Gandhi as Lawyer - From Barrister to Advocate of Truth and Justice
Dr. Christian Bartolf

Ladies and gentlemen,

When we hear the name Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, we usually think of the Indian independence movement, nonviolence, the Salt March, and the struggle against British colonial rule. We picture the familiar figure in a simple white garment, walking with a staff, leading thousands of people in peaceful resistance.

But today I would like us to look at Gandhi from a different perspective.

Before he became Mahatma Gandhi, before he became a political leader, and before he became an internationally recognised symbol of nonviolence, he was a lawyer.

He was a trained barrister who studied in London, attempted to establish a legal practice in India, and eventually developed a substantial professional career in South Africa.

His legal career raises a fascinating question: **How did a young man who initially struggled to speak confidently in court become one of the most influential challengers of political and legal authority in modern history?**

The answer is not simply that Gandhi became more confident. His transformation involved a fundamental change in his understanding of law itself.

He began by learning how to practise law within an established legal system. He gradually came to understand that the law could protect people, but it could also be used to discriminate against them. He learned that a legal victory was not always the same as justice, that a settlement could sometimes be better than a prolonged dispute, and that professional success could not be separated entirely from moral responsibility.

Eventually, he developed a method of resistance that challenged unjust laws while rejecting violence. This method became known as *satyagraha*.

To understand Gandhi's contribution, therefore, we must first understand the lawyer he was before he became the political leader the world remembers.

Our lecture will examine five principal questions:

1. Where did Gandhi study law, and what kind of lawyer was he?
2. What did he learn from his early failures in India?
3. How did his legal practice in South Africa change his understanding of justice?
4. How did his professional ethics contribute to his philosophy of truth and nonviolent resistance?
5. What can modern lawyers learn from his career, including its limitations and contradictions?

Let us begin at the beginning.

Part I: The Making of a Barrister

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi was born on 2 October 1869 in Porbandar, in present-day Gujarat, India.

He grew up in a society shaped by Indian religious traditions and British colonial power. His father held administrative positions in princely states, and the family valued education and professional respectability.

For a young Indian man of Gandhi's background, a legal career offered an opportunity for advancement. British institutions exercised considerable influence over public administration, commerce and the courts. A British legal qualification could provide professional standing and open doors that might otherwise remain closed.

In 1888, at the age of eighteen, Gandhi travelled to England to study for the Bar.

He enrolled at the Honourable Society of the Inner Temple in London, one of the four historic Inns of Court responsible for qualifying barristers in England and Wales.

We should make an important distinction here. Gandhi did not attend a modern university law school in the way a student might today. The Inner Temple was a professional institution for barristers, and his training followed the professional system of the period.

He completed the requirements for qualification and was called to the Bar on 10 June 1891.

He was now a qualified barrister. But what does that mean?

A barrister is traditionally a lawyer trained in legal argument and courtroom advocacy, although the precise division of responsibilities between barristers and other lawyers varies across legal systems.

Gandhi had acquired a recognised professional qualification. Yet qualification and competence are not the same thing.

A person can understand legal principles in theory and still struggle to apply them under pressure. A lawyer must be able to examine witnesses, organise evidence, understand procedure, advise clients and present arguments persuasively.

Gandhi would soon discover this distinction.

His years in England also exposed him to different religious, philosophical and ethical ideas. He developed a stronger interest in questions of personal discipline, religion and moral conduct.

We should not imagine, however, that the complete philosophy of the future Mahatma emerged during his student years. His beliefs evolved over decades. The experiences that would most profoundly shape his understanding of justice still lay ahead.

In 1891, Gandhi returned to India, expecting to establish himself as a practising barrister. His professional life was about to begin.

Part II: The Young Lawyer Who Struggled in Court

Gandhi's early legal career in India was not an immediate success.

He attempted to establish a practice in Bombay, now Mumbai, where the High Court offered opportunities for professional advancement. But he lacked confidence in courtroom advocacy.

He found cross-examination difficult and felt nervous speaking before judges. In one of his early cases, he became so uncomfortable that he struggled to continue and withdrew from the proceeding.

Think about that for a moment.

The man who would later address enormous crowds, confront colonial authorities and lead mass political campaigns began his career as a lawyer who could barely manage some courtroom situations.

This is an important part of Gandhi's story because it reminds us that historical greatness does not necessarily begin with professional mastery.

Gandhi had studied law in London, but he had not yet developed the practical confidence required to build a successful practice.

He returned to Gujarat and attempted to work in Rajkot, where he undertook legal drafting and prepared petitions.

His prospects remained limited.

There is a lesson here for anyone entering a profession. Education supplies knowledge, but practice develops judgment. A professional qualification may establish that someone has completed a course of training; it does not guarantee immediate success.

Gandhi's difficulties also demonstrate the importance of understanding the actual needs of clients. Legal practice is not an abstract intellectual exercise. It involves people, money, relationships, uncertainty and consequences.

A lawyer must learn to translate knowledge into practical assistance.

For Gandhi, this learning process would take place not primarily in India, but in South Africa.

In 1893, he accepted an assignment connected with a commercial dispute involving an Indian merchant, Dada Abdulla.

He travelled to South Africa expecting a temporary professional engagement.

That journey would change the direction of his life.

Part III: South Africa and the Development of a Lawyer

Gandhi arrived in South Africa in 1893.

At the time, South Africa was governed through colonial institutions and racial hierarchies. Indians occupied different social and economic positions. Some were indentured labourers or former indentured workers; others were merchants, traders and professionals.

Many faced restrictions and discriminatory treatment.

Gandhi's initial assignment concerned a commercial dispute involving business accounts and financial obligations.

This was practical legal work. He had to understand the transactions, examine documents, communicate with the parties and assist in resolving a complicated disagreement.

The experience taught him something that would become central to his professional philosophy: a lawyer's task is not necessarily to prolong a dispute until one side defeats the other.

Sometimes the parties need a workable settlement more than they need a courtroom victory.

A judgment may determine who is legally entitled to money. But it may also leave both parties with substantial costs, damaged relationships and continuing resentment.

Negotiation, by contrast, may help the parties find an arrangement that addresses their real needs.

Gandhi became increasingly interested in this possibility.

He developed a view of the lawyer as someone who could help reconcile conflicting interests rather than merely intensify conflict.

This did not mean that he believed every dispute could be settled amicably. Nor did it mean that courts were unnecessary. It meant that a responsible lawyer should consider whether litigation was genuinely the best way to resolve the problem.

As Gandhi's practice developed in South Africa, he handled civil and commercial matters, represented Indian clients and dealt with legal questions affecting their businesses and lives.

His work included commercial disagreements, debt-related matters and dealings with government authorities.

He gained experience, confidence and professional standing.

But another development was taking place.

Gandhi was beginning to recognise that some of his clients' problems could not be understood solely as individual legal disputes.

Their difficulties were connected to broader systems of discrimination.

A merchant might encounter restrictions because of the colour of his skin. An individual might face administrative obstacles because of his ethnic background. A person might possess money, property and commercial experience yet still be denied treatment comparable to that received by white residents.

The problem was no longer simply whether one client had a valid claim against another.

The problem was the legal and political system itself.

And this brings us to one of the most important themes of the lecture.

Can a legal system be orderly and still be unjust?

Part IV: When the Law Itself Becomes the Problem

Gandhi had been trained in the British legal tradition. He understood the importance of courts, procedure and legal rules.

Yet South Africa exposed him to a contradiction.

Colonial institutions presented themselves as systems of lawful government, but discriminatory legislation and administrative practices restricted the rights of Indians.

The existence of courts did not guarantee equality. The existence of statutes did not guarantee justice.

This experience gradually changed Gandhi's understanding of the legal profession.

At first, he sought remedies through conventional means. He prepared petitions, made representations to authorities and worked with members of the Indian community to challenge discriminatory policies.

In 1894, he helped establish the Natal Indian Congress, which organised political advocacy on behalf of Indian interests.

His legal training was valuable in this work.

He knew how to formulate an argument, identify the relevant rule, organise supporting facts and direct a petition to the authority responsible for a decision.

He also understood the difference between an individual complaint and a structural problem.

If one person was treated unfairly, a legal remedy might address that particular case. But if an entire community was subject to discriminatory regulations, individual litigation alone might never resolve the underlying injustice.

The community needed to organise, document its experiences and demand changes in public policy.

Gandhi therefore began moving from private legal practice towards collective advocacy.

The transition was significant.

A conventional lawyer acts for clients within a legal framework. A public advocate may have to question the framework itself.

Gandhi increasingly found himself doing both.

He used the law where it offered protection, but he also challenged laws that he believed were unjust.

We should be careful not to portray this development as instantaneous. Gandhi initially sought fair treatment within the British imperial system. His later methods developed through years of experience, political struggle and reflection.

Nevertheless, South Africa taught him that legal validity and moral legitimacy are not identical.

A law may have been enacted through an authorised procedure and still produce unjust results.

That distinction would become central to his later political philosophy.

Part V: Gandhi's Professional Ethics — Truth Before Victory

Let us now turn to a question particularly important for lawyers.

What did Gandhi believe about the lawyer's duty to tell the truth?

Gandhi's writings describe several occasions when he refused to advance a claim that he believed was dishonest or to pretend that he possessed knowledge he lacked.

In one account, a client's testimony revealed that the claim being pursued rested on falsehood. Gandhi concluded that the case could not honestly be maintained and sought its dismissal.

In another incident, he acknowledged that he lacked sufficient knowledge of a particular aspect of the law rather than pretending to be an expert.

He also described advising a client to acknowledge wrongdoing in a customs matter rather than conceal the facts.

These stories illustrate Gandhi's belief that professional competence must be accompanied by moral responsibility.

For him, the lawyer was not simply an instrument hired to secure victory.

The lawyer had a responsibility to the integrity of the legal process.

This raises an important question: What is the purpose of advocacy?

One answer is that the lawyer must represent the client's legitimate interests vigorously within the rules of the profession.

Another answer, associated with Gandhi's ethical outlook, is that professional representation must never become a justification for dishonesty.

These two principles are not necessarily in conflict.

A lawyer can challenge the prosecution, test the evidence, protect a client's rights and insist on proper procedure without presenting evidence known to be false.

But there is a distinction we must preserve.

Modern legal ethics does not require a defence lawyer to force a client to confess or to disclose every confidential fact. The presumption of innocence and the right to silence are important safeguards against arbitrary state power.

A lawyer may be required to challenge a case even when the client is accused of serious wrongdoing.

Gandhi's personal approach should therefore not be treated as a complete modern code of legal ethics.

Its enduring contribution is more fundamental.

It asks lawyers to consider whether their professional conduct is consistent with the principles they claim to serve.

Are they advancing a legitimate claim or knowingly misleading a court?

Are they protecting a client's rights or exploiting the process dishonestly?

Are they using their knowledge to resolve a problem or merely to prolong it?

Gandhi believed that truthfulness could strengthen a lawyer's credibility. A reputation for honesty could become a professional asset because clients, colleagues and judges would have reason to take that lawyer's representations seriously.

But he also regarded truth as a moral obligation, even when dishonesty might have produced a more convenient result.

For Gandhi, the ethical question was not simply, "Can I win this case?"

It was, "Can I pursue this case without betraying the truth?"

Part VI: Negotiation and the Art of Settlement

Another important aspect of Gandhi's legal philosophy was his preference for negotiation where a fair settlement was possible.

Modern legal systems devote considerable resources to litigation. Lawyers prepare arguments, gather evidence, file documents and appear before judges. These processes are essential for enforcing rights and resolving disputes authoritatively.

But litigation has costs.

It can be expensive. It can take years. It can damage commercial relationships. And it can leave the parties more hostile than they were at the beginning.

Gandhi believed lawyers should not assume that a courtroom battle was always the best solution.

His experience with the Dada Abdulla commercial dispute helped him appreciate the value of examining the parties' underlying interests.

The legal question might concern the payment of money. The practical question might be how to resolve the debt without destroying both businesses.

A settlement could sometimes serve justice more effectively than a judgment followed by years of further conflict.

This approach anticipated concerns that are now familiar in mediation and alternative dispute resolution.

A good mediator does not simply ask which party can defeat the other. The mediator tries to understand the interests behind the competing positions and determine whether an acceptable agreement is possible.

Gandhi's approach similarly emphasised listening, compromise and the search for common ground.

But compromise has limits.

If one party is much more powerful than the other, a settlement may simply reproduce the existing inequality. A vulnerable person might accept an unfair agreement because they cannot afford litigation.

Nor should fundamental rights always be traded away in the name of harmony.

The lesson is not that settlement is always better than court proceedings.

The lesson is that lawyers should consider the purpose of the remedy they seek.

A legal victory is a means, not necessarily an end.

The responsible lawyer asks: What outcome will actually resolve this problem? Will it protect the client's rights? Is it fair? Will it endure?

Gandhi's approach encourages lawyers to see dispute resolution as a human activity rather than merely a contest of technical skill.

Part VII: From Lawyer to Satyagrahi

We now reach the point at which Gandhi's legal career connects directly with his most influential political idea.

The word is *satyagraha*.

It is commonly translated as "truth-force" or "holding firmly to truth."

Satyagraha developed through Gandhi's experiences in South Africa and became central to his later campaigns in India.

It was not simply passive resistance.

It was a disciplined form of nonviolent action intended to challenge injustice without resorting to physical violence.

Participants might refuse to cooperate with an unjust law, organise demonstrations, undertake public acts of civil disobedience or accept punishment rather than abandon their principles.

Several aspects of Gandhi's legal experience contributed to this method.

His commitment to truth encouraged him to reject deception.

His experience of negotiation encouraged him to seek reconciliation rather than the destruction of an opponent.

His encounters with discriminatory legislation convinced him that formal legality did not necessarily settle the question of justice.

Satyagraha brought these ideas together.

Consider the difference between two approaches to an unjust law.

The first approach says: "This law is unjust, so I will evade it secretly and avoid the consequences."

The second says: "This law is unjust. I will oppose it openly, explain why I believe it is wrong, act without violence and accept the legal consequences of my conduct."

The second approach was closer to Gandhi's conception of civil disobedience.

He believed that openly accepting punishment could demonstrate sincerity and reveal the moral contradiction involved in punishing peaceful resistance.

But there was another important principle.

The person practising satyagraha should resist the injustice without treating the opponent as someone who must be destroyed.

The objective was to change the relationship and expose the wrong, leaving open the possibility of reconciliation.

This approach differed from conventional litigation.

In court, parties present competing arguments before an institution authorised to determine the dispute. In satyagraha, the campaigners also appeal to public conscience and the moral judgment of society.

The action itself becomes part of the argument.

The refusal to cooperate with injustice communicates a claim about what is right, while the willingness to suffer consequences demonstrates the seriousness of that claim.

Gandhi's legal background helped him understand the authority of law and the consequences of disobedience. He knew that deliberately breaking a law was not the same as winning a case through ordinary legal procedures.

His method emerged partly because conventional remedies could fail when the legal system itself supported the injustice being challenged.

Satyagraha offered a way to resist without abandoning the pursuit of truth.

Part VIII: The Lawyer Who Criticised Lawyers

Here we encounter one of the most interesting tensions in Gandhi's life.

He had trained as a lawyer. He had practised law. He had earned his living from legal work.

Yet he later criticised lawyers, courts and aspects of the modern legal system.

In *Hind Swaraj*, published in 1909, Gandhi questioned whether modern professional institutions necessarily promoted genuine social progress.

He argued that adversarial legal systems could intensify disagreements, encourage dependence on professional intermediaries and sometimes reward the continuation of disputes.

His criticism reflected a concern that the legal profession might become more interested in its own status and income than in resolving the problems of the people it served.

He also questioned the assumption that a society became more just simply by establishing more courts, employing more lawyers or passing more legislation.

A country might possess sophisticated legal institutions while remaining deeply unequal.

But does this mean Gandhi believed courts were useless?

That would be too simple an interpretation.

His own career demonstrates the practical value of legal knowledge. He used petitions, legal arguments and established procedures to challenge discriminatory practices.

His criticism was directed more fundamentally at the belief that legal institutions alone could guarantee justice.

The distinction matters.

Courts are essential when rights need to be enforced, when powerful parties refuse to negotiate, and when people require protection against arbitrary government action.

Professional legal assistance can be indispensable to those who would otherwise be unable to navigate complex rules.

At the same time, legal institutions can become detached from the social problems they are intended to address.

Gandhi's criticism asks us to consider whether a system is serving the people or simply reproducing its own procedures.

The lawyer should not assume that every conflict must become litigation. The citizen should not assume that every injustice will disappear merely because a statute exists.

Justice requires institutions, but it also requires ethical judgment, public participation and the willingness to reform institutions when they fail.

The apparent contradiction between Gandhi the lawyer and Gandhi the critic of law is therefore part of his intellectual development.

He learned to work within the system, observed its limitations and developed methods of resistance when conventional legal remedies proved insufficient.

Part IX: The Return to India — Legal Skills in the Service of Social Reform

Gandhi returned permanently to India in 1915.

By then, he was no longer merely a barrister seeking a successful practice. He had become an experienced organiser, public advocate and critic of colonial rule.

His subsequent work focused increasingly on social reform and political change.

Yet the skills developed through his legal career remained important.

In 1917, Gandhi became involved in the Champaran campaign in Bihar, where peasants faced coercive agricultural arrangements associated with indigo cultivation.

He investigated their complaints, listened to their accounts and helped bring their grievances before the authorities.

This was not simply a conventional courtroom case.

It was an effort to establish the facts of a social problem and use that evidence to secure reform.

The method nevertheless had clear similarities to legal work.

First, Gandhi gathered information.

Second, he sought to understand the circumstances of those affected.

Third, he formulated a claim that could be presented to the authorities.

Fourth, he used organised pressure and negotiation to pursue a remedy.

His approach demonstrated that legal training could be applied to public problems beyond the courtroom.

The same broad pattern appeared in later campaigns, including the Salt March of 1930.

The colonial salt laws restricted the production and sale of salt, a basic necessity. Gandhi's march to the coast and his symbolic act of making salt transformed a legal restriction into a major political issue.

The campaign was not a lawsuit. It was a public challenge to the legitimacy of colonial rule.

Nevertheless, Gandhi's understanding of law shaped its form. The campaign identified a specific legal restriction, explained why it was objectionable and organised a visible act of civil disobedience.

It also demonstrated that a seemingly technical rule could become a powerful symbol of a much wider political relationship.

The lawyer had become a leader of mass resistance.

But the habits of legal analysis, argument and negotiation remained part of his method.

Part X: The Limitations of Gandhi's Approach

It would be a mistake to conclude that Gandhi's legal philosophy provides a perfect answer to every question of professional ethics or political justice.

A serious historical lecture must examine the limitations of his approach as well as its achievements.

First, Gandhi's emphasis on truth and confession raises difficult questions about client autonomy and legal rights.

A modern lawyer must not mislead a court, but neither should the lawyer assume that every client has a duty to confess. The right to silence and the presumption of innocence are fundamental safeguards.

Second, Gandhi's preference for settlement requires qualification. Compromise can be constructive, but it can also preserve an unjust distribution of power. Courts and enforceable legal remedies are sometimes necessary precisely because negotiation has failed.

Third, Gandhi's early practice primarily served commercial clients who could afford legal representation. His later concern for disadvantaged communities developed over time. His career should not be portrayed as though he began as a fully formed advocate for every marginalised group.

Fourth, his critique of professional institutions does not remove the need for those institutions. Independent courts, reliable procedures and qualified lawyers remain essential to the protection of rights.

Finally, Gandhi himself was a historical figure whose positions evolved and whose record contains contradictions. His attitudes on questions of caste and race, among other issues, have been subjected to substantial criticism. His commitment to justice in one context does not exempt his conduct or beliefs in another from scrutiny.

Acknowledging these limitations does not diminish the value of studying him.

Quite the opposite.

It allows us to learn from Gandhi without treating him as infallible.

His importance lies in the questions he raised and the methods he developed, not in the assumption that every action he took was correct.

Part XI: What Can Modern Lawyers Learn from Gandhi?

Let us now bring the lecture into the present.

What can a lawyer working today learn from Gandhi?

I would suggest six lessons.

First: Technical competence must be accompanied by integrity.

A lawyer needs knowledge, preparation and practical skill. But professional competence loses its value when it is used to mislead a court or manipulate a client's circumstances dishonestly.

Second: Winning is not always the same as resolving.

A judgment may be necessary, but a fair settlement can sometimes address the underlying problem more effectively. Lawyers should consider the consequences of the remedy they pursue.

Third: Law and justice are related, but they are not identical.

The law provides essential standards and procedures. Yet legal rules can produce unjust outcomes, and legal institutions may require reform. Responsible practitioners must be able to recognise this distinction.

Fourth: Professional responsibility extends beyond personal advancement.

Gandhi eventually devoted his abilities to public service. Modern lawyers can do the same through legal aid, human rights work, public-interest litigation, education and community service.

Fifth: Ethical disagreement does not require personal hostility.

Gandhi's approach to nonviolent resistance attempted to distinguish opposing an unjust policy from treating its supporters as enemies who must be destroyed. In professional and political disputes, firm disagreement can coexist with respect for human dignity.

Sixth: The means matter as much as the ends.

A person who claims to pursue justice must consider whether their methods are consistent with that objective. Gandhi's insistence on truth and nonviolence reminds us that the manner in which a goal is pursued is itself morally significant.

These lessons should not be applied mechanically. Modern legal practice involves professional duties and institutional safeguards that must be respected.

But Gandhi's career encourages us to look beyond the narrow question of whether a lawyer has complied with technical requirements.

It asks us to consider what kind of professional the lawyer is becoming, what the legal system is achieving and whom the system serves.

Conclusion

Ladies and gentlemen,

Let us return to the question with which we began.

How did a young barrister who struggled to speak in court become a leader who challenged an empire?

His development cannot be explained by legal training alone. It involved personal discipline, political circumstances, religious and philosophical reflection, practical experience and the support of communities willing to participate in collective action.

But his legal career was an essential part of that development.

In India, Gandhi learned that a qualification did not guarantee professional success.
In South Africa, he learned how to practise law, understand commercial disputes and negotiate settlements.

Through his encounters with racial discrimination, he came to understand that legal institutions could protect rights while also sustaining injustice.

Through his professional experience, he developed a strong commitment to truthfulness and began to question the assumption that victory was the sole purpose of advocacy.

And when conventional legal remedies proved insufficient, he helped develop satyagraha: a method of challenging injustice through disciplined, nonviolent resistance.

The lawyer did not simply disappear when the political leader emerged.

The lawyer's habits of investigation, argument, negotiation and attention to procedure continued to influence Gandhi's work.

His life also reminds us that professional knowledge can be used for purposes much larger than private advancement. A lawyer may begin by representing an individual client and eventually find that the underlying problem requires institutional or social change.

Gandhi's career does not teach us to abandon courts or reject the law. It teaches us to recognise both the importance and the limitations of legal institutions.

The law needs skilled practitioners. It also needs practitioners who understand that technical legality is not always the final measure of justice.

A lawyer must know the rules but must also ask what those rules are achieving. A lawyer must represent clients but must also respect the integrity of the process. A lawyer may seek victory but should not forget that the ultimate purpose of legal work is to address human problems fairly.

Perhaps this is the most important lesson Gandhi leaves us.

The true measure of a lawyer is not only the ability to argue a case successfully, but also the judgment to understand what justice requires.

Thank you.

1. Should a lawyer's primary duty be to the client, the court, the truth or justice? How should these duties be balanced when they conflict?
2. Is Gandhi's preference for negotiation a strength of his legal philosophy, or can compromise sometimes preserve injustice?
3. Can a law be legally valid but morally unjust? What responsibilities does a lawyer have when confronted with such a law?
4. Was Gandhi's development of satyagraha a rejection of law, or an attempt to pursue justice when ordinary legal remedies were insufficient?
5. What aspects of Gandhi's legal ethics remain relevant to modern practice, and which require qualification?
6. How should we evaluate Gandhi's legacy while acknowledging contradictions in his historical record?

- Gandhi, M. K., *An Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments with Truth*.
- Gandhi, M. K., *Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule* (1909).
- DiSalvo, Charles R., *M.K. Gandhi, Attorney at Law: The Man before the Mahatma* (2013).

If the law and justice conflict, what should a lawyer do?

This connects Gandhi's professional life to the ethical responsibilities of lawyers today.