that was utterly, though gradually, destroying the country."

Resenting and challenging the policy of racial superiority of the British in strong terms, Swami Vivekananda said, "Only just a while ago they were savage..... the vermin crawled on the ladies bodies..... and they scented themselves to disguise the abominable odour of their persons ..... Most horrible! Even now, they are barely emerging from barbarism." Again he said, "They are quite savage. The frightful cold, the want and privation of their northern climate has made them wild. They only think to kill." Swami Vivekananda, thus wanted to demoralise the British imperialism by harping on the false sense of superiority of the British race and culture that sought to perpetuate itself on the Indian soil.
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Swami Vivekananda believed like Prof. Morgenthau, "In truth military imperialism seeks military conquest; economic imperialism, economic exploitation of the people; cultural imperialism, the displacement of one culture by another - but always, as means to the same imperialistic end. That end is the overthrow of the status quo." He also fully believed that "cultural imperialism is the most subtle ... the most successful of all imperialistic policies. It aims not at the conquest of territory or at the control of economic life but at the conquest of and control of minds of men...." for fortification of the imperial regime. He considered the impact of Western cultural imperialism as the most unfortunate for Asian people themselves. He could well imagine the fatal consequence, if the Eastern spiritual culture is replaced by the Western materialistic one. In order to make people of Asia know their spiritual culture and keep their special identity from that of the West, he said, "The voice of Asia is the voice of Religion. The voice of Europe is the voice of politics." Drawing the attention of the Asian people to the merits of Eastern spiritual culture over the political culture of the West he said,
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"Man cannot be made virtuous by act of Parliament: the Chinese experience it before you. And that is why religion is of deeper importance than politics, since it goes to the root and deals with the essential of conduct."

To Swami Vivekananda spiritual culture "is not necessarily bound up with rules and rituals, superstitions and dogmas, but it is a sublime culture, capable of giving peace and solace to the distressed and afflicted." So when the whole of Europe will be tired and fade up amidst the turmoils of materialistic civilization and culture, they will turn to East for spiritual solace and peace. Drinking deep the ambrosia of Eastern spiritualism, they will get their wounds, caused by the wine of Western materialistic culture, healed up.

Swami Vivekananda was confident that Western cultural imperialism can never succeed to efface the spiritual culture from the soil and transplant itself on it. Time and again, "the Western conquerors, sword in hand came to demonstrate to the children of the sages that they were mere barbarians, a race of dreamers, that their religions was but mythology and God and soul and everything they had been struggling for, were mere words without meaning, that the thousands of
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years of struggle, the thousands of years of endless renunciation, had all been in vain." But to Swami Vivekananda it was all meaningless blusterings of the Western conquerors. It was their vainglorious shouts. History shows that India's spiritual culture is still unconquered. It is still indomitable and invincible. It has met the ravages of thousands of foreign invasions, but still it is unmoved and unchallenged. As he has said, "Wave after wave had flooded the land, breaking and crushing everything for hundreds of years. The sword flashed and the victors rent the skies of India with their shouts, but the flood of foreign culture have subsided, leaving the national culture unchanged. Indian culture can not be killed. Deathless it stands. It will stand so long as that spiritualism remains as the background, so long as her people do not give up their spirituality." He further assured that 'India is immortal, her culture is immortal so long as she persists her search for God.'

The whole system of imperial administration was based upon the theory of punishment. Imperial laws were highly repressive. Freedom of the people was muzzled and individual right was a far cry. Swami Vivekananda was very pained to observe it and said,
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"For writing a few words of innocent criticism men are being hurried to transportation for life, others imprisoned without any trial; no body knows when his body will be off." (158)

Swami Vivekananda deplored the way the imperial power did let loose the reign of terror in India to intimidate the masses and continue its imperial domination. Despotism, oppression and brutality of the imperial power tormented him. Loss of dignity and individuality at the altar of imperial slavery shocked him all the more. Monopolisation by the white-settlers of all the opportunities in every sphere was an intolerable sight for him. The brutality and atrocity heaped upon the innocent masses, for slightest error or violation of the imperial rule, caught him to the quick. As he said, "There has been reign of terror in India for years. The English soldiers are killing our men and outraging our women—only to be sent home with passage and pension at our expense. We are in a terrible gloom." (159)

He further said, "For centuries people have been taught theories of degradation. They have been told that they are nothing. The masses have been told all over the world that they are not human beings. They have been so frightened for centuries, till they have nearly become animals." (160)
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The imperial power loudly repeated the slogans of its civilizing mission and raising of the standard of living of the colonial people to deceive the world opinion. But its whole policy was confined to enslave the subject people by shutting all doors of enlightenment. Life of the people was altogether dull and sluggish. Describing the miserable lot of masses Dadabhai Naoroji remarked, "Indians were mere helots. They were worse than the American slaves, for the latter were at least taken care of by their masters, whose property they were." The sole aim of the British was to debase the conscience and destroy the moral fibres of the people so as to continue their over-lordship over them. Marie Louise Burke condemned the so-called policy of civilizing India in strong terms, "The English used three B's - Bible, brandy and bayonets in civilizing India." Swami Vivekananda resented the education policy of the British and said that the British government made huge profit in India but spent much less even than Russia on education. He further said, "We do not get that education which the common people in the West do get..."

Criticising the achievement of the British India in educational sphere he said, "A few hundred modernised half-educated and denationalised men are all the show of

\[\text{References:}\]

(161) Dadabhai Naoroji, Poverty and UnBritish Rule in India, P. 60
(162) Marie Louise Burke, Swami Vivekananda in America, P. 535
(164) Ibid, Vol-V, PP. 461-62
modern British India - nothing else."

There was no room for humanitarianism in British imperialism. The predatory instinct of the ancient wild races found its fullest manifestation in it. As it is said, "While the Christian missionaries were trying to save the souls of the people, the British officials and traders were extorting what wealth they could, with little concern for the welfare of the inhabitants." Heathen murdering was the legitimate pastime for them. But to deceive the world opinion, they took the plea of friendship and love with the colonial people. They appeared to be very kind and sympathetic but in their heart they were quite the opposite. They were not really so as they appeared to be. In words they seemed to be very kind and considerate but in action they were very cruel and monstrous. Referring to it Swami Vivekananda said, "It is their hunger that has civilized them .... The love of man is on their lips, in their hearts there is nothing but evil and every violence." Such duplicity of the British, has been depicted by Nehru as "We find British imperialism inclining more and more towards fascist powers, though the language it uses, as its old habits, is democratic in texture and pious in tone. And because of this contradiction between
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words and deeds, British prestige has sunk in Europe (168) and the world."

British imperialism created an atmosphere of suspicion, hatred and jealousy between the imperial power and the people of India. Pretension and treachery characterised the imperial administration. Swami Vivekananda observed, "There is love on their lips. But in heart there is evil and every violence. (169) In the plea of love, they cut our throat." As a lover of mankind Swami Vivekananda said that this heinous act of cut-throatism of Western imperialism would never go scott free. It would suffer vengeance of God and have its deplorable fall very soon. Subsequently Gandhi also got annoyed with the British blood-sucking policy who in a fit of anger said, "I have no doubt what so ever that ....... England will have to answer, if there is God, for this crime against humanity, which is perhaps (170) unequalled in history."

Swami Vivekananda considered the British to be the worst of all imperial powers to whose attack and exploitation, India had been subjected in the past. India had been conquered time and again by several imperial powers. They came slaughtering the Hindus, but they
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left behind them so many beautiful places and monuments that are part of India's art and architecture. But to Swami Vivekananda the British left nothing behind but mounds of broken brandy bottles and heaps of skeletons of those who died of poverty and hunger.

To Swami Vivekananda British imperialism was best known for its cruelty and barbarity. It paid no attention to the grievances of the poor and distressed. They lived with maximum comfort and luxury when the hungry masses cried for a piece of bread. Such brutish cruelty and callousness characterised the whole system of British imperialism in India. Explaining it he said, "They ground down poor people for their own wealth. They heard not the voice of distress. They ate from the gold and silver when the Indian cried for bread."

Imperialism created racial barriers, strained human relations, stunted social progress and marred human happiness. It resulted in social chaos and conflicts that divided the whole human society into various warring camps - the whites and non-whites or the Christians and the heathens. Swami Vivekananda had been much disturbed particularly by the racial discrimination of the West against the Negroes. He voiced his grave concern against it and said that though the position of the Negroes has improved after the abolition of
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the institution of slavery, their position in human society was still deplorable. They are treated very harshly by the white people. As he pointed out, "Their lives are of no value; they are burnt alive on mere pretences. They are shot down without any law for their murders; for they are niggers, they are not human beings, they are not even animals." An ardent lover of mankind he could not tolerate such a situation. His very slogan 'free men in the free society' held out a severe threat to Western imperialism.

Swami Vivekananda hated most the diplomacy coercion and military force that are the true accompaniments to imperialism. He realised that the path of imperialism is red with blood of the victims. The imperial powers sought to impose their will over the weaker nations through force, fraud or violence. They pursued the most nefarious policy of exploitation forgetting all canons of morality and justice. War and aggression seemed to them to be the only means for the attainment of their end. All these wounded the heart of Swami Vivekananda. He expressed his mental agony after returning from a tour of an European country; "Europe resembled a military camp. Every where the stretch of war." His mental agony is marked further when he said, "Every day we read of Christian nations acquiring land
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by bloodshed." As a prophetic visionary he cautioned Europe that relished imperialism as her way of life and said, "It is hopeless and perfectly useless to attempt to govern mankind with sword. ........the very centres from which such ideas as government by force sprang up, are very first centres to degrade and degenerate and crumble to pieces. Europe.... will crumble to dust ..... if she is not....to change her...."

Thus though Swami Vivekananda was a mystic par excellence his deep sense of humanism and universalism imbibed from the Hindu scriptures - the Vedas, the Upanishads, the Gita etc, reacted severely against the Western imperialistic policy in general and British imperialism in particular.

To sum up, Swami Vivekananda as an impassioned nationalist was a bitter critic of imperialism and condemned out right the imperialistic greed of the West. India's poverty and backwardness he considered to be the direct consequence of British imperialistic exploitation. As a lover of mankind as a whole he earnestly desired liberation of all peoples and all nations all over the world, from the clutches of imperialism. Hence he advocated shedding of fearlessness and
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commencement of struggle for the liberation of India from the grip of imperialism. He called upon Indians to cultivate muscles of iron and nerves of steel to put an end to British imperialism.