7.a Introduction: Gandhi was a revolutionary thinker. He has been one of the very rare personalities of modern times - the most controversial and yet the most attractive and the most impressive one. He worked for a major change in human nature. This is why he is compared to such contrasting personalities as the Buddha, the Christ, Mazzini, Lincoln, Karl Marx, Lenin, Rouseau, Tolstoy, San-yatsen and others, all at the same time. He believed in the absolute oneness of God and therefore also of humanity. He subscribed to the theological belief that all life in its essence is one, and that the humans are working consciously or unconsciously towards the realisation of that identity. Gandhi was a great social thinker. He had a rare potentiality of thinking on unbeaten lines and a capacity of putting a constructive social philosophy before the world. The modern world which is shaking under the assaults of cold and hot wars and is threatened with utter destruction due to the invention of powerful atomic weapons must try to understand Gandhi's social philosophy. Its study can bring understanding to the minds of the people and a new hope to the sinking world.
Like Gandhi everyone knows about Karl Marx (1818 - 83) and tons and tons of writing exist about him. He was essentially very human. He was also a great humanist. The teachings of Marx and their critiques are well known. Marx's concepts can be grouped into six categories.

1. Labour theory of value
2. Instability of the capitalist system
3. Stages of civilization.
4. Stagealism - stageal values and institutions.
5. Infrastructure - Superstructure theory.
6. Class wars as the dynamics of history

Marxism is radical humanism, but with a set of dogmas of its own. There can be no question that Marxism is radical. Indeed Marx, was the first philosopher who said that the world needs to be changed. Before him the philosophers were only explaining the world, each in his own way.

7.b Comparative Study of Gandhi and Marx: What can be a more fascinating study to us in the present age than that of a comparison between the ideologies of Gandhi, the great soul (mahatma) and Marx, the great thinker? If the last hundred years or so of the social life of humanity were boiled away, the residue will most likely be these two great names.
Lenin is associated with Marx. The shadow of Tolstoy spreads over Gandhi. The two ideologies stand face to face, each bent on swallowing up the other. Like Gandhi, Marx also was a humanist, although in the short view, it may mean the "liquidation" of millions of "class enemies". The early Marx, distressed by the alienation of men from each other, emphasised humanism. Young Marx believed in the primacy of man, in the opposition to all external authority that frustrates human possibilities, in emphasising the relational character of human reality.

But regarding the comparative study of Gandhi and Marx it can be said that, "if the Gandhian thought shows up a halo of spirituality around it, communism has at its back the support of a scientific terminology. Having proved its worth by securing swaraj for us, Gandhism may no longer be dubbed visionary and impracticable." Marx would not accept Gandhi's weapon of soul force. For Marx there, is no such things as self-suffering or change of heart. On the other hand, Gandhi's approach is essentially spiritualistic. Marx rejected Gandhi's non-violent approach. Marx would not mind if revolutionary changes could be affected in a peaceful manner and he believed this could be possible in a liberal democracy like England. Gandhi lays stress on the individual as the
starting point of social regeneration. To him, the problem of the group
is essentially the problem of the individual. The idea underlying this
emphasis is that man is after all a soul and the progress of the soci­
ety depends on the soul-force of an average individual. Gandhi works
from the inner-self to improve the social environment. The Marxists,
on the contrary, work from the outside to the inner.

Marx held that it was the highest duty of the working class
to disobey the laws of the bourgeois government. The unjust and ex­
ploitative government must be overthrown. He taught the working class
to break its laws as far as possible. Marx believed only in matter as
the ultimate reality. He rejected the existence of spirit and believed
spirit to be at best a bye-product of matter.

Although Gandhi's critique of modern civilization bore a
strong resemblance to Marx, it contained several original insights de­
erived from the two great advantages he enjoyed over them. As one
belonging to a despised race and an oppressed country, he grasped the
darker side of modern civilization with unusual clarity. He saw that
although Europe championed the great ideas of human dignity, freedom,
and equality, it defined them in an ideologically biased manner and used
them to justify slavery, colonialism, racism and other patently evil prac­
tices.
Again, as an offspring to the rich and differently structured Indian civilization, Gandhi brought to his critique of modern civilization a perspective not easily available to its western critics. He was able to see it from the outside and uncover its hidden assumptions, contradictions, and limitations. Gandhi saw that contrary to its self-understanding, modern civilization's approach to religion was excessively credal and dogmatic.

But almost like Marx, Gandhi argued that, although the state claimed to be a moral institution transcending narrow group interests and pursuing the well being of the whole community, it was in fact little more than an arena of conflict between organised interests manipulated and controlled by the more powerful forces among them.

M. N. Roy too held that Marxism has a strong rational element, an ethical and moral fervour too, and that it is for ultimate reality. Marx, according to him, was too romantic in stressing revolutionary activity too much. Contradictorily, his dialectics made history independent of human will, and so throttled romanticism. His romanticism was not soberd by thinking, his thinking preluded romanticism. 141

Again Mahatma Gandhi's approach to social problems was akin to that of a social scientist in the sense that he was an alert, intensive, devoted appriser of Indian society, its ethos and its behaviour. He envisaged a direction in which
the society may well proceed on its own and along with the world interest.

7.c Similarities : Gandhism and Marxism:— Gandhism, like Marxism, is a complex whole in the making of which multiple and multi-dimensional factors are involved, due to which it is not always easy to categorise his thinking in terms of traditional schools of thought—philosophical, sociological, and political. Since the French revolution, the modern world has produced two great revolutionaries, Marx and Gandhi, Marx believed in violent revolution to end an inequitable, unjust and antisocial order, whereas Gandhi believed in real revolution to end the tyranny and oppression of the weak by the strong which could only be carried out through resisting evil without deviating from the fundamentals of moral law, and its two cardinal principles of truth and non-violence.

Karl Marx came to communism in the interests of freedom, not of security. In his early years, he sought to free himself from the pressure exercised by the mediocre German Police state of Fredrick William IV. He rejected its censorship, its elevation of authority and of religion, its cultural Philistinism and its empty talk of national interest and moral duty. Marx held that Philosophers has till then tried to explain the world, but the
need was to change it. This was true, and that too in a limited sense, about the theories and speculations of western Philosophers in the middle ages and modern times. The ancient Greek philosophers like Socrates, Aristole, Plato, the Cynics and the Epicureans had more or less practical aims. But through their theories, they wanted not only to explain the world, but also to reform it. This reformation was not meant merely to change the individual's behaviour, but to some extent change the basis of organised society as was done by Plato in his Republic and the laws. Indian Philosophers had always a practical aim in view. It was to change the basis of the individuals conduct so that it would be possible for him to attain his final goal, that of salvation, Nirvana or self-realisation.

Gandhi thought that "labour was far superior to capital. Without labour gold, silver and copper were a useless burden. It was labour which extracted precious one from the bowels of the earth". (7)

Gandhi came quite close to Marx's labour theory of value. Like Marx he thought that the combination of labour against capital could subvert capitalism. Yet he would not incite labour against capital, nor encourage the overthrow of capitalists by force. This
latter process would be based on class hatred and undermine the moral principle of ahimsa. No society can thrive on hatred and undermine the moral principle of ahimsa. (8)

Karl Marx thought the world was ripe for revolution, and it was round the corner. Marx had not expected the revolution to begin in an industrially backward country like Russia. He had expected that it would be brought about in the industrially developed countries like Germany and England. There capitalism had reached its climax to produce contradictions which could only be resolved through class-war.

The fundamental difference between Gandhi and Marx lies in their different approaches towards life and the universe. All other differences, whether of ends and means or of ideas about political, social, economic, religious order, arise from this basic difference. And in this approach, Gandhi is different not only from that of Marx but also from that of the protagonists of capitalism and industrialism. Between Marxism and capitalism there are some important common grounds as follows:

Both attach great importance to centralized control over capital and land and to industries and agriculture on large scale. Both believe in money economy. Both wanted to establish its own
control over these and each desiring to get the largest share in the fruits.

The common points between Gandhi and Marx is the extreme concern of both for the suppressed and the oppressed, the resourceless and the ignorant, the dumb and the starving section of humanity. They form the major part of the family. Both Gandhi and Marx wanted to establish an order, which would make these masses co sharers in the gifts of nature and fruits of human labour and genius. But while Gandhi insists upon adherence to truth and non-violence for achieving this object, Marx does not care about the quality of the means, provided they appear efficient enough for achieving the end as quickly as possible. Marx was a calm thinker and a passionate fighter. Throughout his life, he suffered due to poverty and repression. Though Marx was greatly impressed by the Hegelian logic, he rejected Hegelian idealism which regarded ideas as the principal cause of the historical process and absolute ideas fully conscious of themselves as the goal of the evolutionary process. The view of Marx was that matter and not spirit or idea, was the ultimate reality. The society organised for production was that in which there was to be no exploitation of one class by another. This was the goal of the evolutionary process. The world by its nature develops
in accordance with the laws of the movement of matter. Marx believed that different social ideas and theories which appeared at different periods of history, were merely reflection of the material laws of society. Matter is active and not passive and moves by an inner necessity of its nature.

The dialectical materialism of Marx differs from Hegel's dialectics. Whereas for Hegel, the ultimate reality is reason or spirit, for Marx it is matter in motion. The goal towards which the dialectical materialism is moving is the society perfectly organised for production in which there shall be no class distinctions or exploitation.

According to Marx, production and the exchange of things produced is the basis of every social order. In every society which has appeared in history, the distribution of wealth and the division of society into classes is dependent upon what is produced, how it is produced and how the products are exchanged. The ultimate causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought not in man's brain, not in their growing insight into eternal truth and justice, but in changes in the modes of production and exchange. They are to be sought not in the philosophy but in the economics of each particular
epoch. History is the history of man's productive activity. Production is a process which creates definite relations between man and man. The economic structure is the base and political, philosophical, religious, cultural, ethical and other structures are determined by the economic foundation, according to Marx.

According to Marx, any meaningful change means change in the mode of production. Without changing the production relations, no meaningful change can be brought about.

According to Marx, classes are determined by the mode of production and struggle between the classes with opposite interest is fundamental. Change is always sought by the oppressed and exploited class. Class struggle is an inevitable product of the contradiction between the productive forces and production relations. Struggle between the two classes is fundamental. It is the driving force for social and historical change. Class struggle is the vehicle of change. When the dominant class is defeated and a new class takes over, it is a revolutionary change. When the contradiction between the relations of production and forces of production reaches a climax, revolution occurs and there is the transformation of one mode of production into another. Revolutionary change means fundamental change. It is not a change within the existing system. It is a change of one system by another.
Class struggle is a driving force of change and revolution is the midwife which helps the delivery of a new society out of the womb of the old one. Social change and social movements occur because of conflicts and contradictions within the society. There is always a conflict between the present state of affairs and what is coming. Society contains within itself the seeds of its own destruction and transformation to a higher stage. Causes of change are internal contradictions of a system. Historical process is not a mechanical process. Many other factors influence the process of change. It does not believe that changes will come automatically. Marx believed that the future depends on ourselves. Circumstances make man just as much as man makes circumstances. However, men do not act out of the historical context. They are not free to make it just as they please.

7.d Differences: Gandhi and Marx:– The difference between the philosophies of Gandhi and Marx manifest itself in their political and economic ideas. Marx puts forth the theories of class-war and its end through the dictatorship of the proletariat, expropriation of land, mines and other material sources of wealth, state capitalism, nationalisation of industries and regimentation of life and labour. As against this the Gandhian theorise about varna-dharma, satyagraha, decentralization, trus-
teeship and as much individual liberty and democratization as possible in social life. (10)

Gandhi had the opinion that grinding poverty of the masses of India worked for their degradation which needed to be removed. Although, he did not disregard the importance of economics in the life of the individual or the groups, he, unlike Marx, did not think that all human values and institutions were the result of the working of economic forces. Both, Gandhi and Marx, fought for establishing equality, freedom, brotherhood and democracy.

Gandhi, however, did not believe that dictatorship based on violence would automatically evolve itself into democracy. Being an advocate of non-violence, Gandhi could not imagine any other form of Government except democracy. He like Marx, talked of the withering away of the state. But as a practical politician he could not envisage a time when the state would disappear. Karl Marx was trained in the traditions of German left-wing Hegelian meta-physics. He emphasized on logical reasoning. Gandhi was generous even to his opponents; Marx was a perpetual fighter.

Marx was opposing the philosophy of idealism for which the material world of time and space, accessible through the sensory mode, is in one form or the other a derivative from the objective idea that
was static and transcendental with Plato, but dynamic and self realizing with Hegel. Again Marx came out against the philosophy of mechanical materialism. The general philosophical viewpoint of Marx is known as dialectical materialism which when applied to social phenomena is termed as dialectical historicism.

Gandhi was born and bred in Indian culture and he spoke mostly to the people stepped in that same culture. He was an inspired teacher and prophet who had no intention to work out a logical and theoretical construction. He poured forth the results of his deepest feelings and the most sincere realisations of truth. On the other hand, Marx was trained in the traditions of German Hegelian metaphysics. He believed in the efficacy of logical reason and for over thirty years he laboured persistently to give finishing touches to his system. Gandhi possessed an attractive personality of a prophet and he was shown the greatest reverence even by his enemies. Marx was engaged in a bitter and furious controversy with Bakmin, Lassalle etc. He possessed an aggressive personality and he complained that his towering intellectual strength was not recognised by others.

Gandhi represented metaphysical idealism and Marx dialectical materialism. Gandhi started with the conception of an omnipresent fundamental spiritual reality. He inherited a strong faith in the existence
of a deeper spiritual power. On the other hand Marx was a rationalist. He condemned mysticism and faith. He criticised idealistic philosophy.

Gandhi believed in ethical absolutism and Marx in ethical relativism. There was no eternal moral principles and the ethical system was related to the relations of productions. Both Gandhi and Marx differed on the question of religion as a factor in history. As Gandhi believed in truth and non-violence he accepted the force of religion in human history. On the other hand, Marx was an advocate of dialectical materialism and he considered religion to be a reactionary force. He thought that religion is an ideology fitted to production, organisations and relations of the time.

Gandhi and Marx provided divergent solutions for mankind. The central evils against which Gandhi fought were racialism, imperialism, communalism and untouchability. But Marx fought against the reactionary policies of the Russian Government. Gandhi considered imperialism as the enemy. According to Marx, bourgeois capitalism was the enemy.

Gandhi challenged the foundations of modern civilization. On the other hand, Marxism grew as the creed of the western industrial world. The workers suffering under the injustices of the early years of industrial capitalism found in it the gospel of emancipation. Marx believed that History moves through the struggle of different classes.
Both Gandhi and Marx succeeded because they tried to find a solution to the eternal problem of man which is to provide him with bread. Marx called the capitalist as robbers. The view of Gandhi was that anybody who had more than what he barely needed was a thief. Marx challenged the theory and practice of capitalist accumulation. Gandhi challenged accumulation in all its shapes.\(^{(12)}\)

Though Gandhi and Marx were opposed to the capitalistic process of social and economic exploitation, their emphases were on different points. Gandhi was a moral and spiritual individualist. The view of Marx was not an appeal to the sentiment of justice by individual self-sacrifice but organised expropriation by the armed proletariat of the expropriators which would destroy the evils of society.

But in a sense both Gandhi and Marx were anarchists. Gandhi considered the state as an organisation of violence and force. The view of Marx was that the capitalist state was to be replaced by the proletarian dictatorship.

Again Gandhi was not a philosopher of history but he accepted theological determinism. He believed that nothing could happen without the sanction of God. Marx believed in the power of reason to create a better society and happier future for men. Marx believed in the power of man, society and science to satisfy all human wants.
Gandhi took into consideration not only the ends but also the means. On the other hand Marx did not care for the means provided and wanted to achieve the end as quickly as possible.

Gandhi preached the philosophy of love while Marx advocated that of hatred. Gandhi stood for democratic government and Marx for the dictatorships of the proletariat. Gandhi was essentially a democrat and Marx did not believe in it. Gandhi stood for decentralised democracy but Marx did not believe in it.

Regarding this Mashruwala says: "It has been often said that Gandhi was a communist minus violence. Indeed, it is possible to quote Gandhi himself in support of this proposition. Gandhi was not in the habit of rejecting descriptions of him or his principles, if they were meant as compliments, and if they helped his main mission. But in a careful examination of principles, such description should not be regarded as very accurate and must not be used as handy definitions. The error of such descriptions lies in its capacity to conceal the full implications of the differential factor. When it is said that Gandhism is communism minus violence, the impression created is that the 'minus violence' factor in communism is some small impurity the removal of which will make it the same as Gandhism. As a matter of fact, even if it were possible to so equate Gandhi in terms of communism, the
'minus violence' factor is a major factor of considerable value. The implication of 'minus violence' are so great as to make the equation as illusory as to say that red is green minus yellow and blue, or a worm is a snake minus poison.\(^{(13)}\)

As Marx was a great social thinker, he believed in more, the influence of society as a whole to individual and moulding of their character. Any individual develops his true nature only in society. Power of nature of an individual is measured by the power of the society he belongs to.

But Gandhi was a great politician with charisma. He was an organiser and a leader of men and also could be told as a moral reformer. Gandhi emphasises the spiritual nature of man and he believes in the exercise of free will as well as the effect of environment. Gandhi is the most important of the great thinkers of modern India who have drawn their inspiration largely from the intellectual and cultural tradition of India and tried to relate their thought to contemporary social and political realities. The Gandhian approach to values, it will be seen is more consistent than the Marxian approach with scientific value Relativism which, as explained is the only logical method of dealing with the problem of values\(^{(14)}\). Gandhism is a method of progressing towards an ideal. Marx examined the political and other insti-
tutions of the world from the standpoint that they were moulded mainly, if not wholly, by the economic conditions and institutions of the time, and came to the conclusion that with the passage of time political power will ultimately pass into the hands of the proletariat and there will be no privileged class of people in the state.

This is clear that neither Marx nor Gandhi subscribes to the cult of passive effeminate and helpless submission or cowardice. But class analysis is central to Marxist approach and any explanation of social phenomena without the class approach is alien in Marxism.

Karl Marx died when Gandhi was just eleven years old and Gandhi died hundred and thirty years after the birth of Marx. Marx, a German by birth, belongs to the whole world and is acclaimed as a prophet by the communist world. Gandhi, born in India, belongs to Humanity. Both of them look upon a cause of the downtrodden and exploited humanity, which has been reeking under the heels of the purseproud, self puffed, high and mighty. Both were the mighty minds who moved men and led movements. Both fought against social suffering, economic exploitation and inequalities. It was not they were both dreamers, but both have carved out a way to materialize their dream. Both shed their tears on the suppression of the people, fought against the social injustices and tyrannies and gave a message of hope.
emancipation from exploitation. Both have deeply influenced men and minds and have left behind a large following who is seeking to dogmatize and idolize their teachings and thoughts. It is a tragedy for both that they are more respected in foreign lands than in the land of their birth. Both have influenced the course of the socialist movement in India and both have their deep impress on the socialist thinking in their country and hence the importance of the study of the dominant political philosophies of Gandhi and Marx.

As political philosophers both are opposed to the State and seek to abolish it. Gandhi's opposition to the State is based on the fact that State means powers and for the maintenance of that power, force and violence is essential. Marx is opposed to the State because the role of the State, so far, has been as an instrument of exploitation of the 'have nots' by the 'haves'. The class which enjoys the economic power in the society also enjoys the political power of the state. But he was generous even to his opponents, Marx was a perpetual fighter and a rationalist, Mysticism and faith were accepted by him. Idealistic philosophy according to him tried to hypnotize the functional products of human brain and thus exalted ideas as the Absolute Idea of the world. He flourished in the era of Biblical criticism and wanted to unravel the secrets of the cosmos by sole reference to reason and science.
Marx was inspired by the materialistic tradition of Democritus, Hobbes, Holbach and Feuerbach and felt delight in the application of the dialectical methodology of German philosophy.

Both Gandhi and Marx were anarchists opposed to political authority of the state over the individual. Both of them, therefore, conceived of an idea - a stateless society free from exploitation of any kind. Gandhi's ideal of Ramrajya in a society, where each individual living in it, is a Satyagrahi, following the dictates of truth, and governed by his own moral will. There will be the sovereignty of the moral authority of the people. Discipline will be self imposed in the interest of social good. It is unfortunate that Gandhi's concept of Ramrajya has been criticized as a reactionary in the sense that he intends to take us back to the days of Ramayan. This is not true. Ram to Gandhi is a symbol of truth. Thus Ramrajya means rule of righteousness. It may be called as Dharmrajya - the rule of virtue. When people are motivated to their actions by truth and virtue, we need no state. There is no doubt that the function of the state has been negative so far. State cannot make man moral, because of the very nature of morality. Morality is a thing of inward realization. The state cannot make me good unless I decide myself to become a good man. Of course the state can indirectly help me in becoming good. It can cre-
ate an environment where in it may be possible for me to become a
good man. The state therefore, has no positive role in making man 
moral and hence Gandhi would wish it to vanish.

Both Gandhi and Marx were opposed to the state, because of 
its negative role so far, but at the same time, they would not stand 
for its immediate ending. They would like it to disappear gradually. At 
the moment the state is a necessary evil. It is able to avert the hin-
drances that come in the way of a good life of the citizen. Marx 
would first abolish the present state- based on the domination of one 
class over the other- and replace it by a Quasi state based on the dic-
tatorship of the proletariat. This would be the first phase of commu-
nism. Marx believed that when the people are educated in the commu-
nistic ways of life and the class consciousness is merged in social 
awareness, the state would start withering away. Marx, therefore, does 
not stand for the abolition of state, but for the gradual withering away 
of the state. Marx is thus a gradualist so far as the ending of the state 
is concerned. Similarly Gandhi stands for the gradual transformation of 
society through non-violence and truth. Trained Satyagrahis would usher 
in Ramrajya. It shall gradually come through a change of heart, by inner 
purification, by an assiduous cultivation of moral values and virtues and 
by constructive work.
There is no doubt that a revolution shall bring the classless society into existence. But the Gandhian revolution is a 'Revolution by consent' while the Marxian revolution is first a blood bath disobeying all accepted values and norms and it is on the ruins of the old structure that the new society shall come in to being. Gandhian Ramrajya will evolve out of the present society.

The process of social change is evolution. Things that gradually evolve are more permanent than the things that suddenly appear. The path of sound social change lies through evolution. Of course it takes more time, but it is a philosophical anarchism. His anarchism represents the influence of the moral anarchism of Tolstoy. Marxian anarchism represents a reaction against the injustices of the nineteenth century capitalist state. Gandhian anarchism has its inspiration in his spiritual teachings while Marxian anarchism is based on his materialistic conceptions. Gandhi is a pacifist anarchist, while Marx is a revolutionary anarchist. Gandhi believes in a state free society, while Marx conceives of a stateless society.

We have seen that there is another basic difference in the anarchist philosophy of these two thinkers. Gandhi is essentially a realist and as such he believes that the stateless society is not practicable and feasible because of the weakness of human beings. He is, therefore.
convinced that such a society shall never come into existence and that is why he thinks of the second best, a society in which there is the decentralization of both political and economic power. Marx is more utopian than Gandhi. He is convinced that the stateless and classless society shall come into existence. Marx feels that his ideal is realizable while to Gandhi it is only an ideal worth attaining.

It is now clear that the objectives of Gandhi and Marx are the same that is to fight against injustice and exploitation of man and the setting up of a brave new world and yet both stand apart. Their differences are basic and fundamental and hence they cannot be bridged and reconciled.

We may here observe that Gandhi is an ethical revolutionary. He emphasizes the moral hollowness of modern civilization and suggests the sanctity of ethical substance and criterion. Gandhi believed in changing the heart of his opponent. He believes in converting his opponent through the peaceful pursuit of persuasion and education. Such a solution would be real. Gandhi is a realist with touches of idealism. He believed that synthesis has more truth than the thesis and the antithesis. Gandhi like Aristotle believed that virtue lies in following the middle path.

It is clear that Gandhi's whole life was a life of synthesis. His
political philosophy was a synthesis of Indian Liberalism and Indian Extremism. Gandhi was a practical idealist and so he converted the freedom movement, from an intellectual Middle class movements into a revolutionary mass struggle, giving it a method of effective action. Gandhi endorsed it with an urge for social justice with a passion for equality, and aroused the conscience of India to the conditions of the depressed classes and other under privileged sections of the community. Gandhi emphasized on rural India and the moral fervour which he imparted to the national movement were his real contribution entitling him to be called the Father of the Nation.

Marx drew his inspiration from the scientific rationalism of France and Germany. He, therefore, brings his theories before the court of reason and tries to have the verdict from it. Marx's faith in the power of reason led him to create a brave new world. By harnessing science and technology, through reason and human mind he could rationalise our socio-economic process. The dialectical use of human reason would reveal the marvels and grandeur of freedom to man. He has faith in the powers of man, science and society. He formulates broad rules of history which are assumed to operate in the totality of the historical structure. His basic concepts, in history and politics, are freedom, reason, science, secularism and revolution.
Again Marx's mission of materialism makes him a realist and a man of action. He sees the social injustices, economic exploitation and political plunderings. Marx is in a hurry to cure these evils. He, therefore, cannot go deeper into them. He sees the appearance of them and has little patience to go deep into the realities of them. He sees that capitalism has evils and therefore, it must go. He has no patience to cure the ills of capitalism. The revolution which he seeks to bring about would result in the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the transference of the means of production from private hands to communal ownership. Human exploitation, however, as seen has not ceased either in the Soviet Union or in people's China.

Gandhi and Marx both have a common destination- an exploitation free society. But the path paved by them are different as both of them conceived the course of action in the socio political climate of their times and of their countries. Mahatma Gandhi being born in India has the impress of the heritage of this country. Karl Marx became mature in the climate of the capitalism and industrialism in the west. Both were the harbinger of hope to mankind. Again India achieved independence under the inspiring leadership of Mahatma Gandhi and Russia shook of the shackles of Czarism under the inspiration of the Marxian ideology.
Gandhi challenged the foundations of modern civilization. The hedonistic, materialistic and imperialist aspect of modern western civilization repelled him. It was equivalent to darkness and disease. Gandhi accepted the gospel of a return to nature like Plato, Rousseau and Tolstoy. Gandhi preached a return to simplicity. In the Hind Swaraj he wrote as an almost absolute ruralist but in his later writings it appears that he was only opposed to the perversities of modern imperialism, fascism and the technological instruments of violence.

Regarding Gandhi and Marx K.G. Mashruwala observed that "Whatever interest the world may or may not take in the comparative study of Gandhi and Marx, in our own country at least, it has become a subject of everyday discussion among the educated. Every discourse attempts to weigh and measure them up according to his capacity. If the Gandhian thought shows up a halo of spirituality around it, Communism has at its back the support of a scientific terminology. Having proved its worth by securing Swaraj for us, Gandhism may no longer be dubbed as visionary and impracticable. And communism, too, has for the moment proved its virility by rejuvenating the hoary old China".

It is clear that Gandhi believed in spiritual idealism and hence he believed in the supremacy of ethical absolutism. The Gandhian theory of ethical absolutism can be traced to the vedic concept of the
Rta—the doctrine that are all following the cosmic and moral order which govern both men and gods. The Rta is not a precept of human reason. It is a cosmic law imminent in the very structure of the universe. Buddha also had faith in the existence of a moral order in the world. But Marxism, on the other hand, accepts the relativism, of the moral criterion and regards ethical codes as the products of our social growth. There are no eternal moral principles and the ethical system is relative to the relations of production. The Marxian theory of ethical relativism receives support from the researches of the social sciences.

But inspite of this philosophical difference between the theoretical standpoints of the two teachers it must be pointed out that in their personal life and carrier both were fundamentally idealists. Both believed in the values of freedom, progress and emancipation of the suppressed strata. Both were men of solid character and nothing favour or frown, fear or tempatation, could make them compromise with what they considered vital principles of their life.

It is clear that in one sense Gandhi and Marx may be regarded as polar types. Gandhi had an idealist approach and he regarded the betterment and ennoblement of human nature as the foundation for social amelioration. Gandhi reminds us of St. Augustine, Bonald and
De Maistre and the Existentialist philosophers. Marx had an institutional and sociological approach. He wanted to change the social structure as the prelude to the change of human nature.

Starting from different metaphysical orientations, Gandhi and Marx provide divergent solutions for social and economic maladies of mankind. The central evils against which Gandhi fought were racialism, imperialism, communalism and untouchability. The problems of labour versus capital were not yet acutely significant for him. In South India, as a reformer he fought against social injustices, political tyrannies and imperialist oppressions. Primarily he was engaged in abolishing the unjust economic and political exploitation of India. According to Gandhi the enemy was foreign imperialism, according to Marx it was bourgeois capitalism.

The relation between man and his bread is eternal. His bread may not determine his thought but he must have bread and plenty of that. Both Gandhi and Marx have succeeded because they have busied themselves with providing the solution to this eternal problem. How everybody will be provided with bread? If according to Marx, capitalists are robbers because they extract surplus unearned profit, according to the Gandhian commentaries on non stealing anybody who has more than what he barely needs is a thief. Marx challenges the theory and practice of
capitalist accumulation. Gandhi challenges accumulation in all its shapes. All the great prophets in history have been socialist in this sense. Jesus Christ was a socialist and Dayananda and Vivekananda were socialists because all of them condemned the perversities of wealth and glorified the blessings of poverty. Gandhi emphasized not only the settlement of problems arising out of the iniquities of wealth but he radically wanted to cure even the drive towards avarice and lust which are the chief criminals in creating an unequal society.

Both Gandhi and Marx were opposed to the capitalistic processes of social and economic exploitation, but their emphasis are on different points. Gandhi was a moral and spiritual individualist.

The individual seeking to better his character by moral techniques is the starting point of Gandhian ethics. Marx, inheriting the Hellenic and the Hegelian traditions of the significance of the collectivity accepts that not an appeal to the sentiment of justice by individual self sacrifice but organized expropriation of the expropriators by the armed proletariat would destroy the evils of society. Gandhi thinks that the root of the malady is not in structure of society but in the psychic components of man. Thus, not individual wealth but the
individualistic propensity towards the acquisition of wealth is the central devil. Gandhi did believe in changes in the structure of society and politics. Like Buddha, he believed that the enemy has to be converted into a colleague and helper. A classless society based on mutual active love and harmony was his goal. Marx will say that the people who hold property now do not have any inviolable right to it.

Gandhi condemned violence because in whatsoever a form it may be, it is bound to generate future violence. Thus there is a strong realistic foundation of the Gandhian techniques of the resolution of conflicts through peaceful methods. The modern methods of technology and science have placed immense military power in the hands of the capitalist state and hence if the workers and the peasants advocate for forcible overthrow, the chances are that, they will fail.

But regarding politics in a sense both Gandhi and Marx were anarchists. Gandhi considered the state as an organization of violence and force. He postulated that in the ideal society of Ramrajya there will be the sovereignty of the moral authority of the people and the state as a machine of concentrated violence would be extinct. But certainly he was not for the immediate ending of the state power.
Increasing perfection of the state through the application of the techniques of non-violent democracy should be the immediate goal although the ultimate aim is philosophical and moral anarchism conceptualized as Ramrajya.

According to Marx, the capitalistic state would be replaced by the proletarian dictatorship. It would be the first phase of communism. The dictatorship of the proletariat as pointed out by Lenin would be the highest concentration of power. It will build the foundations for the ultimate classless society. The communist society will be the second phase of communism. According to Marx, the state is the child of social exploitation consequent on the growth of commodity production, the socialization of the means of production and the end of private appropriation would mean the withering away of the state.

The idealistic character of both Gandhism and Marxism is apparent in their anarchistic philosophy. Gandhi referred to the ideal of Ramrajya. The anarchistic theory of Gandhi represents the influence of the moral and religious anarchism of Tolstoy upon him and is similar to the ancient literature of India, as for example, in the Ramayana and the moral and religious anarchism of Tolstoy upon him and is
similar to the ancient literature of India, as for example, in the Ramayana and the Mahabharata where we find the ideals of the Ramrajya and Dharmarajya. In a fundamental sense, anarchism is a religious ideology and its roots go back to the religious condemnation of the state as an institution of sin, consequent upon the fall of man from the state of resplendent grace. Hence we find that in postulating the final ideal of anarchism, the spiritualist teachings of Gandhi and the materialistic teachings of Marx join hands.

7. Conclusion: We can say that Gandhi was a great national liberator, a champion of Asian consciousness, a saint and a moral revolutionary who preached the supremacy of satyagraha or soul-force. He stressed the moral bankruptcy of modern civilization and prescribed the sanctity of ethical substance and universal moral will. He thought that a peaceful solution of our problems is not only possible but also the only way to have a real solution. Marx on the other hand wants a radical change in the social structure by resorting to force. Gandhi along with the touch of the celestial prophet was a leader with tremendous sense of social and political realism. Marx was a dynamic fighter trying in history to revive the laws of Moses. Marx will have a permanent place in the history of social, political, and economic
thought for his theory of scientific socialism built on the foundation as of historical materialism and the economics of surplus value. Regarding Gandhi and Marx K.G Mashruwala says that, "I believe I have dealt with most of the important aspects of both the Gandhian and the Marxian doctrines. I have tried to show that the Gandhian way of looking at life and life's problems is basically different from the Marxian one, and the difference can not be stated by such simple equations as "Gandhism is communism minus violence" or Gandhism is communism plus God".

Gandhism is a method of progressing towards an ideal. This method is like a high peak of the Himalayas. When we perceive it from a distance, we do not realize that it might be too difficult to reach. But as we begin to climb, we find that what we thought to be the final goal is but a stage in the way, and a new far away mount appears before the vision as the final one, and this process might take place endlessly. It is a long-range everlasting programme, and yet usefully implementable by even single individuals.

Both Gandhi and Marx have been the determined spokesmen of the aspiration of suppressed humanity and therein lies the secret of their great success. Both have been outspoken champions of the interests and claims of the suppressed sections of humanity.
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