ESSAYS

Aleksandar Gajič*
Institute of European Studies, Belgrade

Ljubiša Despotović**
Institute for Political Studies, Belgrade

GANDHI'S "SATYAGRAHA" AND EUROPEAN POSTMODERN REVOLUTIONS***

Abstract

This paper starts with the comparison between Indian and European civilizations as the "ideal type" personifications of East and West and then turns its attention to their views toward the civil resistance manifestations in cases of illegitimate or unjust rule. By giving a brief review of the birth of the "Indian Independence Movement" with Gandhi's place in it, the paper observes the formation of Gandhi's concept of "Satyagraha" ("Insistence on Truth"). "Satyagraha" was not just a form of non-violent civil resistance as it is known in the West, but moreover, its contrast and overcoming by turning (with some modifications) to Indian religious tradition. By observing "Satyagraha" primarily as an ascetic-religious achievement that leads from "inner-self" toward a social

*   E-mail: romero@eunet.rs; ORCID: 0000-0002-3873-0231

**   E-mail: despotlj@stcable.net; ORCID: 0000-0002-0473-2829

change, this work studies its connection with two other India's traditional praxis – *brahmacharya* and *ahimsa*. In the second part of the paper, the phenomenon of "Color Revolution" as a type of non-violent revolution in East Europe is elaborately observed: all of its major forms, strategic and tactical characteristics, and phases of realizations are carefully cognized. Then, in the final part of the paper, Gandhi's "Satyagraha" and "Color Revolutions" (based on the theoretical and practical recommendations of Gene Sharp) are compared. This comparison gives us a clear contrast between these two forms of civil resistance: the first one that turns to tradition intertwined with spirituality and which leads towards the liberation from colonial submission, and the second one that is profane, anti-spiritual, and inevitably leads to neo-colonial enslavement.

From a European perspective, EU-India relations (or Europe-India relations) are not observed just as relations between the two equal political subjects that grew from different cultural and civilization backgrounds. Besides common Indo-European ancestors who settled two big sub-continents in the Old World a few thousand years ago and their languages that belonged to the same linguistic group, Europe and India are more often seen as opposites rather than diversities. They are considered to be typical representatives of the West and East. Even today, this view contains many typical qualities of "Orientalism" (Said 2008) that imagines, emphasizes, and distorts differences between peoples and cultures of Asia on one side and Europe and America on the other, ascribing inferiority to the former and superiority to the latter. East and West are not only geographic determinants: for some – they are "contrast pictures, ideas, persons and experiences" (Said 2008, 10); for others – they are the personifications of two completely different developing ways of peoples and their societies. West is rational, East is irrational; West is organized, East is chaotic; West is developed, East is stuck in the mud; West is turned toward individual, East is turned toward collective. As Denis de Rougemont wrote in the 20th century: "In the East, India codifies *castes,* adding one more (shudra) and multiplies sub-castes, immortalizing this system for the whole three millennia's, despite the all the efforts of religious reformers, Buddha, Islam, but not the Englishmen [...] In the West, on the contrary, the rise of Europe coincides with the successes of

the permanent struggle against the estates. Hellenic democracy, expansion of the Christian morality, Renaissance and French Revolution mark the stages of the dissolution of tripartite social structure inherited from an Aryan ancestor." (De Rougemont 1983, 25).

Another Francophone thinker, metaphysician, and traditionalist, René Guénon, however, turned his attention towards the core of differentiation between East and West. According to him (Guénon 2001, 51–54), the essence of this difference is that the West has completely abandoned the traditional, religious, and spiritual starting point of its civilization and directed itself toward materialistic, quantitative horizontals of life. On the contrary, Eastern civilizations have remained pre-modern, related – to a lesser or greater degree – to their religious and ethical vertical. Guénon describes this essential difference in the following way: "The differences between East and West seem to have been continually on the increase, but this divergence can be sad to have been one-sided, in the sense that it is only the West which has changed, whereas the East, broadly speaking, has remained much the same as it was in times which we are accustomed to call ancient, but which nevertheless are comparatively recent. Stability – one might even say immutability – is a quality that is quite commonly conceded to the Oriental civilizations, notably to the Chinese, but it is perhaps not quite so easy to agree on the assessment of this quality. Europeans […] since little more than a century ago profess to see a sign of inferiority in this absence of change, whereas, for our part, we look upon it as a balanced condition that Western civilization has failed to achieve. […] In short, Occidentals, and especially modern Occidentals, appear to be endowed with changeable and inconstant natures, hankering after movement and excitement, whereas Oriental nature shows quite the opposite characteristics. Therefore, if one wished to represent diagrammatically the divergence we are discussing, it would be wrong to draw two lines moving in contrary directions away from an axis. The East would have been shown as the axis itself and the West as a line starting from the axis and moving further and further away from it, after the fashion of a branch growing out of a trunk, as mentioned before." (Guénon 1945, 32–33).

Despite centuries of old colonial experience, partial cultural westernization of the East and its postcolonial development after WWII Eastern societies (seen from the Western perspective) are still being seen as generally collectivistic, more or less authoritarian and un-democratic (or, at least, insufficiently democratic) or underdeveloped. On the other

hand, Western societies are being represented as their reference point and the final goal – an ideal that must be unconditionally imitated and reached.

Moreover, some of the experiences of non-Western societies from the times of their struggle against colonialism are being appropriated in contemporary Western sociology, political science, and postcolonial theory and used for the explanation of social and political phenomena and processes. This alleged legitimization and adaptation "from the Eastern to the Western experience" – should not rejoice members of non-Western cultures because it is usually just a consequence of manipulation that is aiming for another abuse. There is probably no better example than a Western theoretical rethinking of Gandhi's *Satyagraha* – India's anti-colonial civil resistance and its inclusion into the corpus of Western types of civil disobedience, with the clear intention to use some of its methods for the theoretical propagation and practical implementation of the series of so-called "Color Revolutions" or postmodern *coup d'etat*'s.

GANDHI AND INDIAN INDEPENDENCE MOVEMENT

Gandhi was not the founder or the first leader of the Indian Independence Movement: its foundation goes back to Indian history, in times when the Indian subcontinent first fell under the rule of the East Indian Company (1757/1858) and later – the British Empire (1858–1947). With the national awakening of India's population in the last decades of the 19th century, the Indian Independence Movement went through different developing phases. At the beginning of the 20th century, it was transformed into the Indian National Congress (Griffiths 1952, 295–296). Congress, led by moderate leaders, at first stood only for the improvement of conditions of Indian subjects of the Raj (rule by the British Crown in the *Indian* subcontinent). Only later, with the emergence of new, more radical Indian leaders, did the Indian National Congress turn toward the advocacy of full political autonomy. Gandhi just gave new directions to this massive national movement and supplied it with new methods of political action.

Mohandas Karamchand *Gandhi* (1869–1948) built his reputation as a non-violent resistance leader in South Africa, where he was working as an attorney. Confronted with discrimination, forced labor, and police repression of the Indian Diaspora in South Africa, Gandhi organized a series of non-violent protests against British colonial rule: boycotts,

protest marches, hunger strikes, etc. During this successful South African campaign (1906–1914), Gandhi gradually shaped his concept of *Satyagraha*.

Gandhi returned to India in January 1915 when the Indian National Congress still wasn't advocating the creation of an independent national state but only a common market in the Indian subcontinent. Under the patronage of Gopal Krishna Gokhale, an Indian political veteran, Gandhi joined the Indian National Movement. "First non/cooperative movement" led by Gandhi in 1920–1922 was very successful.[1] Boycott of British textile products and advocacy of domestic material (which implied renewal of the Indian textile industry), a boycott of the colonial educational and judicial system, and refusal to pay taxes – brought complete paralysis to the British colonial administration. Movement led by Gandhi gained strong popular support all over India. "Thousands went to prison willingly and stayed there to inconvenience of the government. Many more attended meetings, participated in processions and myriad other types of symbolic and practical resistance available on the Satyagraha menu. Even beyond those who were activists in some sense, there were probably millions of sympathetic bystanders." (Brown 2009, 54). The movement was recalled by Gandhi in 1922 because of the so-called "Chauri Chaura" incident. Gandhi was sentenced to six years of imprisonment (served only two years) because of the incident. After he was released from prison, Gandhi founded a newspaper, "Young India," which was brimming with reform proposals in favor of the rural population and lower classes of India's society (Tidrick 2006, 176–180).

New non-violent campaigns against colonial rule followed at the beginning of the 1930s when the Indian National Congress adopted its new political goal – the complete removal of British rule in India and the achievement of independence (*Purna Swaraj* – "complete self-rule"). These campaigns took place in 1930–1934, 1940–1941, and 1942, during the time when the conflict between the Congress and colonial authorities was at its peak. The last campaign, named "Leave India" – that was carried out in specific circumstances at the height of the Second World War – was the most successful one. The British were forced to accept the new reality and to guarantee ("sir Stafford Cripps Mission") that India would gain its full independence once the war was over. Two

---

[1]   About relations between the Indian National Movement and Gandhi, see Singh 2009.

years after the war, British rule in India was over, and its full authority was transferred to the Indian National Congress.[2]

Gandhi's non-violent resistance movement was, to a large extent, conditioned by the specificities of India under British rule. Therefore, Gandhi was directing it and giving it specific goals. He correctly noticed that British rule largely depended on Indian collaboration and conciliation with the status quo. Gandhi was hoping that he would be able to educate the Indian population to recognize the weaknesses of colonial rule and to find enough courage and moral strength to withdraw its cooperation with the British and start building a new society based on its own culture and tradition. Because of that, Gandhi's final political goal – "Swaraj," was more than just an achievement of political independence: it was a call for moral transformation.

Gandhi was convinced that non-violent resistance was not just strengthening the position of his compatriots but that it also helped to achieve clear moral superiority over the British while at the same time undermining their authority in the eyes of both themselves and the entire international public. He had also concentrated all the awakened resistance energies toward agendas that could unite as many Indians as possible and avoid the possibility of turning them into violent acts. According to Brown: "Perhaps the greatest example of this was his choice in 1930 of the government salt monopoly as a universal issue and symbol of protest. He insisted that the movement should progress in controlled stages— from the protest by himself and hand-picked individuals in his famous Salt March to the coast at Dandi, western India, where he made salt on the seashore in the full glare of international press publicity—to a more generalized ritual of making salt illegally in small quantities around the country. Motilal Nehru, father of Jawaharlal, commented with awe that the 'mastermind' had hit on such a simple but effective issue. 'The only wonder is that no one else ever thought of it.'" (Brown 2009, 51).

CHARACTERISTICS OF GANDHI'S *SATYAGRAHA*

The concept of *Satyagraha* was always much more than non-violent civil disobedience. Its content, expression, and goal show that Gandhi's *Satyagraha* was conceived as a contrast and an overcoming of the Western concept of "civil resistance." Some elements of Western

---

[2]   For a more detailed insight into the final days of the history of the Indian struggle for independence, see: Markovits 2002, 367–386.

civil resistance surely influenced Gandhi (especially the teachings of Leo Tolstoy and Henry Thoreau), which he linked with the teachings of Ram Singh (the famous leader of the Kuka movement in Punjab in 1872) and turned to the Indian cultural and spiritual tradition (Parekh 2001, 43).

The very concept of *Satyagraha* (Sanskrit: सत्याग्रह satyāgraha) could be freely translated as "insistence in truth" or "holding onto truth" or "truth force." It differs from "passive resistance" (which was considered the weapon of the weak and the strategy of the powerless against the powerful) because *Satyagraha* turns toward the search for Truth as a spiritual substance of both inner, contemplative, and outer, active part of Being (Majmudar 2005, 138). Passive resistance in Western civilization knows nothing of this inner search for the substance of Being and its relations with outer social activities. Gandhi emphasizes three essential characteristics of *Satyagraha*: "*Satyagraha* is a weapon of the strong; it admits of no violence under any circumstance whatsoever; and it ever insists upon truth. I think I have now made the distinction perfectly clear." (Gandhi 1920). Gandhi embraced the metaphysical and moral ideal of Truth as the Ultimate reality and the basis of moral duty. According to Howard: "It is derived from the root '*sat*,' which means to exist eternally. That which exists eternally is *Satya*, Truth, it can be nothing else." (Howard 2013, 50). Gandhi took this concept from the Indian tradition and extended it to social and political realms, creating the core of his political vision – an ingenious combination of wisdom, morale, and politics. Gandhi, therefore, conceived *Satyagraha* primarily as an ascetic-religious accomplishment directed toward an external social change. Defined and inspired by the Indian spiritual tradition, Gandhi's *Satyagraha* was also associated with two other Indian traditional practices: *brahmacharya* and *ahimsa* (Howard 2013, 81-122).

Gandhi sought *ahimsa* as the other face of Truth. He believed that the perfect vision of Truth could be achieved only by the complete realization of *ahimsa* – the total benevolence of being that was cleansed of all the violence (Howard 2013. 57). According to Howard: "It was the touchstone of Truth—the highest *dharma*—manifesting itself in compassion and goodwill. Moreover, *ahiṃsā* was not merely abstaining from violence, nor was it a political tool. It was comprised of supernatural potency. Anyone who has completely shed hatred and ill will, who has succeeded in making his life a perfect embodiment of Truth, can command everything in life. He does not have to ask that anything be done. He has only to wish and the wish will be fulfilled." (Howard 2013,

58). Gandhi was convinced that the initiation of supernatural powers celebrated in Indian culture could enable an individual to defeat a powerful and unjust empire. According to Howard: "However, his approach to *ahiṃsā* as a political weapon differed from traditional praxis on four grounds: (1) stipulation for those who practice *ahiṃsā* to not merely do works of compassion or goodwill but to confront acts of violence; (2) the integration of a militaristic approach into *ahiṃsā*; (3) an expansion of the scope of *ahiṃsā* by directly relating it to other *yamas* (restraints or required disciplines of self-control); and (4) the evocation of *siddhi* (supernatural power) associated with observance of *ahiṃsā* for his non-violent movement" (Howard 2013, 59).

The second traditional practice that Gandhi embraced was *brahmacarya*. "Brahmacarya", etymologically meaning divine conduct, is much more comprehensive than sexual control. It represents "self-control" of the highest type, as it includes the control of all senses and leads the way to *mokṣa* (liberation) (Howard 2013, 88-94). Even though Gandhi at times rendered *brahmacarya* as chastity or continence simply due to a lack of a direct equivalent in English, he understood it to be a transcending of all types of sensual pleasures. "*Brahmacarya* is a comprehensive principle of intense mental and spiritual discipline used to control the ever active senses and there by attain liberation (*mokṣa*) […]. Gandhi was aware that *brahmacarya* has always been an indispensable component of the pursuit of spiritual freedom within the Indian traditions." (Howard 2013, 88).

Gandhi considered that all these traditional approaches constituted a prerequisite for dealing with the major public issues (Howard 2013, 122-161). By their strict practice, Gandhi acquired the status of "Mahatma" ("great soul") among the Indian religious masses. Before Gandhi, ascetic practices that were searching for spiritual freedom (*nivrti*) and political activities represented two completely different orientations. In *Satyagraha*, for the first time, they were united.

By placing its starting point in the Indian tradition, *Satyagraha* looked at the success and achievement of political goals in a completely different way. Gandhi measured success not only by the level of achieved social and political freedom, but also by the level of spiritual self-realization. His view differed from those who saw their goal as defeating the opponent or, frustrating the opponent's objectives, or meeting one's own objectives no matter how the opponent wants to obstruct them. *Satyagraha* aims to convert, not to defeat the opponent. Confronted

with the *Satyagraha*, the opponent should lose his moral balance and be converted at least to stop obstructing the just end for this cooperation to take place. However, there are cases when the opponent, even ashamed, continues with his previous behavior and obstruction – the *satyagrahi* would count this as a partial success. Gandhi's *Satyagraha* sees means and ends as inseparable. It is contradictory to try to use unjust means to obtain justice or to try to use violence to obtain peace. Gandhi completely rejected the idea that injustice should, or even could, be fought against "by any means necessary": if you use violent, coercive, unjust means, whatever ends, you produce will necessarily embed that injustice. Because of that, all forms of civil disobedience and non-cooperation used in *Satyagraha* must be based on "the law of suffering" – teaching by which endurance of suffering is the main instrument to achieve the ultimate goal – moral renewal of individuals and society. Gandhi saw this approach not as a tactic in the current political situation but as a universal path for overcoming injustice and evil in general. Gandhi, therefore, taught his followers to comply with the principles of nonviolence; truth (this includes honesty, but goes beyond it to mean living fully in accord with and in devotion to that which is true); not stealing, non-possession (which is not the same as poverty; body-labor or bread-labor; control of the palate; fearlessness; equal respect for all religions; economic strategy such as boycott of exported good (*swadeshi*) (Gandhi 1961, 37). By combining these approaches, Gandhi wanted to create a collective spiritual power, a "mental power" – for him, the ideal State would be a direct result of means based on Truth, nonviolence, and adherence to the moral restraint that he practiced on a daily basis.

"COLOR REVOLUTIONS" AND THEIR
MAIN CHARACTERISTICS

The "Color Revolutions" are a colloquial name for a series of *coup d' etat'* s carried out as civil protests in Eastern and Southeastern Europe in the early 2000s. The term has also been applied to a number of revolutions elsewhere, including the Middle East and North Africa. One of the main characteristics of those political overthrows was the important role of non-governmental organizations and youth activists. By combining various forms of civic protest, from non/violent to violent ones, these revolts were aimed at destroying worn-out and corrupt regimes

that were branded as authoritarian. They were also based on promises of true democracy and a better life for all the citizens of these states.

The First true "Color Revolution" was Serbian "October the 5th", when the regime of Slobodan Milošević was overthrown. After that, "The Revolution of Roses" in Georgia in 2003 and "The Orange Revolution" in Ukraine in 2004 followed. Mass civil protests after controversial elections were common to all early "Color Revolutions" in Eastern and Southeastern Europe. All of the protests were strongly supported by students and youth organizations: first among them was the organization "Otpor" (Resistance) in Serbia, whose members have inspired and trained members of related student movements, including "Kmara" in Georgia, "Pora" in Ukraine and "Zubr" in Belarus (Michaud 2005). Behind the scenes, foreign sponsors who generously financed the non-governmental sector exerted significant influence upon the organization and implementation of the protests.

"Color Revolution" as a theoretical and practical instrument and its detailed implementation was studied by Gene Sharp (1928–2018), an American political scientist. Sharp's revolution model was based on research on the fundamental nature of political power. His basic starting point was that there is no completely compact political power: power doesn't stem from the intrinsic qualities of its main bearers but from the obedience of its subjects (Gajić 2018). Therefore, every political system is built around a structure that encourages obedience of the ruled population (Sharp 1973, 19). Every political structure has its specific institutions that impose obedience on its subjects, both oppressive as the regulatory ones (police, prosecution, judiciary) as well as those with cultural influence that inspire people's subordination. Through the actions of these institutions, people are subjected to the systematic imposition of rules (and sanctions for their violation), with both rewards and penalties that promote their obedience (Gajić 2018). Without the obedience of the people, rulers are unable to exercise their political power (Sharp 2003, 19). This power consists of basic elements such as authority (acceptance of its legitimacy by the people), human resources (organized groups of assistants for the efficient exercise of power and the achievement of its main goals), material resources, and sanctions (Sharp 2003, 18–19). All of these elements of power depend on acceptance of the regime and the population's willingness to submit (Sharp 2003, 19). If they refuse to obey, cease their cooperation, and start to resist the imposed order – political power can be effectively overthrown (Gajić 2018).

If there are those interested in overthrowing an authoritarian regime, Sharp points out, it is necessary to do four things: 1) to help subordinates stop obeying, 2) to assist them in strengthening their self-awareness and willingness to confront, 3) to encourage the ability of relatively more independent social groups and strata to rebel and 4) to create as strong as possible connection between different social groups interested in regimes downfall and to sketch common strategic plan of regime's overthrow (Sharp 2003, 7–8). The shaping of this plan is based on identifying the main weaknesses of each government, that is, its "Achilles heel" (Sharp 2003, 25), such as inner conflicts between regime's fractions; predictability based on a routine in the exercise of power and the lack of its imagination; shortage of quality staff and resources; poor communication between the top of the government and its lower echelons; blindness to the perception of real social problems due to ideological prejudices; internal institutional rivalries and poor coordination between competing institutions and persons that are running them; apathetic state of public opinion, growing skepticism and even hostility towards the top of the regime; the growth of antagonism between different regional, class, or national groups living within a single political system (Sharp 2003, 26–27), etc.

Gene Sharp thinks that political defiance to authoritarian regimes must have the following characteristics: "1) It does not accept that the outcome will be decided by the means of fighting chosen by the dictatorship. 2) It is difficult for the regime to combat 3) It can uniquely aggravate weaknesses of the dictatorship and can sever its sources of power 4) It can, in action, be widely dispersed but can also be concentrated on a specific objective 5) It leads to errors of judgment and action by the dictators 6) It can effectively utilize the population as a whole and the society's groups and institutions in the struggle to end the brutal domination of the few 7) It helps to spread the distribution of effective power in the society, making the establishment and maintenance of a democratic society more possible." (Sharp 2003, 29). Therefore a general strategy must be defined just as the strategies of separate campaigns aimed at achieving direct goals. Campaigns can use different methods. Gene Sharp has enumerated 198 different methods for the downfall of the targeted regime, from public appeals and symbolic acts, pressures on individuals, and various forms of economic, social, and political non-cooperation to the numerous non-violent actions – psychological, social, economic, and political ones.

Gene Sharp's doctrine of helping the oppressed minority to overthrow dictatorship developed very different, not-so-benevolent dimensions when practically applied. According to Ljepojević: "The main part of the preparation of the overthrow is the media: the management of the impressions, the production of false consciousness in the public opinion, the formation and imposition of a false social and political framework. Only when the terrain is prepared do revolutionaries, 'moles,' and mobilized infantry enter the stage. Jonathan Mowat described the technique of coup as classic warfare by other means. There is no need to send an army to another state if you can create your own army from its inhabitants through media and political manipulation. In the so-called revolution, only the Empire and 'revolutionaries' are those who profit, while people – in whose name the revolution is started –- are just a flock of sheep. Frustrated, impatient, and inexperienced youth is being used as infantry." (Ljepojević 2008, 9).

The realization of "Color Revolutions," therefore, has numerous precisely defined preparatory and implementation phases. The first preparatory phase starts with the positioning of NGOs (financed from foreign sources) in the "targeted" country. The establishment of a large number of NGOs that are dealing with social issues gives them the advantage of becoming potential generators of people's dissatisfaction with the *status quo*. These organizations are initially receiving great media attention that multiplies their relative strength and social significance. They declare themselves as a "civil society," even though they have not spontaneously emerged from the conditions in this society nor have much contact with it (Ljepojević 2008, 13). The second preparatory phase concerns the monopolization of the media space and the design of illusions ("creation of the carrot"). The main goal of NGOs is to provide political inclination of the critical part of the public through media influence. It is also very important that a part of society that is exposed to media influence start to believe in its propaganda and to hope for the defeat of the oppressive regime that will bring them alleged welfare (Ljepojević 2008, 15–19). The third preparatory phase aims for the recruitment of local exponents – people who are ready to cause disorder that will initiate a revolution. Their professionally directed negative energy is the main moving force of a revolutionary project. There are two kinds of people that are being recruited for the coup: opposition politicians who are striving for power and realization of their personal ambitions, and "street infantry" that gives "Color Revolution" an image of spontaneous

people rebellion. "Street infantry" consists of three groups: 1) "true believers" – media consumers of promised better post-revolutionary life 2) "paid supernumeraries" in cases when the number of "true believers" is insufficient 3) "strong arm of the coup" – trained hooligans ready for the occupation of the institutions and other important or symbolic objects (Ljepojević 2008, 19–22).

The fourth preparatory phase tends to transform media-presented public dissatisfaction into a practical realization of civil disobedience by personalization and demonization of the regime. Dehumanized and Manichean projection of "Enemy" pushes two polarized political groups toward a conflict in which one side will triumph, and the other will be completely defeated and removed (Ljepojević 2008, 22–23). The fifth preparatory phase consists of the production of constant tension that can cause escalation when the time is right (Ljepojević 2008, 23–24). According to Ljepojević: "Strategic dosing of provocations keeps the attention and concentration of the participants. And what is equally important - it causes the escalation of 'righteous wrath' and keeps the gathered masses in belligerent mood." (Ljepojević 2008, 25). The sixth phase represents the beginning of the realization of the coup. It starts with the gathering of dissatisfied masses in a media-friendly location from which they can publicly address the regime with their demands (Ljepojević 2008, 24–25).

Provoking the clashes represents the real beginning of an active phase of the revolution. Some real or fabricated malfeasances of the authorities are usually being used as the cause of the unrest. Then, the decisive blow ("Big Push") arrives in the form of a strong, massive assault that can bring about the collapse of the regime (Ljepojević 2008, 25). Then comes the last phase of the revolution: instrumentalization of the masses for the violent occupation of symbolic centers of power of the crumbling "Old regime" (Ljepojević 2008, 26–28). This spectacle is being constantly supported by the media, which are broadcasting the revolution. Some of the 198 Gene Sharp's revolutionary methods are being used as the most suitable in the given circumstances. Their realization is being managed by trained protesters followed by a violent, angry mob. Everything is prepared and designed by the proscribed technology of revolution: it is only necessary to implement the whole process by strictly following the instructions.

CONCLUSION: *SATYAGRAHA* AND "COLOR REVOLUTIONS" AS CONTRASTING FORMS OF CIVIL PROTEST

Gene Sharp carefully studied Gandhi's *Satyagraha*. He was very inspired by Gandhi when he theoretically formulated his non-violent methods of "Color Revolutions." Nevertheless, those two forms of civil protests have very different characteristics, from their starting points to their final goals. We have already seen that Gandhi's *Satyagraha* found its inspiration almost completely in Indian pre-modern tradition and that it was led by India's religious ideals and ascetic praxis. Gandhi's insistence on truth was not just about objective consideration of the facts but also about reaching the foundations of existence in its inner dimensions. By contrast, Gene Sharp and his followers have an extremely negative and anti-spiritual relationship toward pre-modern traditions. They are standing on the very anti-essentialist position that disaffirms any inner qualities of both the individual and the community, and especially those connected with the authority. For them, both individual and collective identities are constructed and fluid: they mostly depend on the consensuses of individuals and their temporary interests. Even the facts about social reality are very relative and conditioned, and their "truthfulness" is just a result of arrangements and interpretations, both based on interests. New influences and new circumstances can change those interests and the nature of consensus; thus, all social constructs can be changed. Both theoreticians and practitioners of "Color Revolutions" have postmodern worldviews. Their relation toward reality is very skeptical and ironic: they refuse all universalities and "Grand narratives" that are suitable for the promotion of social changes. Instead, they point out phrases, inconsistencies, irrational performances, and marketing slogans; they have a relativistic relation toward all values; they reject the idea of teleological development and prefer current benefits.

Promoters of the doctrine of "Color Revolution" don't request examination of oneself or strife for moral improvement through self-renunciation and self-sacrifice from their followers. On the contrary, they encourage their followers' desires (that is the complete opposite of Gandhi's advocacy of restraint) while directing their frustrations and negative energy toward the authorities who are claimed to be fully responsible for it. They portray the regime as a Manichean evil, something totally opposed to the oppressed people. While Gandhi was searching

for the transformation of political opponents, for re-approaching and compromise, "color revolutionaries" – who see themselves as moral superiors – refused any cooperation, re-approach, and compromise with the authorities. Their demands are maximal; opponents are to be defeated and destroyed, not to be prepossessed. In spite of their refusal to value anything in accordance with traditional morality and its binary oppositions, postmodern European revolutions still create their new, instant binary oppositions: democratic/authoritarian, tolerant/discriminatory, liberal/subordinated, inclusive/exclusive. These are the motivation parameters for the voluntary actions of their votaries.

While Gandhi's *Satyagraha* gives absolute significance to non-violent methods as true means as the only certain way to true ends, non-violent methods in postmodern "Color Revolutions" are just instrumental, utilitarian – comprehended only for the deconstruction of the political system and legitimacy of previous authorities. If it's opportune – their postmodern ironic populism with deconstructionist performances on squares and streets will tear down its peaceful, non-violent mask, and trained professional revolutionaries will storm the most important institutions of the regime.

Satyagraha is inspired by the truth and refuses to gain by renouncing the truth. "Color revolutions," on the other hand, produce their "own" truth in accordance with their needs and for the achievement of their goals: for them, "truth" is just a tool for reaching success, not the reference point for evaluation of themselves and their political ends. They are not obliged to the truth. While Gandhi preaches renunciation of any possession, strictly avoiding theft – "colored revolutionaries" are driven by a desire for personal gain while they advocate material improvement of life. While Gandhi propagates physical work, abstaining from alcohol, and controlling one's own diet as the expression of personal discipline, the "Color Revolution" propagates licentiousness and indecency – both as a means and an end of processes of social transformation. *Satyagraha* promotes fearlessness, profound personal piety, and respect for other religions; postmodern revolutionaries advocate a high-minded self and contempt for opponents, agnosticism, and a jibe for all expression of true devotion, seen only as a form of "essentialist delusions" and narrow-mindedness. While Gandhi's ascetic techniques and methods of non-violent resistance are deeply related to true spiritual awakening and spirituality itself, European postmodern revolutions see all of their non-violent resistance methods just as a technology, utilitarianistically

aimed for the practical goal: power take-off. Revolutionary Images of future happiness are just objects of psychological manipulation, mere instruments of "conflict management."

Therefore, we shouldn't be surprised that the outcomes of these two polarized approaches to civil protests are also completely different. Gandhi's *Satyagraha*, gradually but inevitably, led India to the path of decolonization, the acquisition of full political independence and freedom. In the decades after the achievement of independence, India was very successful in dealing with its social development, which intertwined its tradition with modern technological innovations. India has risen to the level of regional power that tends to become one of the main centers of power of the emerging multi-polar world. Countries whose people were seduced by "sweet promises" of postmodern "Color revolutions" inevitably fell into dependent, neocolonial status. All of their hopes for a better life turned out to be illusions, just as their belief in the rule of the majority and their vital interest being taken care of. One form of oligarchy was just replaced by the other, covered in discursive actions of the postmodern "brave new world."

REFERENCES

Brown, Judith. 2009. "Gandhi and Civil Resistance in India 1917–47: Key Issues." In *Civil Resistance and Power Politics*, eds. Adam Roberts and Timothy Garton Ash, 43–57. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

De Rougemont, Denis. 1983. *Zapadna pustolovina čoveka*. Beograd: Niro „Književne novine".

Gajić, Aleksandar. 2018. „Gandijeva 'satjagraha' i obojene revolucije (2)." *Novi Standard*. Poslednji pristup 1. aprila 2025. https://standard.rs/2018/04/18/gandijeva-satjagraha-i-obojene-revolucije-2/

Gandhi, Mahatma. 1961. *Non-violent Resistance (Satyagraha)*. New York: Barnes and Noble.

Gandhi, Mahatma. 1920. "199. Letter to someone in Madanpalli." dokumen.pub. Last accessed February 1, 2025. https://dokumen.pub/the-complete-works-of-mahatma-gandhi-volume-19-19.html

Guénon, René. 1945. *Introductions to the study of Hindu Doctrines*. London: Luzac and Co.

Guénon, René. 2001. *East and West*. Ghent NY: Sophia Perennis.

Griffiths, Percival. 1952. *British Impact on India*. London: Macdonald.

Howard, Weena. 2013. *Gandhi's Ascetic Activism: Renunciation and Social Action*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Ljepojević, Milan. 2008. „Skidanje maski." In: *Rušenje Republike Srpske: teorija i tehnologija prevrata*. Banja Luka: Besjeda.

Majmudar, Uma. 2005. *Gandhi's Pilgrimage of Faith: From Darkness to Light*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Markovits, Claude. 2002. *A History of Modern India 1480-1950*. London: Anthem Press.

Michaud, Hélène. 2005. "Roses, cedars and orange ribbons: A wave of non-violent revolution." *Radio Netherlands*. https://web.archive.org/web/20050701053305/http://www2.rnw.nl/rnw/en/documentaries/050629doc?view=Standard

Parekh, Bhikhu. 2001. *Gandhi*. New York: Sterling Publishing.

Said, Edward. 2008. *Orijentalizam*. Beograd: XX vek.

Singh, M. K, ed. 2009. *Encyclopaedia of Indian War of Independence (1857-1947), Gandhi Era Vol-13 (Mahatma Gandhi and National Movement)*. New Delhi: Anmol Publications.

Sharp, Gene. 1973. *The Politics of Non-violent Action*. Boston: Porter Sargent.

Sharp, Gene. 2003. *From Dictatorship to Democracy: A Conceptual Framework for Liberation*. Boston: Albert Einstein Institute.

Tidrick, Kathryn. 2006. *Gandhi: A Political and Spiritual Life*. Bainbridge: Taurus.

Александар Гајић[*]

Институт за европске студије, Београд

Љубиша Деспотовић[**]

Институт за политичке студије, Београд

ГАНДИЈЕВА „САТЈАГРАХА" И ЕВРОПСКЕ ПОСТМОДЕРНЕ РЕВОЛУЦИЈЕ[***]

Резиме

У раду се, полазећи од поређења индијске и европске цивилизације као „идеалтипских" оличења Истока и Запада, пажња фокусира на однос у овим цивилизацијама према могућностима пружања цивилног отпора у случају да је та власт нелегитимна и/или неправедна. Савремена западна наука придодаје Гандијево схватање низу заговорника ненасилног отпора који од Софокла преко Перси Шелија, Ештона Николаса, Хенрија Дејвида Тороа и Лава Толстоја води до Мартина Лутера Кинга, Вацлава Хавела, Леха Валенсе и Џина Шарпа. Полазећи од кратког прегледа настанка индијског покрета за независност и Гандијевог места у њему, прелази се на настанак и обличавање Гандијевог концепта *сатјаграхе* (постојаности у истини). Сатјаграха није била тек вид ненасилног грађанског отпора западног активистичког типа, већ његов контраст и превазилажење кроз окретање, уз одређене модификације, ка индијског верској традицији. Посматрајући *сатјаграху* пре свега као аскетско-религиозан подвиг који води од унутрашњег, личног преображујућег подвига ка оном спољном – ка друштвеној промени, рад обрађује њену везу са две индијске традиционалне праксе – са *брамачарјом* и *ахисмом*. У другом делу рада се детаљно обрађује феномен „обојених револуција" у источној Европи као врсте ненасилног преврата; уочавају се њихови видови, главне стратешке и тактичке одлике као и фазе реализације. Потом се, у завршном делу рада, врши компарација између индијског

---

[*]   Имејл адреса: romero@eunet.rs; ORCID: 0000-0002-3873-0231

[**]   Имејл адреса: despotlj@stcable.net; ORCID: 0000-0002-0473-2829

вида грађанског отпора предвођеног Гандијем и „обојених револуција" извршених на основу теоријских и практичних препорука Џина Шарпа (*Gene Sharp*). При томе се јасно уочава контраст између ова два вида грађанског отпора; првог који се окреће традицији, који је прожет духовношћу и води ка ослобађању од колонијалног ропства, и другог, који је профан и антидуховану, и који неминовно води у неоколонијалне видове поробљавања.

Кључне речи: Индија, Европа, Ганди, сатјаграха, обојене револуције, традиција, постмодернизам