

---

# The Moving Force Of Colored Revolutions

By Karen Nahapetyan  
Hayots Ashkhar Daily - 2/9/2008

---

Many of us have most probably noticed that the moving force of the native liberation movement is far not Armenian Pan National Movement, or "Hanrapetutyun" or the People's Party of Armenia, but rather the non-governmental organizations, the so-called public organizations. It is by the help of the before mentioned organizations that all the protest functions are usually organized.

It is one of the modern revolutionary technologies. The experience of the recent years has displayed the privileges of the public organizations over the classical political parties. Flexibility, destabilization, activities of various directions, high level of dynamism and many other peculiarities of those organizations make the counteraction of the law enforcers and the public services rather difficult.

There are lots of social-political organizations in our reality. They are civil-public institutions, structures of the self-organization of the citizens in different spheres of life and activity.

Meanwhile, there are many other public organizations, which are engaged exclusively in political activity, moreover, it is for that very purpose that they are established, by the help of foreign grants. And this evidently goes beyond the frameworks of the civil society.

In our view it is high time to give assessment to the activity of the so-called civil institutions with political trend, which completely changes the concept of the civil society.

Today the difference between the civil public organizations and the political processes is intentionally eradicated; this should have long ago become a matter of analyses. Whereas the public organizations usually appear with the role of a judge that can take decisions regarding the political organization of society and the activity of the state institutions.

But if the parties - the classical participants of the political processes have to regularly prove their own authority, by their participation during the elections and show the level of the public support by the votes gained (that is to say their right to introduce their ideas to the society), then the public organizations engaged in politics think they don't have to prove their right to give lessons on politics. They simply have a claim on the position of the prosecutor. Do they have the right?

The funding and the establishment of similar public organizations is the component of the organization of any colored revolution. For example before "the revolution of tulips" in Kirgizistan, around 5-8 thousand similar organizations were established in this country by foreign grants. By the number of the public organizations Kirgizistan was a champion in CIS. It was really ridiculous; almost each village had its own public organization.

By establishing these organizations the foreign funds were trying to emphasize their importance. Should we mention that by increasing the number of the public organizations they were far not trying to establish civil society and democracy in this country?

Though how can we even speak about democracy? Democracy, in the 21st century,

has become a matter of political blackmail, interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states and false speculations. It has become a tool by the help of which they realize all the before mentioned, in which the public organizations established by the foreign grants serve as a moving force.

At the end we must underscore that the era of new colored revolutions continue in the post-soviet countries. Of course they fail more and more, because people are no more optimistic towards them. Our neighbor Georgia is a bright example of what has been said.

---