Abstract—The Velvet Revolution or the Color Revolution is a bloodless transformation that was first proposed by the former Czech president, Waslaw Howell, who at that time was the leader of the opposition. Color revolutions developed into a series of related movements in the post-communist societies of Eastern Europe, Central Europe and Central Asia. This movement is not a real revolution, since it is not spontaneously public, rather it is guided and supported by a foreign power.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The "color revolution" refers to the changes that have taken place so far in the remaining countries of the former Eastern bloc, and the governing body of these countries has given way to pro-Western governments. These developments began with the "velvet revolution" occurring during a 6 weeks period of November 17th to December 29th, 1989 in Czechoslovakia, and continued with similar developments in Serbia (two stages 1997 and 2000), Georgia (2003), Ukraine (2004) and Kirghizia (2005). A revolution is a process in which power is transferred through, violence, from one group to another while its position gets completely changed. In classic revolutions, the political structure and rulers are definitely and completely changing while new political, economic and social institutions emerge. Violence increases the cost of change and sometimes creates temporary chaos in the society. [1]

In 1989, a new theory was introduced in order to make changes in the communist regimes, known as Velvet Revolution or Color Revolution. The color revolutions in the past decade have been able to change communist regimes and socialist systems. There is no or less "violence" in velvet or color revolutions while it is more reliant on peaceful moves for political change. Color revolutions occur during the "election". That is the opposition groups in the election time, when more free space is created, unite and establish peaceful gatherings and widespread protests using the power of domestic and foreign media, against the ruling or winning group while encouraging their supporters out into the street in order to challenge the winner of the election. Thus, without resorting to violence, the political system changes. [2]

In color revolutions, opponents of the ruling system gather in front of the governance institutions, such as parliament, electoral commission, police, etc., stop these institutions from moving and reacting while preventing the entry of parliamentarians or police officials into the buildings and impede the legitimacy of the governance institutions. In Ukraine and Georgia, opponents of the communist regime gathered in the streets and main squares for several days, while in Kirghizia, opponents gathered in front of the parliament and the presidential congress and forced the sovereignty to surrender, etc.

II. FINDINGS:

After the Cold War and the collapse of the Eastern bloc, the countries of the Eastern bloc moved to authoritarianism with the departure of communism, therefore these countries were the first target of color revolutions. The main purpose of these revolutions is to completely eliminate the great obstacle to the United States' hegemony on the world, namely, Russia and China, and more recently Islam. These efforts are still in the midst of a non-ideological soft war, and has not yet revealed its final outcome. [3]

III. EXAMPLES OF COLOR REVOLUTIONS:

Between 2000 and 2006, various color revolutions took place in different countries, some of which failed, and some resulted in victory. The Bulldozer Revolution in Serbia, the Rose Revolution in Georgia, the Orange Revolution in Ukraine, the Tulip Revolution in Kirghizia, the Green Revolution in Lebanon, the White Revolution in Belarus, the Blue Revolution in Kuwait, the Grain Revolution in Moldova, and the Colorless Revolution in Venezuela.[4]

IV. COMMON FEATURES OF COLOR REVOLUTIONS:

The common features that appear in these color revolutions is that, except in Kirghizia, all of them took place without using violent means. Also, the role of the media, especially the Western media, students and NGOs had been significant in the revolution. A few examples of color revolutions will be discussed. [5]

V. CZECHOSLOVAKIA:

[On January 1, 1993, after the separation of the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic, the country entered the international arena as an independent state.] In 1998, protesters came to the streets besieged by the police, and then rumors spread that in the clashes, Martin Schmid, a 19-year-old student of mathematics, was brutally killed. A large number of protesters were beaten up, but in fact nobody was killed. In the afternoon, Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America went on a daily basis reports on the violent clashes of the police and the death of a student named Martin Schmid (later it turned out that the news did not materialize). This news came as a thunderbolt spread in the country that made students and people so angry and emotional that even members of the Communist Party and...
several members of the Central Committee joined the demonstrations.

On December 19, 1989, the Clotour Society convened at the home of the actor and writer, Waslaw Hawl (later he was the president for three presidential periods and is now an originally Jew multi-millionaire anti-communist millionaires who had also organized an anti-government insurgent in 1977). At 10 p.m., they formally formed a party called “National Participation” without a partisan constitution and announced November 27th as the day of the mass demonstrations throughout the country. [6]

Massive protests continued to spread in other cities days later, and at the same time, the Western broadcasting networks, whose signals were easily accessible and clear, increased the hours of broadcasting in Czechoslovakia, especially at night, and provoked people with broadcasting pictures.

The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia was eventually forced to accept the proposals of the National Participation Party, and Gustaf Husak, president and secretary of the Central Committee, introduced a new cabinet called the “National Covenant of Civilization” on December 10, 1989. He was so much scared that he immediately resigned after 21 years of the kingship. [7]

On December 29, 1989, he elected the Communist Party of Waslaw Hawl as interim president. In June, 1990 election, the National Participation Party won 51% of the vote in the election of June, 1990. While the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia lost the election with 13% moving to the minority, and could not even win 3% for the next ten years.

VI. GEORGIA:

In the Georgian parliamentary elections of 2003, the New Georgia coalition led by Eduard Shevardnadze and Georgian troika led by Mikhail Saakashvili competed against each other. In the heat of election, Soros Foundation, through a survey, announced troika’s victory in advance. But after the election, the results of the vote count announced the victory of the New Georgia.[8]

The Georgian Troika accused the government of cheating while protesting the election results. Also, with the support of the media from the West and the United States, called on its supporters to negative campaign and civil disobedience. They gathered in front of the presidential palace for several days and eventually entered the parliament without police resistance. Then, Student movement of Kamaara interrupted the speech of the Western-opponent Shevardnadze.

VII. UKRAINE:

During the presidential election of Ukraine in 2004, no candidate was able to win the first round. Yanukovych, the Russian-backed candidate won 39/88% and Viktor Yushchenko, supported by the United States and Western governments, won 39.22% of the total votes.

In the second stage, according to the unofficial announcement, Yanukovych won 49/46% and Yushchenko won 46.61% of the total votes. But the result was not accepted by Yushchenko and his supporters, accusing the government of cheating, taking part in sit-ins and demonstrations while preventing Yanukovych from entering the prime minister’s office (Para's movement).

Despite the fact that the Electoral and Parliamentary Commissions endorsed the results. Still, as the crisis worsened, the Supreme Court overturned the results and 12,000 electoral observers arrived in Ukraine. Finally, with US financial and promotional aid, Yushchenko won 52.55 percent of the vote and became president.

George Soros later said that our institution spent $ 70 million.

The Los Angeles Times (December 30, 2004) announced that USA spent $ 58 million on promoting democracy in Ukraine (New York Times announced it as $ 65 Million).

National Democracy Foundation spent $ 820,000 including: $ 400,000 - Training the Trade Unions
$ 2-3,000 - Training the Teachers of middle schools $ 50,000 - Polling $ 50,000 - Analyst Website for Ukrainian media

The American Bar Association has provided $ 400,000 for legal and electoral training of judges, including the five Supreme Court judges who void the election. NATO, also, spent some 10 years in training Ukrainian military officers, which caused them to not react to the demonstrators. [8]

VIII. KIRGHIZIA:

In 2005, the revolution was sparked with the disqualification of opposition candidates in parliament. Thus, holding two parliamentary elections and announcing its results, the opponents of Asgar-e-Yaaf united while the OSCE defined the process of the election as deficient. Yet, the Organization of Russia-supporting States announced the election as a free voting.

The first protests against the electoral process started from the southern cities (youth resistance movement) and then continued spreading through other areas. Under the pressure of public, Aghayev asked for investigating possible violations. But on March 24th, during the first mass gatherings in Bishkek, the state areas and the presidential palace was seized and the government collapsed.[9]

Aghayev fled with his family on a helicopter to Kazakhstan and then to Russia. The Tulip revolution was titled after the fact that it was occurred in the spring. Kolov, Bakiyev, Otono Baya came to power with the support of White House and the Soros Foundation.

IX. THE FOUNDERS AND THEORISTS OF COLOR REVOLUTIONS:

Gene Sharp, director of the Einstein Institute and the color revolution theorist, introduces four main steps to persuade people to participate in social movements of violence:

1) It is necessary to strengthen the will, confidence, and resistance skills in the oppressed people.

2) It is necessary to create and strengthen independent social groups and special organizations of oppressed people.

3) A powerful internal force is needed.

4) A wise strategic plan is needed for freedom to be designed and skilled. [10]

Short-term goals: Humanitarian coverage (Health, Law, Women, etc.)

Medium-term goals: Creating culture, institution, and
The role of the CIA in these velvet and color revolutions is very prominent. A CIA-affiliated political foundation, "Freedom House", played a prominent role in guiding and influencing the developments of the countries in question. Americans believe that color revolutions are the best strategies for changing and overthrowing independent, national, and non-aligned governments in target countries. They believe that this type of subversion is very costly and, because of its democratic nature and the presence of people on the streets, enjoys some kind of legitimacy. In sum, America's purpose of color revolutions includes:
1. Domination of areas which are of particular political and strategic importance
2. Controlling the energy transfer path and preventing its weaponization
3. Eliminating or suppressing the systems that block the expansion of American domination
4. Preventing the establishment of military and security unions in Asia, Middle East and Central Asia
5. Making the countries to be consistent with US policies
6. Economic opportunities
7. Curbing Islamic Awakening.
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