1

Gandhi's Experiments

Gandhi: Merely a Man

We find two diametrically opposed views of Mohandas K. Gandhi's moral stature. One has it that, ethically speaking, he was nearly perfect. Albert Einstein said of him, for instance, that generations to come would scarcely believe that such a man actually walked this earth, and in a collection of essays that appeared under the title *Gandhi Memorial Peace Number* (Roy 1949), a large number of eminent persons accord Gandhi the highest of praise as a moral being. We must also ask ourselves, however, what exactly is the nature of Gandhi's contribution and what is the basis for the tremendous esteem and adulation in which he has been held. For with regard to his own moral achievement, we find a second opinion that is, perhaps, as near the truth as the first: the opinion that Gandhi was often mistaken and that it would be wrong to take him unreservedly as a moral example for everyone.

The best known representative of this latter and more modest view happens to be Gandhi himself. "I claim no infallibility. I am conscious of having made Himalayan blunders . . ." (quoted in Pyarelal 1932: 133; also in Prabhu and Rao 1967: 9). There are other people also who firmly accept that he fell short of his own very high aims. The best collection of Gandhi's teaching, *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi*, compiled by Ramachandra K. Prabhu and U. R. Rao (1946, revised and enlarged in 1967), opens with two chapters in which Gandhi speaks of his own personal imperfection, his mistakes, their painful consequences, and his unrequited desire for support.

Like many other strong personalities, Gandhi was authoritarian in his family life and, perhaps without clearly perceiving it himself, pressed his wife and eldest son into conformity with his own ideas. Gandhi admitted this and elaborated the point by saying that it was especially in his early life, with its violent changes of lifestyle, that he was not aware of his own

coercive powers and that he hoped his younger sons did not have as bad a time as his eldest. About his first son, Gandhi says:

> His grievance against me has always been that I sacrificed him and his brothers at the altar of what I wrongly believed to be public good. My other sons have laid more or less the same blame at my door, but with a good deal of hesitation, and they have generously forgiven me. My eldest son was the direct victim of my experiments. . . .
>
> (*Harijan* 18.8.1940: 253–54; quoted in Gandhi 1961, vol. 1: 378)

This is not the place to go into details, but the general point is of importance: to stress Gandhi's exemplary moral character runs counter to his own perception and tends to force discussion away from his phenomenal achievements and their relevance today.

Discussion is also diverted from central issues when it is said that strong, nonviolent action presupposes a personal belief in God. Especially among socialists, one finds atheism highly esteemed, and people are mindful of Lenin's implacable fight against religion. What they forget is that Gandhi fought godlessness, not atheism. "You may call yourself an atheist, but so long as you feel akin with mankind you accept God in practice."[1] His prayers were self-directed and not childish begging. He called himself an "orthodox Hindu," but this very orthodoxy he interpreted more widely than anybody else, including under Hinduism the teachings of Jesus and Mohammed and treating Buddha as the great, inestimable reformer of Hinduism. His religiousness was revolutionary, of a sort that if it is crushed, then mankind is lost. "You believe in some principle, clothe it with life. . . . I should think it is enough" (*Harijan* 17.6.1939). The pervasive occurrence of the term *God* in the speeches and writings of Gandhi should not discourage any serious atheist or agnostic. Even a cursory study of the use of this word in religious contexts reveals its pragmatic and performatory, rather than purely descriptive, character.

Many of Gandhi's political opponents have maintained that it was difficult to bring him to the realization that he had made a mistake when he was convinced he had not, but even those criticisms do not detract from the sincerity of Gandhi's own declarations of imperfection. He saw then, as clearly as we can with hindsight, how uninhibited idealizing came to play a fateful role for him. We can see this process by distinguishing three separate phases in his relationships with his supporters. In the first phase the re-

lationship can be expressed as the attitude "We won't manage any better with him, but it would be unwise to shake him off"; in the second, as "Together with him we'll certainly manage"; and in the third, as "He'll manage *for us*." In the second phase, Gandhi achieved his best work; in the third, his contribution greatly diminished. A great cause, Gandhi reflects, "can only be injured rather than advanced by glorification of its leaders" (*Young India* 13.7.1921; quoted in Prabhu and Rao 1967: 12). His successes in that last stage came increasingly to be attributed to his own high moral attainments. He was already a saint, a demigod. It became all too easy for people to think, "Whatever he says or does can't possibly have much to do with what I can do. I have no great moral ambition nor any special abilities; I can't reasonably be expected to follow his example." By thus becoming clothed in a mystique of remoteness and divinity, Gandhi's words lost the special appeal they had when his prestige had not yet reached its peak.

People came to stress the morality, not the efficiency, of nonviolent campaigns. As a leader of the nation, Jawaharlal Nehru insisted, "I am not a Gandhi," not a man of that lofty character. "Therefore," he seemed to say, "I have to rely on arms and on other means that Gandhi despised."

The case of Albert Schweitzer presents a parallel. Here we have a man of outstanding ability, the recipient of several doctorates, an eminent musician, missionary, theologian, and healer; how possibly could such a paragon inspire ordinary mortals to action? Excellence of this order seems more likely to induce amazement and reverence than friendly cooperation. It is quite different, of course, if the man next door goes off to Africa to start up a small hospital: knowing Jones as we do, we feel there are no real obstacles to our following in his footsteps, should we feel so inspired.

Gandhi was never able, moreover, to make it sufficiently clear to his supporters that a nonviolent army needs soldiers, not just a general. When the crowds pressed in on all sides to touch him, they did not come to listen to what he said or to work with him; they came for comfort. These occasions were among the few when Gandhi lost control and showed anger. ("It is not that I do not get angry. I do not give vent to anger" [*Harijan* 11.5.35; quoted in Prabhu and Rao 1967: 16].) With Gandhi, as with others, reverence for the man himself is a product of the literature that grows up around him, but this literature contains little support for the reverential attitude. The essential picture we get of Gandhi agrees less with that of his famous admirers than with his own.

> I have become literally sick of the adoration of the unthinking multitude. I would feel certain of my ground if I was spat upon by them. Then there would be no need for confession of Himalayan and other miscalculations, no retracing, no re-arranging.
>
> (*Young India* 2.3.1922: 135; quoted in Prabhu and Rao 1967: 11)

To describe Gandhi as a moral genius, however, would not be altogether absurd if what we want to stress is his constructive imagination and uncommon ingenuity in finding and applying morally acceptable forms of political action. In this field, Gandhi was an Edison. He made incredible discoveries in the field of ethics and politics and showed how to apply those discoveries. This, rather than any high moral level of his own conduct, is the truly remarkable feature of his achievement. Personally, of course, he did continually exert himself to maintain a high moral standard, but many people do that without ever making a moral discovery, a contribution to moral thinking and practice.

Especially in the West, Gandhi has been described as an ascetic. This is inadequate. He lived in certain respects like his followers among the poor, but his modest consumption was motivated less by Indian ascetic ideas than by certain views on the healthy life.

> The life I am living is entirely very easy and very comfortable, if ease and comfort are a mental state. I have all I need without the slightest care of having to keep any personal treasures. . . . I regard myself as a householder, leading a humble life of service and, in common with my fellow-workers, living upon the charity of friends. . . .
>
> (*Young India* 1.10.1925: 338; quoted in Prabhu and Rao 1967: 4)

He was also influenced by the idea that a person devoted to a great cause cannot afford to use energy for other purposes.[2]

India has long traditions of ascetic exercises and austerities, the *tapas*. A *saṃnyāsin* is a person who renounces the world, who abandons and resigns worldly affairs and often starves himself in the effort to reach higher levels of religious consciousness. Gandhi explicitly repudiates that he is or ever tried to be a *saṃnyāsin*.

Gandhi earned the title *mahātman*, great soul, primarily because of the effect of his work. To understand this, we must see the difference between external and internal criteria of moral quality. Referring to external criteria, the

goodness of an act is judged relative to its consequences. Referring to internal criteria, on the other hand, the strength of one's will to do good, the inflexibility of one's good intentions, is what counts. In practical life, where it is primarily what people do that matters, we tend to measure moral value in terms of achievement, not intention; and for Gandhi, too, it was what was accomplished that mattered. Thus, when we judge him, we must bear in mind that from the practical viewpoint, great moral achievement need not presuppose a corresponding degree of personal morality.

It Works

Gandhi and his influence can be studied from many points of view. In the following chapters, we shall concentrate on his teaching, in particular on his direct instruction for group conflict. The first question, then, must be, What is most characteristic and highly developed in Gandhi's teaching? Perhaps we are inclined to answer immediately that it was his conviction that the use of violence against living, sensible beings is never morally warranted, that it always infringes valid moral principles. Accordingly, Gandhi's doctrine might be summed up in one commandment: "Thou shalt not use violence." However, such a commandment would be highly misleading. The essential and most important point in Gandhi's doctrine, taken as a whole, is not a principle or a commandment, but the working hypothesis that the nonviolent resolution of group conflict is a practicable goal—despite our own and our opponents' imperfections, nonviolent means are in the long run more effective and reliable than violent ones; and they should be trusted even if they seem unsatisfactory for the moment. He teaches that nonviolence is a practical method that we may, indeed must, adopt immediately and without hesitation in social, political, national, and international conflicts. Here Gandhi is talking to all of us, not mainly to politicians whose power is dependent on the opinions of others.

Understood in this way, the essential and most original aspect of Gandhi's teaching is his descriptive and explanatory account of man and of man's ability to resolve his own conflicts. In the realm of principles and metaphysics, Gandhi shows no remarkable originality.

Any systematic morality must base itself on a number of purely descriptive or causal assumptions, as well as on intuitive, normative notions.

Indeed, it is often precisely the emphasis it puts on one or the other of these two factors that gives a moral view its distinctive stamp; generally the tendency is for systems to lean toward descriptive and causal characteristics rather than intuitive and normative ones. It is therefore not so remarkable that new working hypotheses and methods covering group action can have immense import morally and normatively. Let us see what this general feature of philosophical systems can tell us about Gandhi.

There is nothing very original in condemning violence; and in any case, Gandhi's condemnation of physical violence is considerably less radical and more qualified than that of many other moralists. The doctrine that violence and coercion against one's fellow humans are indications of moral poverty is to be found in the teachings of prophets, philosophers, and wise men as far back as historical records go. In fact, among the generally acknowledged moral leaders from the time of ancient China and India down to the present, the principle of nonviolence has been the rule, and the condoning of violence, even in defense, the exception. In ancient India, not only was vengeance condemned, but the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" was often extended to all animal life. However, alongside this one often finds pessimistically and fatalistically colored theories of human frailty and of man's inability to adhere strictly to such commandments. Evil nature and ignorance have usually been considered to be so deeply ingrained in man that general use of nonviolence in ordinary political and social struggle is thought to be impracticable, or else the principle of nonviolence has been associated with the view that nonviolent methods, even if the individual could and did employ them, would be ineffective in any significant social and political conflict. In our own culture, influential studies of mass psychology have similarly stressed the impulse to mass violence, even if conceding that, individually, men are peaceable enough.[3] All of these theories espousing "it will not work" are clearly anti-Gandhian, for Gandhi's teaching in its essence and originality is the straightforward doctrine that it *will* work and that it can be shown to work. The proof of this for him lay in his own all-important "experiments."

It follows that the focus of our examination of Gandhi's thought must be centered on his view of man and man's possibilities, especially on his faith in the inexhaustible richness of ways of mass action without violence and in the practical possibility of influencing every individual and group

by the example of nonviolent conduct. That this is the correct approach should be clear if we first base our study on, among other things, an examination of the contributions Gandhi made at the time when he was forming his ideas, that is, on a study of his activities in South Africa.

If the originality of Gandhi's teaching lies in his account of what men are constitutionally capable of, what it is in man's power to accomplish, it would nevertheless be misleading to say that his teaching was mainly of a descriptive character; above all, Gandhi stressed man's duties. To UNESCO's inquiry about individual rights, Gandhi replied characteristically that primarily man has no rights, only duties. From the duties, the rights follow like spring follows winter.

Gandhi maintained that the key to his faith in nonviolence lay in his practical experience with men. Since he believed only in the truth of what he was able to test, we are in a position to test his own power of judgment by reviewing and examining as far as possible what his actual experience with men was.

So far, research on Gandhi has neglected to view his activity from this standpoint. Although we cannot attempt any very comprehensive survey here, what we can and will do is to describe briefly some of his experiments.

When the Boer War broke out in 1899, Gandhi, though his "personal sympathies were all with the Boers," felt that if he was to demand rights as a British citizen, it was his duty as such to participate in the defense of the British Empire (Tendulkar 1951, vol. 1: 63). He collected 1,100 comrades to form an ambulance corps. Although opposed initially, Gandhi was eventually able to convince the British to accept their services at the end of 1899. This was done only after great difficulty, however, since the British apparently thought his countrymen unsuited to carrying weapons, unsuited even to carrying stretchers on the battlefield, and hence consigned them to transporting dead and wounded behind the lines. However, Gandhi's men showed unexpected courage and were eventually accorded the "honor" of working in the front line. A few years later, during the so-called Zulu rebellion of 1906, Gandhi himself organized an ambulance corps, which brought him into contact with some Zulus who had been flogged by the British. He and his corps also took care of people who had received burns when the British set fire to villages. Had he chosen to, he could have written an account of his experiences that would have caused

consternation and horror and have increased the bitterness and hatred that already existed. However, instead of inflaming negative feeling, Gandhi did all he could to improve relations between the British and the Zulus. Thus we see him at this early stage, a courageous and influential man, already looking for positive solutions to problems of bloody conflict.

Another instance is worth mentioning. Indians in South Africa had become embittered by a judgment of the Supreme Court in 1913 that the state was henceforth to recognize Christian marriages only. Indian mothers were thus considered unmarried unless married as Christians. As a consequence, political demonstrations by women, something quite exceptional at the time, broke out. Gandhi succeeded, however, in getting the women actively involved in a wider struggle by persuading them to undertake a long march to the mines; the miners were then persuaded to stop work and to join the protest. Indignation grew to a high pitch when the men's wives were thrown into jail with male criminals, but Gandhi did not exploit the negative feelings. He persuaded the miners that whatever they did, they must avoid the use of violence, and he urged them to recognize that they would best attain their ends by other means. The miners, between two and six thousand of them, marched resolutely into the Transvaal, completely avoiding the use of violence — despite repressive measures taken against them by the police and frustrations caused by privation and hunger.

This march strengthened Gandhi's belief in the ability of the common man to grasp the meaning of nonviolence. The marchers were wholly illiterate; far from belonging to any culturally enlightened section of the community, they were, on the contrary, neither peaceable nor meek by disposition, but oppressed men who, seething with anger, had joined together to oppose repression and the discrimination shown against them.

Another case is even more illuminating. When a violent railway strike broke out that caused the government to declare martial law, Gandhi's own campaign had not been progressing very well. Now, suddenly, the government's own position was endangered, and Gandhi held a very good card. Ordinary political strategy would dictate that he play this card, take full advantage of the situation, and enlarge the immediate goals of his campaign. However, all Gandhi did was to enunciate once again his aims, adding that he had said that his goal, as it was then and as it had been, was to bring about the end of racial discrimination. The railway strike could not help

to persuade the opposition of the justice of his goal; quite the contrary, if Gandhi's forces were now to make use of the difficult position of the government to push through their demands, they should have done so without persuading their opponent of the justice of the Indians' cause.[4]

Gandhi broke off his campaign until the strike ended. In the long history of political strife, this event must surely have few parallels. The impression it made was profound. Gandhi's opponents saw that he and his followers literally meant what they said when they claimed, "This and only this is our aim in this struggle." By not exploiting their advantageous position, Gandhi's supporters remained true to his and their own aim, which was future cooperation with those who were then their opponents. He was able to draw his own conclusions from the effect made by such a plea for moderation.

If Gandhi had written a psychology of the masses, it would, no doubt, have been quite different from those that equate mass man with the aggressive coward, for he had seen with his own eyes how the masses are capable of being led to two extremes — on the one hand, to the most horrifying violence, and on the other, to the most inspiring kind of nonviolence. Gandhi invites us all to continue *experimenting* with nonviolence, and to see for ourselves what can be achieved.

Empirical Basis of Nonviolent Extremism

The combination of courage, sacrifice, and devotion to humanity shown by Gandhi does not significantly distinguish him from many thousands, even millions, of forgotten men who, in the course of history, have shown similar moral qualities. "The world knows so little of how much my so-called greatness depends upon the incessant toil and drudgery of silent, devoted, able and pure workers, men as well as women" (*Young India* 26.4.1928: 130). Perhaps the greatest moral heroes of all time have slipped by unknown and unacclaimed, or at least unrecorded. This may be true, but let us remember that Gandhi's experiments are not mentioned to illustrate any exceptional level of morality. Moral evaluations, at least those speaking of courage and so forth, assume insight into another person's motives, and motives are notoriously elusive. We invite the reader to study Gandhi's "experiments with truth" *within group conflicts* and apart from any opinion about their moral

value. As I have already remarked, it is on the field of practical principle and action that our interest in Gandhi's teaching on conflict must mainly focus, not on the moral quality of his individual acts.[5]

It was Gandhi's claim that the greater the efficiency he acquired in the use of nonviolence, the greater the impression nonviolence made on his opponents. This claim he held to be a legacy of his experiences in South Africa. Was he right in this? Did his claim follow, according to inductive principles, as a valid conclusion from what he observed?

The railway strike episode and others of a similar kind did in fact provide Gandhi with an empirical basis for the hypothesis that the more he applied, even to fanatical extremes, the principle of nonviolence, the greater was its effect, and that every increase, no matter how slight, in the purity of the application of the principle meant an increase in the chances of success. Thus we can see what was meant by Gandhi's seemingly extreme claim that if one man were able to achieve an entirely perfect, nonviolent method, all the opposition in the world would vanish. Yet we must be careful to note that Gandhi explicitly stated that we are all more or less imperfect, not least himself, and that therefore we can talk only in terms of degrees of success and not perfection.

Gandhi, then, had a substantial experimental basis for his claim that the consistent, or pure, forms of *satyāgraha* (strictly, "method of holding on to truth") are more effective than the less consistent, or less pure, and that an increase in consistency or purity is especially favorable when a struggle is already well advanced. He had, in other words, an argument for nonviolence over and above the purely moral one, and this argument is strongly empirical and utilitarian. It may not seem so strange, then, that the versions that Gandhi's opponents gave of the political struggle in South Africa agree with his own, for where nonviolence was at once most consistent and effective, no side suffered from the struggle itself or from its outcome.

Gandhi's campaigns were fought in widely different environments. Only in South Africa were the numbers of people on his and on the other side small enough to make it possible for him to lead the campaigns personally. The opposing groups were sometimes rather rough — the extremely violent Pathans being one of the groups he antagonized but eventually turned into cooperating friends. In South Africa and in India, he met the British Empire's colonial police and jailers. Blood flowed freely, but the high ad-

ministration was eager not to use extreme forms of terror. In the conflicts between various religious groupings, terror was extreme; here Gandhi and his helpers showed how nonviolent methods were able to bring huge riots under control. It has been objected that under Hitler, Gandhi's nonviolence would have been of no avail. However, the Jews could scarcely have suffered more than they did, and it is an open question whether active nonviolent resistance would not have reduced the suffering and number of deaths. No leaders were trying out ways of resistance adapted to the special features of the German situation. From an empirical point of view, it is therefore of little value to discuss the consequences of nonviolent struggles in the Fascist and National Socialist areas.

When judging Gandhi's influence by the standards he himself set for empirical adequacy, we must subject it to the same rigorous critical scrutiny that we apply to any piece of social research. We should, however, also note the enormous complexity of Gandhi's experiments compared with ordinary experiments in, say, social psychology. The number of unknown, or insufficiently known quantities is overwhelming — so much so, in fact, that no conclusions can really claim the title of "scientific." Nevertheless, not all worthwhile research need culminate in well-founded scientific conclusions, nor need the unavoidable uncertainty of a conclusion cause us to reject it.

What then is our verdict to be? Judging from the material available to us, I think we may agree with Gandhi that his approach did in fact work and that the positive results of his action can to a large extent be traced to the nonviolence that characterized his campaign. If we look at nonviolence as a *working hypothesis*, the conclusion that nonviolence can be a vital force in resolving conflicts appears to be a valid inference from the experiments in which Gandhi was involved, however few and scattered these operations were.

Moralism and Pragmatism

Gandhi's writings and speeches are full of moral injunctions and exhortations. He was forever moralizing. That this did not depress those around him seems to be due to his humility, cheerful disposition, and profound sense of humor. "If I had no sense of humour, I should long ago have committed suicide" (*Young India* 18.8.1921: 238). Before that he might have been murdered!

When reading the moralizing speeches, one's first impression is that Gandhi is severely curtailing political action: do *not* do this, do *not* do that. The promise to use only nonviolent means might seem tantamount to caring rather little for the aim and subordinating it to moral exercise. However, there is no known case in fifty years of fighting in which Gandhi states that although an aim could be reached more easily or more thoroughly through some measure of violence, one ought to remain nonviolent. He never gave expression to the view that a *satyāgraha*, or any part of a (genuine) *satyāgraha* was less effective than an alternative involving violence. Thus, every conclusion in the form of a moral prescription had a nonnormative equivalent. That is, the conclusion could be reached from premises of a purely instrumental character, lacking any moral ingredients.

If the reader suspects that this is only a sort of argumentational sleight of hand, it may be because he is unaware of the multiplicity of and different kinds of aims that a given political action is intended to help realize. A plan to murder someone or a plan to support a false rumor has an immediate objective of little or no intrinsic importance. It is the widespread indirect effects of such actions that count. If certain effects of an action obviously occur only through violence, Gandhi turns our attention to other effects that can hardly occur except by nonviolence. This example suggests how Gandhi never *needed* to rely on moral principles but could always argue empirically and pragmatically.

"Would you recommend nonviolence even if the world were such that it could not succeed?" This kind of question Gandhi never answered very clearly, it being in his opinion based on a contrary-to-fact hypothesis.

One may say that Gandhi had, or found himself committed to, a definite political ethics. Having said this, however, one must add, first, that the definiteness had limits: if one tries step by step to make the normative formulations more precise, to eliminate borderline cases, and to cover all kinds of hypothetical cases, it soon becomes clear that the implications of Gandhi's actions and speeches do not solve all dilemmas.

Second, one must add that the commitment to a definite political ethics does not imply the abdication of "the gentle inner voice." The ethical system can at most only codify or systematize past ethical decisions. No new decision follows from it. Each new decision, and each repetition of a kind of decision made earlier, must rest on the free reflection and deliberation of the subject. The system may help to make clear the interconnection

of past decisions, and the implications for the present, if one follows the same rules and uses the same hypotheses.

All of this will become clearer when we discuss definite norms and hypotheses in chapter 3. Here it is our aim only to clarify the nature of our approach to describing that part of Gandhi's political ethics that covers behavior in group conflicts.

Taking Gandhi to be a sender of norms, who is the intended receiver? The primary group of receivers were the listeners to his speeches and the readers of *Young India* and *Harijan*. Much was explicitly aimed at the British, and Gandhi often expressed his wish to reach a world audience, calling attention to what was happening in India. The more special norms can only be understood by describing special situations in India and South Africa, but adequate formulation must be such that the claim to universality is apparent. However dependent upon local circumstances, including the level of nonviolent training of the campaigners, Gandhi, like Hume, Kant, and others, conceived ethical norms as having a universal validity. Under certain sets of circumstances, certain kinds of behavior in conflict are timelessly right, others wrong.

For Gandhi, as for others who act in political life, there are questions of strategy and tactics. Some find a contradiction here. However, the timing of a campaign and all the measures and countermeasures must be chosen in harmony with hypotheses concerning causes and effects. Cleverness is necessary. The norms and hypotheses of nonviolence apply to strategy and tactics, but if Gandhi is right in his hypotheses, they never rule out the use of effective means. No effective tactical moves are ruled out. The norms do not introduce any limitations in that respect.

This point, like many others, reminds us of the fundamental function of *factual hypotheses* in Gandhi's ethics. Sometimes an ethics is conceived as a set of norms without any descriptive components. There is, however, no instance of an ethics that is capable of adequate formulations but contains no ordinary declarative sentences.

In what follows, we make extensive use of Gandhi's own explicit reasonings in the description of his ethics. Therefore, his many norms have unavoidably colored our exposition. Nearly all of them could be eliminated in favor of nonnormative statements, for example, "*If* one's intention is to reach a certain goal, then this particular behavior is more effective than that behavior." Although sentences of this and similar kinds often do not con-

form to Gandhi's own way of talking, they can be used to express the bulk of his teaching.

The extensive use of Gandhi's own lucid argumentation does not imply an underestimation of the obscurity and complexity of his imperfectly articulated, or even unconscious, motivations. Erik H. Erikson (1969) has recently delved into this latter realm. His findings confirm that the basic norms and hypotheses of Gandhi had deep psychological roots in his character.