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INTRODUCTION

Introduction 0.1: Topical Significance

“Supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy’s resistance without fighting.” – Sun Tzu

Over two thousand years ago, the ancient Chinese military strategist Sun Tzu realized that indirect warfare is one of the most efficient ways of fighting an enemy. It allows an opponent to defeat their adversary without directly engaging them, thereby saving themselves the resources that would have to be expended in a direct confrontation. Attacking an enemy indirectly can also bog them down and put them on the defensive, thereby making them vulnerable to other forms of attack. It also carries with it a certain opportunity cost for the defending side, since the time and resources that they spend in dealing with the indirect attack could potentially have been put to better use elsewhere. Besides the tactical advantages, there are also strategic ones as well. There may be certain constraints (e.g. alliances, military parity, etc.) that prevent one entity from directly launching hostilities against another. In this case, indirect warfare is the only option to destabilize the other.

In the current day, weapons of mass destruction and the emerging multipolar world place limits on direct confrontation between Great Powers. Even though the US still retains the world’s strongest conventional military, the nuclear parity it shares with Russia serves as a reminder that unipolarity has its limits. Additionally, the international system is morphing in such a way that the political and physical costs of waging a conventional war against certain countries (i.e. China, Iran) are becoming too much of a burden for US decision makers, thereby making this military option less attractive. Under such circumstances, indirect warfare acquires a heightened value in strategic planning and its application can take on a variety of forms.

Direct warfare in the past may have been marked by bombers and tanks, but if the pattern that the US has presently applied in Syria and Ukraine is any indication, then indirect warfare in the future will be marked by “protesters” and insurgents. Fifth columns will be formed less by secret agents and covert saboteurs and more by non-state actors that publicly behave as civilians. Social media and similar technologies will come to replace precision-guided munitions as the “surgical strike” capability of the aggressive party, and chat rooms and Facebook pages will become the new “militants’ den”. Instead of directly

---

confronting the targets on their home turf, proxy conflicts will be waged in their near vicinity in order to destabilize their periphery. Traditional occupations may give way to coups and indirect regime change operations that are more cost effective and less politically sensitive.

Introduction 0.2: Theory

The book focuses on the new strategy of indirect warfare that the US has demonstrated during the Syrian and Ukrainian Crises. Both situations led many wondering whether they were observing the export of Color Revolutions to the Mideast, the arrival of the Arab Spring to Europe, or perhaps some kind of Frankenstein hybrid. It is asserted that when the US’ actions in both countries are objectively compared, one can discern a new patterned approach towards regime change. This model begins by deploying a Color Revolution as a soft coup attempt, only to be followed up by a hard coup Unconventional War if the first plan fails. Unconventional Warfare is defined in this book as any type of nonconventional (i.e. non-official military) force engaged in largely asymmetrical combat against a traditional adversary. Taken together in a two-pronged approach, Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare represent the two components that form the theory of Hybrid War, the new method of indirect warfare being waged by the US.

Introduction 0.3: Official Russian Position to the Topic

The Moscow Conference on International Security in May 2014 focused heavily on the role of Color Revolutions in advancing US foreign policy goals across the world. Defense Minister Sergei Shoigu stated that "Color revolutions are increasingly taking on the form of warfare and are developed according to the rules of warcraft."\(^2\) The Center for Strategic and International Studies’ Anthony Cordesman attended the conference and has published photos of the PowerPoint slides presented there.\(^3\) He also included notable comments from each speaker. Valery Gerasimov, the Chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of Russia, had an especially important presentation. He introduced the concept of the “adaptive approach” to military force. By this he means that non-military means

---


(identified as Color Revolutions) are aided by the concealed use of force and open military interference (after a pretext is found) against an opposing state.

Introduction 0.4: The Shortcomings of the Russian Position

The Adaptive Approach first introduced by Gerasimov must be further examined, and this is one of the goals of the book. Because it is so new, the concept has not been fully developed and must be refined. For example, the absence of Humanitarian Intervention/Responsibility to Protect à la the Libyan scenario in Syria and Ukraine needs to be accounted for. It is therefore theorized that in today’s complex international environment, the closer that US destabilization operations get towards their targeted cores (Russia, Iran, China), the lower the probability of direct warfare and the higher the chances that indirect means (Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare) will be applied. Of course, this axiom can theoretically be reversed as the respective cores become weakened, distracted, or lose their strategic initiative and unipolarity goes on the upswing.

Because Libya is on the extreme periphery of Russia and Iran, direct regime change methods were eventually applied, but since Ukraine and Syria are much closer to the targeted cores, indirect regime change attempts via Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare have been the primary plan in the evolving multipolar world. Since a repeat of the Libyan War so close to core states’ borders is extremely difficult for the US because of the international situation (more so for Ukraine than for Syria, since Russia is much stronger of a core than Iran, which has undergone a relative weakening in the past year), it is proposed that the Syrian and Ukrainian models will become the standard in the future. Although the Libyan scenario may be the ultimate goal of American military planners, it will come to be seen as more of an anomaly than a rule as the US advances deeper into Eurasia.

Additionally, the Adaptive Approach as expressed at the Moscow Conference on International Security 2014 has not been placed into a geopolitical context, nor does it provide an in-depth explanation of Color Revolutions or Unconventional Warfare. There is also no mention of how these two concepts are bridged between one another, which is because the Adaptive Approach idea is very new and had only been first coined in May 2014. Accordingly, the field is open for new research into these topics that can connect everything together into a unified theory. Since the understudied and newly unveiled Adaptive Approach is identified as an emerging threat to global security, the book takes on a more pressing and timely character than ever before.
Introduction 0.5: Object, Subject, Scope, and Aim of the Book

The object of research is US grand strategy and the new patterned approach to regime change is the subject. The book restricts itself towards only analyzing the Color Revolution and Unconventional Warfare aspects of the Adaptive Approach, believing them to be a new theory of warfare in and of themselves. The fusion of these two can stand alone from the third step of military interference, and it will be argued that this hybrid may be more preferable than expanding the destabilization operation to Humanitarian Intervention/Responsibility to Protect. The structural events in Syria and Ukraine serve as the case studies for testing this new theory, and it will be taken for a given that the reader has some level of pre-existing knowledge about these situations. The book aims to elaborate upon and analyze the evolving US regime change template and method of warfare first described at the Moscow Conference on International Security 2014, as well as showing that the combination of Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare represents a new theory of state destabilization that is ready for strategic deployment all across the world.

Introduction 0.6: Methodology

The book will undertake a specific methodology in order to clearly elucidate its findings, with examples from Syria and Ukraine being used to bolster the new theory’s claims. The first chapter will deal with the theoretical contexts underpinning the new concept. It will first look at the progression of geopolitical theories that place the US’ anti-Russian foreign policy actions into perspective. Then it will examine military theories that explain the preference for covert and indirect destabilization against Russia. The end of the chapter will briefly speak about Full Spectrum Dominance and how Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare fit into this paradigm.

The second chapter will focus on how Color Revolutions are applied. It will begin by looking at the theory and strategy behind them, placing a hardened focus on network warfare and the influence of social media. Then it will show that the end result of these efforts is to create a “swarm” of anti-government actors, which will in turn follow the tactical dictates advocated by Gene Sharp. Finally, brief commentary on two key individuals who have experience practicing these methods will conclude the chapter.

The third chapter follows the skeleton of the second one, except instead of Color Revolutions, it speaks upon Unconventional Warfare. It starts by offering an official US military definition of Unconventional Warfare before modifying it for
the context of the book. It then looks at the history of the US' traditional Unconventional Warfare operations and the rise of non-state actors in the post-Cold War world. Following this, it is then explained how Unconventional Warfare follows the same strategic paradigm as Color Revolutions. Finally, the leaked TC 18-01 Unconventional Warfare handbook from the US military will be partially analysed to show its relevant application to the book, thereby ending the chapter.

Chapter Four connects the concepts of Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare and shows how they are mutually complementary parts of the same regime change whole. This important chapter brings the previous findings together in order to construct the new theory of “Hybrid Wars”. It is at this point that one should be able to clearly see the uniqueness of the concept and how each of its two constituent parts seamlessly flow into one another to create the integrated theory.

The final chapter is the Conclusion, and it offers limited forecasts and general recommendations about Hybrid War. The last section briefly summarizes the book and finishes with a couple concluding thoughts. By this point, the goal is that the reader will have developed an understanding of Hybrid War that can be used as the basis for further research into this revolutionary topic.
CHAPTER 1: THEORETICAL CONTEXTS

Chapter 1.1.1: Geopolitical Context

Contemporary American foreign policy towards Russia is the result of the cumulation of geopolitical theory. Being situated nearly halfway across the world from one another and in opposite hemispheres, it is natural that geopolitics would figure prominently in the policy formation of each state towards the other. Both countries are also strong powers capable of projecting influence and force beyond their borders, even more so nowadays for the US than for Russia. In fact, it will be argued that the US has developed a Eurasian-wide approach towards dealing with Russia and other powers, and it is this strategy that is at the heart of Hybrid Wars. In order to get to this point, however, an overview of geopolitical pillars that led to it must first be commenced. Without an understanding of the theoretical principles that led to today’s policy, it is not possible to adequately comprehend the significance of the new theory and its pivotal place in American strategic planning.

Chapter 1.1.2: Mahan and Mackinder

Alfred Thayer Mahan can be thought of as the forefather of the geopolitical thinking that led to and influenced current American policy. He published “The Influence of Sea Power Upon History” in 1890 and is credited with highlighting the importance of naval strategy in the projection of global influence4. The overriding concept behind his work was that strategic control of certain areas of the sea can be translated into control and influence elsewhere. This helped naval powers in formulating their global strategy.

Partially as a response to Mahan’s treatise on the influence of sea power, Halford Mackinder wrote “The Geographical Pivot of History” in 19045. His article focused instead on the influence of land power, emphasizing that control over the Heartland (which he identified as part of Russia and Central Asia) is a necessary precondition for control over the “world island” of Eurasia. Although not a prominent part of his theory, he distinguished the Inner Crescent as being the part of the world island contiguous to the coast. Mackinder critically identified Eastern Europe as the gateway to the Heartland, later writing in 1919 that “Who

---

What is important here is that both geostrategists proposed opposite views of how power is exercised across the world. In the context of this book, however, Mahan’s primary importance is that he influenced Mackinder, who in turn utilized some concepts of sea power in proposing the Eurasian world island and Heartland theories. Combined with his analysis of Eastern Europe’s role, Mackinder’s theoretical contributions elevated Russia’s role in global geopolitical planning and placed it in the crosshairs of those eyeing global dominance.

Chapter 1.1.3: Prometheism

The next stage of geopolitical thought relating to Russia deals with interwar Polish leader Josef Pilsudski and his Prometheism strategy. Pilsudski believed that if the non-Russian people of the Soviet Union could be externally influenced to rebel against the center, the entire state could fracture into a myriad of ethnic entities that Poland could exploit via an alliance system. Although he was unsuccessful in achieving this goal, Pilsudski had a strong influence on Russian-themed geopolitics. He pioneered the idea that strategic destabilization of the periphery can spread into the interior, and this mantra can be seen as the spiritual genesis of compatriot Zbigniew Brzezinski’s highly influential Eurasian Balkans idea.

Chapter 1.1.4: The Rimland and Shatterbelt

Nicholas Spykman returned to Mackinder’s Inner Crescent idea in 1944 and expanded upon it by renaming it the Rimland. He saw this region as being more important than the Heartland because of its industrial and manpower potential, as well as its recent legacy of aggressive revisionist powers (Napoleonic France and Germany in the two World Wars). This led to his revision of Mackinder’s thesis about Eastern Europe and the Heartland to instead command that “Who

---


controls the Rimland rules Eurasia; who rules Eurasia controls the destinies of the world.”

Saul Cohen took this a step further by conducting a cross-regional comparison of the Rimland states to create what he termed Shatterbelts. He defined this as “a large, strategically located region that is occupied by a number of conflicting states and is caught between the conflicting interests of the Great Powers”, which he saw as being Sub-Saharan Africa, the Mideast, and Southeast Asia. Because of their diverse characteristics, he predicted that they were more averse to conflict than any other places in the world.

Chapter 1.1.5: The Eurasian Balkans

Zbigniew Brzezinski, the former National Security Advisor to Jimmy Carter and godfather of the Mujahedeen, wrote the “The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and its Geostrategic Imperatives” in 1997. In this famous work, he outlined how the US can preserve its unipolar dominance across Eurasia, specifically by utilizing something that he termed the “Eurasian Balkans”. He defines it as such:

9 http://metapoinfos.hautetfort.com/tag/rimland
“The Eurasian Balkans form the inner core of that oblong (portions of southeastern Europe, Central Asia and parts of South Asia, the Persian Gulf area, and the Middle East)...not only are its political entities unstable, but they tempt and invite the intrusion of more powerful neighbors, each of whom is determined to oppose the region’s domination by another. It is this familiar combination of a power vacuum and power suction that justifies the appellation ‘Eurasian Balkans’”

Brzezinski essentially expanded the idea of the Rimland/Shatterbelt to include the newly independent former Soviet republics of Central Asia and the Caucasus. This places the “ethnic cauldron”, as he terms it, right on Russia’s doorstep. He then borrowed from Pilsudski to include peripheral strategic destabilization within the Eurasian Balkans as a possible method for weakening the Russian core and preserving American hegemony. This is also envisioned as preventing the collusion of continental powers that could threaten American control of Eurasia.

Chapter 1.1.6: Geopolitical Context Summary

Brzezinski’s Eurasian Balkans concept is the apex of American geopolitical thinking. If Mackinder constructed the world island and located Russia as its Heartland, Spykman and Cohen outlined its vulnerabilities, and Pilsudski innovatively conspired to break it up, then Brzezinski combined the teachings of all of them in identifying the geostrategic imperatives of American primacy. In

order to permanently weaken Russia and thus control the Heartland, it must be indirectly targeted via the Pilsudski method of destabilization in select Shatterbelt areas.

The idea is not necessarily to foster separatism within Russia itself as Pilsudski had planned (although this would also serve American goals), but instead to embrace the general idea of peripheral chaos and maximize it for strategic purposes. The logic goes that if Russia’s Eurasian periphery can remain in a constant state of destabilization or chaotic flux (or at the very least be stably filled with anti-Russian governments, which in and of itself would be extremely destabilizing), Russia would be thrown off balance and not be able to hinder America’s hegemonic plans. The closer that this destabilizing chaos can penetrate into the Russian core, the better.

America’s challenge today lies in the fact that as the world grows more multipolar and Russia restores its ability to reassert its neighborly interests (and China and Iran acquire theirs), the US must now tread indirectly with its destabilizing methods. The “Shock and Awe” campaign of 2003 or the 2011 NATO War in Libya are nearly impossible to repeat in Kazakhstan and Ukraine, for example, owing to the changed international circumstances and enormous collateral (physical, financial, political) costs that they would entail. What can happen, however, are campaigns of indirect geopolitical sabotage under the guise of “pro-democracy” movements or externally supported civil conflicts. In fact, combining both of them into a “one-two punch” is the perfect “knockout” attack for dealing with Eurasian heavyweights, in this case, Russia.

The novelty of this approach lies in the fact that it succeeds simply by reaping chaos and creating centripetal forces that threaten to tear a targeted society apart. It doesn’t have to overthrow a government per say in order to be a success – all that has to happen is that society becomes divided and large-scale uncertainty, the harbinger of social chaos, ensures. This combination of vacuum and suction, as Brzezinski wrote about above, creates a geopolitical deadlock, which in turn presents an enormous challenge for the indirectly targeted state (Russia) to take initiatives past the border of the directly destabilized one. They are deadlocked into dealing with it, whether they want to or not, and this places them on the strategic defensive. This is even more so if the targeted state directly abuts the main indirect target, as Ukraine does to Russia, for example.

Chapter 1.2.1: Military Theories

It is now appropriate to segue into an explanation of certain military theories that promote the appeal of indirect warfare. It is important to understand how and
why American decision makers apply these concepts in order to have a better grasp of the Hybrid War theory. Select theories, strategies, and tactics will be discussed within this section, and for the sake of brevity, only the relevant aspects of each will be included.

Chapter 1.2.2: Fourth Generation Warfare

In 1989, William Lind co-authored an article in the Marine Corps Gazette which forecast the next generation of warfare\textsuperscript{14}. Identified as Fourth-Generation Warfare, it is predicted to be more fluid, decentralized, and asymmetrical than the warfare of the past. When one looks at the explosion of non-state actor activity since the end of the Cold War\textsuperscript{15}, Lind’s prognosis appears to be correct. This type of warfare also corresponds to the style of Unconventional Warfare, meaning that its rise can be seen as a direct consequence of Fourth-Generation Warfare. Lind also forecast that there would be an increased emphasis on information warfare and psychological operations, which perfectly meshes with the modus operandi of Color Revolutions. He writes:

"Psychological operations may become the dominant operational and strategic weapon in the form of media/information intervention... A major target will be the enemy population's support of its government and the war. Television news may become a more powerful operational weapon than armored divisions."

Thus, in the context of the book, Lind’s forecasts were very prescient. They foretold the coming popularity of Unconventional Warfare and the rolling out of massive anti-government information campaigns. He also wrote that “the distinction between “civilian” and “military” may disappear”, and this has also turned out to be the case. Specifically, it will later be seen how civilians are co-opted into fulfilling de-facto military roles during Color Revolutions and how the military uses civilian support during Unconventional Warfare. Through this way, Hybrid Wars are the epitome of Fourth-Generation Warfare.


Chapter 1.2.3: The Five Rings

Air Force Colonel John Warden is the originator of The Five Rings strategic concept. This states that there are five primary centers of gravity that hold an opposing force together. Beginning from the core (the most important) and expanding outwards, they are: leadership; system essentials; infrastructure; population; and fighting mechanisms. The picture below represents this in visual form:

![Five Rings Diagram](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Warden%27s_Five_Rings#mediaviewer/File:Warden%27s_Five_Rings.svg)

Warden writes that the enemy is like a system, therefore meaning that all of these parts are interconnected to some degree. The closer one strikes at the core, the more powerful and reverberating the attack will be. Hitting the system essentials, for example, will affect all of the circles outside of it, whereas harming the fielded military will keep the attack isolated to that ring only.

This concept is very important for both Unconventional Warfare and Color Revolutions, the two pillars of Hybrid Wars. When it comes to Unconventional Warfare, the fighting units seek to attack each of these circles, but there seems to be a preponderance of focus on the middle three (population, infrastructure, system essentials) out of convenience and effectiveness. Of course, attacking the fielded military or leadership does occur, but as for the former, the odds may be stacked against the Unconventional Warfare actors, and for the latter, it may be difficult to come across such an opportunity as a high-profile target.

The Five Rings look different when it comes to Color Revolutions, and there are two different sets of rings for each target: society and the individual. Society is targeted by the Color Revolution en masse after the decision has been made to

---


17 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Warden%27s_Five_Rings#mediaviewer/File:Warden%27s_Five_Rings.svg
initiate the destabilization. From the outer ring to the inner ring, the listings are on the right-hand side:

Society

Population
(International) Media
National Elites
Military/Police
Leadership

The goal of the activated Color Revolution is to seize power and overthrow a state's leadership. It is very effective in doing this, since it gathers the population into a swarm (a concept which will be described in Chapter Three) and has them overwhelm public institutions that represent the government. The massive outer ring thus comes together (or importantly, creates the impression of doing so) in order to strike directly at the inner ring, circumventing the rest. If the military/police come to the protection of the leadership core and are successful in repelling the offensive, then the stage for an Unconventional War is set, even if it is low-scale like the events in Ukraine (and not full-fledged like in Syria).

The elites are the third deepest ring because they have the power to influence the media and the populace but are usually unable to affect the military or police. International and national media have varying degrees of importance depending on the targeted state, but both do have an effect on the population. Anti-government (international) media may make the authorities uncomfortable and hesitant defending themselves from the Color Revolution coup attempt, but it is not the deciding factor in whether or not the government is overthrown.

The second target of the Color Revolution is the individual, and “the movement” attempts to poach as many of them as possible prior to the onset of the destabilization. These rings are different for each culture and age demographic, as there are many variances present within a targeted state. One of the myriad possibilities is below:

Adult Individual (Western)
In this example, the family is the core of the individual’s life, so if the information psy-op campaign can target this vulnerability in convincing the person to join the movement, then their odds are improved. Likewise, if the movement appeals to patriotic sentiments but the person or the majority of the population do not place a strong emphasis on this notion, then it will not be successful. This means that each Color Revolution must first gather data about their target demographic and then accordingly market itself to the most vulnerable core circle.

Chapter 1.2.4: The Indirect Approach and the OODA Loop

One of the defining characteristics of Fourth-Generation Warfare is that it is largely indirect. Be it through asymmetrical warfare or psy-ops, targets are not typically attacked directly. The whole concept of the indirect approach was institutionalized long before the advent of Fourth-Generation Warfare in 1954 by B. H. Liddell Hart. In “The Strategy of Indirect Approach”, he writes about the necessity of approaching targets via unexpected and indirect methods. His work includes the following except that summarizes this concept:

“In strategy the longest way round is apt to be the shortest way home. More and more clearly has the fact emerged that a direct approach to one’s mental object, or physical objective, along the ‘line of natural expectation’ for the opponent, has ever tended to, and usually produced negative results…the dislocation of the enemy’s psychological and physical balance has been the vital prelude to a successful attempt at [the enemy’s] overthrow…This dislocation has been produced by a strategic indirect approach, intentional or fortuitous. It may take varied forms…”

Color Revolutions are an indirect assault on the government of the targeted nation because no conventional outside forces are being utilized, and the same holds for Unconventional Warfare. Instead of sending an anti-establishment army directly into battle against the state or its military, Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare indirectly wage war by selectively targeting various parts of the Five Rings. This makes them amorphous and difficult to predict.

Unpredictability is the Achille’s Heel of John Boyd’s OODA Loop. Although initially conceptualized to assist fighter pilots, writer and strategist Robert Greene believes that the Loop is applicable to all fields of life as well. The idea is that decisions are made after the individual observes the situation, orients himself, decides, and then acts. The unpredictability associated with the indirect approach upsets the target’s OODA loop by disorienting them, thereby hampering their ability to make the right decisions and act properly. Color Revolutions disorient the police and military because their manifestations are purposely designed to appear unpredictable, and Unconventional Warfare by its very nature is endowed with this quality. On the other hand, when Color Revolutions try to appeal to future participants, they cater their message in as simple a way as possible in order to maximize the target’s OODA loop.

Chapter 1.2.5: Chaos Theory

One of the most applicable streams of thought for Hybrid Wars is Chaos Theory. Steven Mann wrote “Chaos Theory and Strategic Thought” in 1992 in an attempt to fuse these two seemingly disparate concepts. It must be said, however, that Mann’s understanding of chaos may be different than that of the reader’s. He views chaos as synonymous with “nonlinear dynamics” and applying to “systems with very large numbers of shifting parts” (e.g. society or war). Although it may seem disorderly, he argues, it is possible to sporadically see some semblance of patterned order among the chaos, especially in “weakly chaotic systems”.

He theorizes that chaos is dependent on a few initial variables, and that “once we arrive at an accurate description of our environment, we are in a position to create strategies which advance our interests.” These variables are the following:


* initial shape of the system
* underlying structure of the system
* cohesion among the actors
* conflict energy of the individual actors

They apply just as much for Color Revolutions as they do for Unconventional Warfare. For example, the initial shape of the social situation in the targeted country is just as important for a Color Revolution as the initial shape of the physical, military, and infrastructure situation is for Unconventional Warfare. The same goes for the other two variables.

Where things get extra interesting is when it comes to the last one, the conflict energy of the individual actors. Mann writes that “to change the conflict energy of peoples – to lessen it or direct it in ways favorable to our national security goals – we need to change the software. As hackers have shown, the most aggressive way to alter software is with a “virus”, and what is ideology but another name for a human software virus?” Although he wrote this in reference to what he calls America’s “democratic pluralism and respect for individual human rights”, it is applicable in many more contexts than that.

Simply put, depending on the civilizational/cultural code and the best way to penetrate the target citizenry’s social Five Rings, Color Revolutions can adapt their message to create their own custom “virus” for winning over converts. The virus “infects” individuals by working to change their political sentiment, and the idea is that once it finds one “victim”, this individual will then actively “spread” their new ideas to others, leading to a “political contagion”. This will be discussed more at length in Chapter Three and the creation of “swarms” via (social) network warfare, but it is important to at least mention that strategic facet at this moment due to its relevancy.

The incorporation of chaotic principles into Hybrid Wars is a defining aspect of Fourth-Generation Warfare. Also, due to their nonlinear nature, they are inherently indirect and (initially) unpredictable to the target, upending the OODA Loop that was discussed earlier. On a geopolitical level, chaos fulfils Brzezinski’s Eurasian Balkans concept, thereby showing that it can have an effect in International Relations as well as in sociology and military science. This makes chaos versatile and deeply extends the horizons of its applications.
When chaos is willingly unleashed in International Relations as part of a larger strategy, it has been termed “constructive”\(^{21}\), “creative”\(^{22}\), or “managed”\(^{23}\) chaos. This form of chaos has been used to describe the Arab Spring events (essentially theater-wide Color Revolutions, as in the Moscow Conference on International Security 2014 PowerPoints\(^{24}\)) and the externally and non-state-actor-driven destabilization in Syria and Iraq. At its core, **Hybrid War is managed chaos**. It begins as a virus that upends the social system of the targeted state, and if its swarms and pseudo-Unconventional Warfare vanguard (e.g. Pravy Sektor-esque individuals) cannot forcibly seize power or intimidate the government into stepping down on its own, then an actual Unconventional War is commenced. The final step, the commencement of Unconventional Warfare, is the new complementary contribution to Color Revolutions that creates Hybrid War. It was learned from the Color Revolution failures in Belarus, Uzbekistan, and other places where such coup attempts were initiated without any fallback (Unconventional Warfare) plan. Taken together as a unified package (as has been seen in Syria and to some degree in Ukraine), the ultimate aim of the Color Revolution and Unconventional Warfare combination (Hybrid Wars) is systemic chaos.

**Chapter 1.2.6: Lead From Behind**

In the Introduction, it was mentioned that certain international constraints limit the application of American force abroad. For example, the resurgence of Russia and its nuclear parity with the US makes it all but impossible for the Pentagon to launch a regime change-oriented invasion of Ukraine or Kazakhstan. The US has thus formulated the Lead From Behind policy to deal with such matters. This policy has been defined as “discreet U.S. military assistance with [others] doing the trumpeting”\(^{25}\). It is the new strategy of warfare for theaters where the US, for whatever reasons, is reluctant to directly militarily engage itself. It relies on using regional allies/leaders as proxies to further US geostrategic and geopolitical


goals via Fourth-Generation Warfare asymmetrical measures. Although originally conceived to describe America’s position relative to France and the UK in the Libyan War, Poland and Turkey can also be described as Lead From Behind allies in the destabilization of Ukraine and Syria. Whereas France and the UK fulfilled a more conventional combat role, Poland and Turkey, due to the sensitivities of the states they are helping to destabilize, proceed along more of a Fourth-Generation Warfare approach. For the argument of this book in proving the theory of Hybrid War, Lead From Behind should henceforth be taken to mean the Fourth-Generation Warfare approach of Poland and Turkey.

Conventional (forceful) regime change strategies (Panama, Afghanistan, Iraq) were possible in a unipolar world, but with the unipolar moment fading, the US has been compelled to revive the Lead From Behind template first flirted with during the Soviet-Afghan War. The first official indication that the US was moving towards this strategy was its behavior during the 2011 Libyan War, the first-ever use of the Lead From Behind moniker. This was followed by then-Secretary of Defense Robert Gates’ final speech that summer, in which he implored NATO allies to do more to assist the US in tackling global challenges. It thus became clear that the US was no longer as enthusiastic about “going it alone” as it had been before, nor does it seem willing to pose the ultimatum of “you are either with us or against us.”

The indication that American power is relatively slipping vis-à-vis the other Great Powers was formally seconded by the National Intelligence Council in late 2012. In its “Global Trends 2030” publication, it writes about how the US will be “first among equals” because “the unipolar moment is over, and Pax Americana -- the era of American ascendancy in international politics that began in 1945 -- is fast winding down.” Clearly, under such a competitive environment, aggressive unilateralism will be more difficult to deploy without risking collateral consequences. This further gave an added impulse to the Lead Form Behind strategy’s implementation into mainstream American military planning.
Finally, President Obama institutionalized the Lead From Behind template when he spoke at West Point at the end of May 2014. In his speech, he notably said that "America must lead on the world stage... but U.S. military action cannot be the only -- or even primary -- component of our leadership in every instance. Just because we have the best hammer does not mean that every problem is a nail." This has been interpreted as the US formally abandoning the unilateral "go it alone" doctrine except under exceptional circumstances. At this point, it is evident that the US has definitively displayed its intention to trade the world policeman post for the Lead From Behind mastermind mantle. Further illustrating this point, the theater-wide social and political transformation that the US envisioned with the Arab Spring could not have succeeded with unilateral action. Therefore, the year 2011 represents the official end of the unipolar moment and the beginning of the Lead From Behind era, which is in and of itself the US military’s adaptation to a multipolar world.

Lead From Behind has both Color Revolution and Unconventional Warfare applications, although it is more commonly used for the latter. Pertaining to Color Revolutions, the US leads from behind by manufacturing the entire destabilization and using its on-the-ground proxies to carry it out. Also, it is important for a pro-US government to abut a state undergoing the coup attempt in order to funnel material support to the organizers and participants. This state can also serve to pressure and intimidate the targeted government from utilizing its right to forcefully defend itself from the coup attempt, and under the "right scenarios", it could be a launching ground for the open military interference stage of the Adaptive Approach (even more so if it is a NATO member or close NATO partner). The US can also use its ally for funnelling the material necessary to transform the Color Revolution into an Unconventional War. As for the latter, which can be prominently witnessed in the case of Turkey and Jordan’s role to Syria, the US uses its Lead From Behind partners as training grounds for anti-government insurgents and conduits for arms shipments.

Chapter 1.2.7: Military Theories Summary

To summarize everything from this section, John Boyd proposed the idea of the Five Rings in order to conceptualize the best way to attack a foe. The more centralized the ring that is targeted, the more effective the attack due to its center of gravity. Boyd’s concept can transplanted from the military realm to the social for application with Color Revolution information campaigns. Depending on the civilization/culture, there are different rings for “marketing” the political concepts to both the general society and the specific individual demographic. With all of the rings, however, it is best to follow Liddel Hart’s indirect approach, which upsets the pivotal OODA Loop.

Perhaps the most important innovation in warfare and the most relevant for Hybrid Wars is Chaos Theory. The non-linear dynamics that Steven Mann describes are the epitome of Fourth-Generation Warfare, the current amorphous state of the field. By its nature, Chaos Theory seeks to exploit the seemingly unpredictable, thereby making it largely indirect and fully capable of neutralizing the OODA Loop. Constructive/creative/managed chaos occurs when there is an attempt to harness these forces for strategic purposes. Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare completely fit into this principle, thereby making them more effective than older and more traditional regime change tactics.

Finally, the US has pioneered a new strategy for waging war in the multipolar world, Lead From Behind. This allows the US to outsource its destabilization operations to like-minded regional allies if the objective is deemed too costly or politically sensitive for the US to directly and unilaterally pursue. It basically amounts to war by proxy, with the US managing its allies’ contributions to the effort from afar. This novel strategy is only but a few years old and is still developing, but the instance of Turkey and Jordan’s participation in the Syrian Crisis provides a strong template to follow for forecasting its future direction. Additionally, Poland helped fill a similar structural role during the EuroMaidan Coup, but since the regime change operation was successful in such a short period of time, its full potential in destabilizing its neighbor was not actualized.

Chapter 1.3.1: Full Spectrum Dominance

On 30 May, 2000, the Pentagon released a strategic document entitled “Joint Vision: 2020”36. It explicitly aims to achieve Full Spectrum Dominance, which it defines as being “Persuasive in peace; Decisive in war; Preeminent in any form of
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conflict”. The Department of Defense’s American Forces Press Service elaborates on this goal by adding that it is also “the ability of U.S. forces, operating alone or with allies, to defeat any adversary and control any situation across the range of military operations.” F. William Engdahl wrote a 2009 book about this topic, wherein he proves that the US’ main priority is to acquire full dominance over the spheres of the conventional military, nuclear weapons, human rights rhetoric and other norms, geopolitics, space, and communications. In a nutshell, this is everything and anything that can be weaponized or have some kind of significance on the battlefield or the consciousness of its actors, and Engdahl meticulously documents the steady progress that the Pentagon is making in controlling it and depriving its adversaries of this crucial advantage. He also outlines various methods, including Color Revolutions, that the US uses to try to control Russia and China.

Chapter 1.3.2: Full Spectrum Dominance and Color Revolutions

Engdahl’s book devotes an entire chapter to the phenomenon of Color Revolutions and how they are institutionally structured. He also provides a detailed overview of their history, use of NGOs as front organizations, and their deployment to secure American geostrategic energy interests. It is thus highly recommended that the reader reference his work to gain valuable insight into these aspects. Nonetheless, the book at hand explains the theoretical underpinnings of Color Revolutions and how they fit into a new niche of Full Spectrum Dominance strategy together with Unconventional Warfare, something that is not addressed in Engdahl’s work.

The mantra of Full Spectrum Dominance to be persuasive in peace, decisive in war, and preeminent in any form of conflict forms the backbone of Color Revolutions. To begin with, Color Revolutions begin as information campaigns targeting the affected population. They must be persuasive in order to reach as wide of an audience as possible (in some cases, it may be more strategic to only reach a certain demographic in order to have them ‘rise up’ and exacerbate existing ethnic fractures within society, for example). This is where the author’s variation of Warden’s Five Rings becomes relevant in effectively reaching various societies and individuals. Innuendo and insinuation may be utilized to present an indirect and effective approach to penetrating the rings, although this will be discussed more in Chapter Two.

The core of Color Revolutions boils down to social dominance. The movement is able to harness a sizeable enough amount of individuals to publicly confront the state and attempt to overthrow it. In order to gather the recruits, ideological, psychological, and information techniques are employed. Although it is preferred that the movement’s ideas are the dominant stream of thought, this does not have to be the case. Color Revolutions do not have to reach the majority of the population in the country or the capital to be successful. All that they have to be able to do is summon a large amount of people to create a public relations and security challenge for the defending government. The range of individuals needed to successfully carry out a Color Revolution can fluctuate depending on the country, the characteristics of its leadership, and the strength of the government and its security apparatus. Social dominance is achieved once this critical mass is deployed against the authorities and provides the chaotic challenge that the movement is aiming for. Color Revolutions thus try to gain dominance over such intangible aspects as society, ideology, psychology, and information.

Chapter 1.3.3: Full Spectrum Dominance and Unconventional Warfare

The Full Spectrum Dominance goals of Unconventional Warfare are more akin to conventional military objectives than those of Color Revolutions. The difference, however, is that Unconventional Warfare is more irregular, indirect, and non-linear than regular warfare, and therefore, it has certain limits in what it can and cannot dominate. Therefore, it is more appropriate to state that Unconventional Warfare’s goals in relation to Full Spectrum Dominance are to gain as much physical dominance as possible within the targeted state’s original Five Rings, short of using committed direct intervention from an outside state or metamorphosing into conventional warfare. In this way, Unconventional Warfare aspires for dominance over tangible aspects of the battlefield but not in the same manner that conventional war does.

This is not to say that Unconventional Warfare is inferior to conventional warfare in the realm of Full Spectrum Dominance, however. It is quite the contrary, as it actually holds some very important strategic advantages over it. For example, the targeted state’s conventional forces can never be entirely sure to what extent or for how long they can control and safeguard various territory or infrastructure from attack, thus fostering uncertainty over when and where to deploy their units. This in turn is used to affect the decision part of the OODA Loop, thereby obstructing decisive action and hindering its effectiveness.
Chapter 1.3.4: The Dominance of Chaotic Dynamics

Per the above two sections, it has been seen how Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare occupy a specific role in overall Full Spectrum Dominance strategy. In fact, they serve complementary purposes, as Color Revolutions seek intangible dominance and Unconventional Warfare is used to attain its tangible form. Both strategies are direct by-products of Fourth-Generation Warfare, and therefore, they have the seeds of chaos sown within them. It has earlier been explained that constructive/creative/managed chaos is one of the tools that can be used to propel certain foreign policy objectives or grand strategies (e.g. the Eurasian Balkans), so it is therefore appropriate that the US would also want to dominate it in the same manner that it does space, communications, etc.

This brings about the idea that Hybrid War, the combination of Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare, fits into the Full Spectrum Dominance paradigm by being the domination of chaotic dynamics. Those behind Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare control the initiative of their coup offensive, thereby placing the targeted state on the defensive. The chaos that comes with Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare spreads throughout the enemy “system” (as Warden views the opponent to be39) as a “virus” does a computer, per the logic of Mann, with the eventual hope that it will result in its full corruption and the need to initiate a “system reboot” (regime change) to remove the threat. Unconventional Warfare adds an element of nonstop fear to the equation, which works as a force multiplier in exacerbating the combined chaotic effect of the destabilizing regime change operation.

Chapter 1.3.5: Full Spectrum Dominance Summary

As part of the Pentagon’s official strategy, the US military has been working towards dominating every single facet of war-fighting capability that there is. Hybrid War presents itself as a unique hybrid package of intangible and tangible dominance over battlefield variables, which itself is manifested in a largely indirect way. All in all, it is paradoxically “structured chaos” (to the extent that it can be called that) which is being weaponized to achieve specific foreign policy ends. This makes it both a strategy and a weapon, doubling its effectiveness in proxy combat and equally destabilizing its target.

Chapter 1.4: Chapter Conclusion

As explained through the logical progression of geopolitical thought, certain determinants can approximate the wide field in which Hybrid Wars can be deployed. The most important geopolitical theory influencing Hybrid Wars is Brzezinski’s idea of the Eurasian Balkans. Since both concepts employ the use of directed chaos, they are mutually complementary. Therefore, if the Eurasian Balkans is the strategy, then Hybrid War is the tactic to achieve it. Military theories provide confirmation of the effectiveness of Hybrid War’s indirect war-fighting methods. They also show that it is heavily derived from Chaos Theory and may very well be its first patterned application. The Lead From Behind template is the new structure that the US is using to wage Hybrid Wars and destabilize the volatile Eurasian periphery via proxy conflict. Finally, the idea of Full Spectrum Dominance is the end objective of all US military planning and strategy. Hybrid War is a unique asymmetrical part of Full Spectrum Dominance that can be best summarized as the weaponization and attempted management of chaos. It is a new plane of warfare that transcends all others and incorporates them into its multifaceted being.
CHAPTER 2: COLOR REVOLUTION APPLICATION

Chapter 2.1.1: Introduction to Theory and Strategy

This section addresses the lens through which Color Revolutions should be viewed. It establishes the theoretical and strategic framework that supports this phenomenon, but unlike other works on this topic, it does not speak about the role of NGOs and international financing in bringing it about. Should the reader be interested in the organizational structure of CRs, it is recommended that they read the author’s briefing note on this topic available online.

The focus of this work is instead on how the ideas behind Color Revolutions are spread and the participants recruited. It is claimed that there is a heavy emphasis on psy-ops in reaching the specified targeted demographic(s), and that network warfare is the most effective way to disseminate the message. Some of the applications explored in that section are partially influenced by geopolitical analyst Leonid Savin’s “Coaching War” article, in which he presented his perspective in how they can be integrated into social systems. Additionally, the rise of social media provides a unique opportunity to infiltrate the minds of many unaware future participants, and it will be proven that the Pentagon is actively searching for ways to maximize this tool.

Chapter 2.1.2: “Propaganda” and “The Engineering of Consent”

The primary backbone for beginning and spreading a Color Revolution is information outreach among the population, be it a special demographic therein or society as a whole. Due to the dependency on disseminating a certain message (in the instance of Color Revolutions, one which encourages individuals to overthrow the government), it is absolutely necessary to discuss Edward Bernays’ famous 1928 work, “Propaganda.” As a result of this book and his life’s work, The New York Times recognized him as the “Father of Public Relations” and “leader in opinion making” in his obituary.

Public relations is largely a synthesis of marketing principles and mass population outreach, which both figure prominently in communicating a Color Revolution’s message, so it thus follows
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that “Propaganda” had an important influence on Color Revolutions. Although an entire book can be devoted to the connection between Bernays and Color Revolutions, for the sake of space, the current section will only highlight some relevant key concepts and will not focus on specific tactics.

Bernays believes that a small number of largely unseen individuals influence and guide how the masses think, and that this is the only way to keep a semblance of order in an otherwise chaotic society. He importantly writes the following:

“The systematic study of mass psychology revealed to students the potentialities of invisible government of society by manipulation of the motives which actuate man in the group... (which) has mental characteristics distinct from those of the individual, and is motivated by impulses and emotions which cannot be explained on the basis of what we know of individual psychology. So the question naturally arose: If we understand the mechanism and motives of the group mind, is it not possible to control and regiment the masses according to our will without their knowing it?”

This is the very basis of Color Revolutions. General and specific (in the context of the targeted civilization/culture) group psychology is studied in order to best exploit the methods for spreading anti-government messages. Here it is relevant to evoke the social and individual Five Rings model from Chapter One, as this helps conceptualize the broad outreach strategy of the Color Revolution movement’s public relations managers.

Bernays also writes that due to advances in instantaneous communication technologies (which have become even more pronounced in the current day with social media platforms such as Facebook and Twitter), “persons having the same ideas and interests may be associated and regimented for common action even though they live thousands of miles apart.” Not only that, but he soon adds that “This invisible, intertwining structure of groupings and associations is the mechanism by which democracy has organized its group mind and simplified its mass thinking.” Once more, this is exactly the case with Color Revolutions. They physically and virtually bring together disparate portions of the population that share (or are engineered to share) the same anti-government ideas, and this assists in organizing the group mind (or hive mind, as will be discussed later in this chapter) and simplifying the mass thinking of the society during the onset of the Color Revolution coup attempt.

The primary method that Bernays advocates for reaching infecting the masses with one’s outside ideas is the indirect approach (i.e. the social application of
Liddel Hart’s theory), which he expostulates upon in his 1947 essay “The Engineering of Consent.” He directs interested “engineers of consent” to begin painstaking research on their targets long before the onset of their multifaceted information campaign. This will allow them to get an understanding of the best way for approaching their audience. News must be artificially manufactured in order to make the marketing campaign more effective, and the involved events must be “imaginative” (i.e. non-linear). In relation to Color Revolutions, this would explain the variation in promotional stunts employed in each targeted state.

He ends his article on a note that is extremely relevant for all Color Revolutions:

“Words, sounds, and pictures accomplish little unless they are the tools of a soundly thought-out plan and carefully organized methods. If the plans are well formulated and the proper use is made of them, the ideas conveyed by the words will become part and parcel of the people themselves. When the public is convinced of the soundness of an idea, it will proceed to action...[which is] suggested by the idea itself, whether it is ideological, political, or social...but such results do not just happen...they can be accomplished principally by the engineering of consent.” (emphasis added)

It can thus be evidenced that Color Revolutions, like marketing or public relations campaigns, are not spontaneous and are manufactured well in advance of their deployment. Information outreach (“propaganda”) is at its core, and the anti-government ideas must be propagated in a coordinated fashion in order to engineer the consent of an appropriate (critical) amount of the population to participate in the Color Revolution. These individuals may not be cognizant of their larger role in the events that are unfolding, but they merely will be used as stand-ins to create the appearance of widespread support for the coup. They can also act as “human shields” in protecting the Color Revolution’s core members (e.g. the organizers themselves or Pravy Sektor-esque insurgents) from the state’s forceful methods at breaking up the coup attempt.

The main goal of the information campaign is for the target to internalize the ideas being presented and make them seem as though they arrived at the outside-directed conclusions on their own. The anti-government ideas must seem natural and not forced, thereby placing increased emphasis on the indirect approach in communicating them. If an individual thinks that they are being

manipulated by unseen forces, they will largely reject the message. If, however, this message can be internalized by an individual and they start spreading it among their trusted friends and associates who would never even think that this person is unwittingly under the influence of a foreign psy-op, then Mann’s “virus” enters society and starts spreading the Color Revolution’s ideas on its own. The next sections will speak about this more in-depth via the use of network warfare principles.

Chapter 2.1.3: Reverse Neocortical Warfare

Before moving onto the actual theories of network war, it is necessary to speak upon Richard Szafranski’s idea of neocortical warfare, which serves as a bridge between Bernays’ teachings and the upcoming theories. The author describes it as follows:

“Neocortical warfare is warfare that strives to control or shape the behavior of enemy organisms, but without destroying the organisms. It does this by influencing, even to the point of regulating, the consciousness, perceptions and will of the adversary’s leadership: the enemy’s neocortical system. In simple ways, neocortical warfare attempts to penetrate adversaries’ recurring and simultaneous cycles of “observation, orientation, decision and action.” In complex ways, it strives to present the adversary’s leaders—its collective brain—with perceptions, sensory and cognitive data designed to result in a narrow and controlled (or an overwhelmingly large and disorienting) range of calculations and evaluations. The product of these evaluations and calculations are adversary choices that correspond to our desired choices and the outcomes we desire. Influencing leaders to not fight is paramount.” (emphasis added)

Szafranski’s idea is to use information outreach techniques to indirectly alter the “collective brain” of the enemy’s leadership (i.e. the target) in order to influence them not to fight (i.e. change their conflict behavior). Therefore, the reverse of this neocortical warfare which is relevant for Color Revolutions is that it targets the mass population’s “collective brain”, not the leadership, and it aims at indirectly influencing them to agitate and attempt to overthrow the government, not stand down and remain passive.

The best way to do this, he writes, is to study the target’s values, culture, and worldview, and then to approach them via neuro-linguistic programming. This is because “neocortical warfare uses language, images and information to assault the mind…and change the will. It is prosecuted against our weaknesses or uses our strengths to weaken us in unexpected and imaginative ways.” This shows that it is inherently nonlinear and has elements of chaos built within it, further confirming the theory that Hybrid War is a weaponized version of Chaos Theory, with neocortical warfare being the weaponized version of Bernays’ teachings. Additionally, when it comes to neuro-linguistic programming and targeting the individual, one of the most effective contemporary ways of doing this is to utilize social media and the theories of network and network-centric warfare.

Chapter 2.1.4: Social Network-Centric Warfare

In 1998, Vice Admiral Arthur Cebrowski and John Garstka published their joint article on “Network-Centric Warfare: Its Origin and Future”46. Although dealing more with the technological hardware aspects of battle communications and strategies for their use, the theme of network-centric warfare is very pertinent to Color Revolutions when adapted to a social form. For example, Leonid Savin has drawn structural comparisons between the Arab Spring, the social application of network-centric warfare, and Chaos Theory47.

Returning back to the article at hand, the authors reference Metcalfe’s Law by saying that “the “power” of a network is proportional to the square number of nodes in the network. The “power” or “payoff” of network-centric computing comes from information-intensive interactions between very large numbers of heterogeneous computational nodes in the network”. They also write that “at the structural level, network-centric warfare requires an operational architecture with three critical elements: sensor grids and transaction (or engagement) grids hosted by a high-quality information backplane.”

Adapting this to human social networks, the nodes become the individuals participating in the Color Revolution and their aggregate “power” in carrying out the coup attempt increases as they interact, first via social networks and then in person after the Color Revolution is initiated. As for the sensor grid, this becomes the initial point of contact by which the individual is provided with the anti-
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government information. It could be virtual through computers and cell phones or physical through direct interaction with an NGO. The transaction or engagement grid is the catalyst for action, and in this comparison, it becomes social media networks that organize the Color Revolution participants and issue the call for action. Finally, the high-quality information backplane that supports the entire apparatus is the external information campaign influenced by Bernays’ teachings and made more effective by Szafranski’s neocortical warfare approach.

Chapter 2.1.5: Social Network War

John Arquilla and David Ronfeldt of the RAND Corporation published a book in 1996 titled “The Advent of Netwar”\(^{48}\). They posited that a new type of societal conflict was on the rise, where “leaderless” networks of primarily non-state actors will take advantage of the information revolution (i.e. the internet) to wage an amorphous low-intensity struggle against the establishment. They summarized this work in the first chapter for their 2001 book “Networks and Netwars”\(^{49}\), stating that the term itself:

> “refers to an emerging mode of conflict (and crime) at societal levels, short of traditional military warfare, in which the protagonists use network forms of organization and related doctrines, strategies, and technologies attuned to the information age. These protagonists are likely to consist of dispersed organizations, small groups, and individuals who communicate, coordinate, and conduct their campaigns in an internetted manner, often without a precise central command.”

In a clear verification of Bernays’ influence on this concept, they describe network wars as focusing on soft power, specifically “information operations” and “perception management”. Showing the contribution of Chaos Theory and Liddel Hart’s indirect approach, they write that this form of warfare is at the “less military, low-intensity, social end of the spectrum” because it is “more diffuse, dispersed, multidimensional nonlinear, and ambiguous”.

They identify three types of network formations:
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A chain network has a centralized command, the star version is compartmentalized and may form a cell within a larger network, and the all-channel network fits the model of “tactical decentralization”, which occurs when “the members do not have to resort to a hierarchy because “they know what they have to do.” This makes the individual units “all of one mind” and presents an extremely difficult challenge to counter because of the “blurring” between offensive and defensive actions. The authors write about how netwar “tends to defy and cut across standard boundaries, jurisdictions, and distinctions between state and society, public and private, war and peace, war and crime, civilian and military, police and military, and legal and illegal”. They attribute this somewhat to Szafranski’s neocortical warfare which was discussed in the above section, recognizing that it can “confound people’s fundamental beliefs about the nature of their culture, society, and government, partly to foment fear but perhaps mainly to disorient people and unhinge their perceptions”, which thus gives it “a strong social content”.

Hybrid War understands social network warfare in the same way as Arquilla and Ronfeldt, but it proposes a combination of the three types of network formations for Color Revolutions. The chain model is the first part of the Color Revolution movement’s network. It begins abroad with the decision to overthrow a noncompliant, strategically located government. This is the first step. After that, the decision is filtered down the administrative hierarchy until it gets to the planning node. At this stage, a star network begins. For example, the headquarters of various organizations (CIA, Pentagon) start brainstorming methods for carrying out their orders and they will then branch off to create or connect to “active nodes” to help fulfil them. From here, they may also latch on to institutional (think tank) stand-alone nodes that had earlier produced research about the prospects of regime change and/or publications about the socio-cultural-civilizational workings of the targeted country.
During the planning stage, the external organizers will then examine the existing all-channel networks that define the target’s social environment. This will allow them to better understand the interactions that govern society and its disparate groupings. Once the external organizers feel comfortable enough with the information they have learned, they will then attempt to penetrate the targeted society through either physical (on-the-ground) or virtual (internet) means. For the first category, this would be actual intelligence operatives on the ground whose goal is to assemble the Color Revolution movement, whereas for the second, this would be online contact with friendly sympathizers or dissidents (which may turn into physical contact). These individuals may or may not know that they are interacting with the intelligence services of another country, but what is important is that they are witting participants and organizers of the oncoming destabilization.

More than likely, a hybrid approach of the physical and virtual will be used. These individuals (on-the-ground intel operatives and/or entrenched sympathizers/dissidents) serve as the point-of-contact (POC) nodes that are tasked with creating their own star and all-channel network(s) via online social networks or physical NGOs. As more organizational leaders are recruited, new POC nodes communicating (whether cognizant of it or not) with the foreign intelligence agency will likely sprout up. The objective is to exponentially increase the number of nodes, per Metcalfe’s Law, to maximize the social network and electrify the coup movement’s social energy and momentum.

As can be seen, the model quickly becomes very complex, but nonetheless, as Mann wrote in “Chaos Theory and Strategic Thought”50, “patterns can be predicted in at least weakly chaotic systems”, and the above illustration is one such example. Using the conceptualized approach, one can see that the network takes on the appearance of molecules forming a biological cell. Continuing with
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the metaphor, just as the cell brings life to the organism, so too does the fully connected social network “cell” bring life to the CR.

The further removed that the all-channel networks get from the intelligence agency star network, the less likely it is that each individual “spoke on the wheel”, so to speak, realizes the origin of the movement, let alone that they and their participation are being exploited by a foreign intelligence agency. If everything is organized well enough and there is a fluid give-and-take of input and output (commands and feedback) moving throughout the entire network, then the active nodes within the targeted state become “all of one mind”. The tactical application of this in the context of CRs is something called “swarming”, and both authors wrote a book about this in 200051. Nevertheless, swarming will be addressed in-depth later in the chapter, as well as Hybrid Wars’ strategic interpretation of the “all of one mind” objective (the hive mind).

Chapter 2.1.6: Facebook Case Study

The social media platform Facebook provides what is likely the best case study of the abovementioned theories and strategies in action in a virtual environment.

Brett Van Niekerk and Manoj Maharaj wrote an article in 2012 for the International Journal of Communications about “Social Media and Information Conflict”52. In it, they state that Facebook has become synonymous with the user-generated Web 2.0. It has been used to organize large-scale protests and carry out influence operations all across the world. Since it deals with perception management and social engineering, it thus has utility as a psy-op tool. Additionally, the authors mention how intelligence organizations can find valuable information about potential targets through their Facebook and other social media profiles.

Such data mining is not new and nor should it come as a surprise. Facebook tracks, stores, and profiles its users’ likes and preferences in order to enhance its “targeted advertising”, and it has recently started accessing their browser history to assist with this as well53. Just as economics influenced the theory of network-centric warfare54, then it is proposed by the Hybrid War theory that so too has it
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influenced the Color Revolution application of social network war. Facebook users voluntarily create their own psychological profile through the information they willingly post, the likes they click, and the online friends and groups they associate with. Intelligence agencies can then use the phenomenon of Big Data to organize, filter, and track the macro-social profile of people in targeted countries to fine tune their outreach mechanisms there. This “targeted advertising” by the Color Revolution movement mirrors that of Facebook’s own, albeit for political purposes instead of economic ones. Such a theory may even justify the security explanations given by China and other countries for banning Facebook.

Intelligence organizations are not just passive users of social media, however, as they have been proven to actively engage this medium in social engineering operations. Niekerk and Maharaj document how the US military was using the Persona software to build ten sock puppet social media accounts per person, creating the “potential to significantly magnify the psychological influence a small group of covert operators can have on a broader audience”. Although the purpose of this was “to create a consensus favorable to the United States on controversial issues”, the authors suggest that it could also be used to “instigate popular protests and uprisings” (i.e. Color Revolutions).

Recent news stories suggest that instigating civil unrest and fostering a hive mind in targeted states is the true objective of the US government’s covert involvement in Facebook and other social media networks. RT reports that Facebook conducted secret psychological experiments on over half a million of its users in order “to study how emotional states are transmitted over the platform”\(^{55}\). The study was called “Experimental evidence of massive-scale emotional contagion through social networks” and concluded the same, namely that “emotions spread via contagion through a network”, thereby increasing the ability for an intelligence organization to socially engineer a hive mind (which will be discussed in the next section).

Ominously, it was shortly thereafter revealed that the secret Facebook research was linked via one of its authors and institutions to the Pentagon’s Minerva Research Initiative. This project provides funding to researchers who examine the connection between social media and civil unrest. The author in question, Jeffrey Hancock, describes himself on Cornell University’s webpage as being interested in the “psychological and interpersonal dynamics of social media, deception, and language” and had previously received money from Minerva to carry out such research as “Modeling Discourse and Social Dynamics in Authoritarian Regimes”.

and “Known Unknowns: Unconventional Strategic Shocks in Defense Strategy Development”. Cornell University previously cooperated with Minerva in predicting “the dynamics of social movement mobilization and contagions” and wanted “to foresee “the critical mass [tipping point]” of social unrest and upheaval by studying their “digital traces” from a number of recent events”.

As it turns out, the Pentagon’s Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) had spent millions of dollars in funding other similar research for its Social Media in Strategic Communications program (SMISC). RT’s article quotes DARPA’s website as saying that “through the program, DARPA seeks to develop tools to support the efforts of human operators to counter misinformation or deception campaigns with truthful information.” Considering that it had already been discussed how social media and online networks can be used for psy-ops, DARPA’s statement isn’t telling the entire truth. Instead of being used defensively, as DARPA makes it seem, its SMISC program can also be used offensively to infect its recipient audience with anti-government ideas via social media and network platforms such as Facebook. This can be used to foster a hive mind that can be manipulated to initiate large-scale civil unrest on cue, which, once it gets picked up by the international (Western) media, then becomes a “Color Revolution”.

Chapter 2.2.1: Swarming and the Hive Mind

It has been mentioned within the above sections that the grand purpose of foreign intelligence infiltration into social media networks is to create a hive mind. This hive mind can then have its members tactically swarm their target in a seemingly chaotic manner in order to disrupt its OODA loop and lead to its collapse. In the context of Hybrid War, this is the masses swarming the authorities’ symbolic and administrative centers of power as a unified (if decentralized) whole in order to lead to regime change by mob rule (i.e. organized and directed chaos).

Per the book’s research that has been thus far conducted, it has been demonstrated that hive minds can be engineered by foreign intelligence organizations via social media platforms and network war principles. The “public relations” techniques first advocated by Bernays are extensively put to use in the virtual and physical world in order to make this happen. The purpose is to

---

assemble as large of an amount of people as possible who have indirectly come to share the same anti-government convictions. Importantly, these individuals must also be “programmed” via reverse neocortical warfare into wanting to actively bring about this change when the decision to initiate the Color Revolution is made. Through these means, the disparate parts become “all of one mind” and can be deployed as a single unit.

This hive mind can also be termed collective consciousness or swarm intelligence, depending on whether it is passively or actively engaged. Collective consciousness is defined by Anna Piepmeyer from the University of Chicago as “the condition of the subject within the whole of society, and how any given individual comes to view herself as a part of any given group.” She goes on to elaborate that it is “the affect/effect upon and inside of any given public whose thoughts and actions are constantly mediated by outside pressures”, with Hybrid War taking these outside pressures to specifically mean the influence of foreign intelligence organizations dedicated towards fostering civil unrest aimed at regime change within a targeted state/society. Piepmeyer importantly finds that “collective consciousness is a term much needed by media theorists because it postulates one, if not the, effect of media—whose broadest primary function is to carry/transmit/interpret/reify messages/information from one site to another.” All of this conforms to Hybrid War’s understanding of the role of social media in artificially generating anti-government dissent.

The hive mind becomes active when its members participate in anti-government action, hence the transition to swarm intelligence. Gianni Di Caro of the University of Washington says that it is “a recent computational and behavioral metaphor...that originally took its inspiration from the biological examples provided by social insects (ants, termites, bees, wasps) and by swarming, flocking, herding behaviors in vertebrates.” The phrase “swarm intelligence” was first used to describe artificial intelligence that is modelled off of the behavior of certain insects, but it is also relevantly applicable to human beings operating within a social network. Arquilla and Ronfeldt wrote about this in 2000 when they published “Swarming and the Future of Conflict.” In their book, the network warfare pioneers describe the swarming method of warfare as such:

Swarming is seemingly amorphous, but it is a deliberately structured, coordinated, strategic way to strike from all directions, by means of a

---
sustainable pulsing of force and/or fire, close-in as well as from stand-off positions. It will work best—perhaps it will only work—if it is designed mainly around the deployment of myriad, small, dispersed, networked maneuver units (what we call “pods” organized in “clusters”).

They confidently assert that “the rise of advanced information operations will bring swarming to the fore, establishing a new pattern in conflict”. Furthermore, they argue that “nimble information operations (IO)—especially the part of IO that has to do with managing one’s own information flows—will be necessary if swarming is to take hold.” What this means is that Fourth-Generation Warfare, the information revolution, and network warfare all come together to form the swarming tactic, with this representing the epitome of weaponized Chaos Theory in a social form. Of course, it also has military applications, but these will be discussed in Chapter Three when the Unconventional Warfare pillar of Hybrid War is examined.

Chapter 2.2.2: Swarming and Color Revolutions

Bringing the focus back to Color Revolutions, Engdahl directly attributes swarming as the key tactic used to successfully bring about these events in his previously mentioned work, “Full Spectrum Dominance: Totalitarian Democracy in the New World Order”60. He sees networks and technology as being pivotal ingredients for swarming. Writing about the 2000 Bulldozer Revolution in Serbia, the first instance of a Color Revolution, he states that:

“The non-violent tactics that the Otpor! youth had been trained in were reportedly based on RAND corporation analyses of the warfare methods of Ghengis Kahn upgraded with modern networking technologies that connected people like swarming bees. Using GPS satellite images, special agents could direct their hand-picked, specially trained leaders on the ground to maneuver ‘spontaneous’ hit-and-run protests that always eluded the police or military.”

He continues by noticing that:

“What was new in the Belgrade coup against Milosevic was the use of the Internet – particularly its chat rooms, instant messaging, and blog sites – along with mobiles or cell phones, including SMS text-messaging. Using these high tech capabilities that had only emerged in the mid-1990s, a
handful of trained leaders could rapidly steer rebellious and suggestible ‘Generation X’ youth in and out of mass demonstrations at will.”

This observation provides validation of the fact that networks, organized and actively deployed using technological means, can evolve into swarming cells that destabilize society on the path to overthrowing targeted governments. This makes their tactics indirect and chaotic, undermining the authorities’ OODA Loop and giving the attacking swarms the strategic initiative. Nowadays, Google Maps, YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter are integral parts of the “armory” that Hybrid Warriors use, with the latter two specifically being crediting with helping bring about the Arab Spring events. Here’s how the theory of Hybrid Wars sees these four social platforms, all available on modern cell phones, as working together to chaotically destabilize society and assist with swarming:

Facebook is the portal to joining and advertising the Color Revolution movement. It recruits supporters and provides closed groups where anti-government activists can virtually meet and discuss their strategies. Once the decision is made to initiate the Color Revolution, Google Maps is used to plan protest routes, pinpoint public areas (typically parks) where activists can assemble beforehand, and identify the best places for the marching swarm to congregate (Maidan, in the case of Ukraine). During urban combat against the security services, Google Maps can quickly display escape routes for the fighters and help them strategize their attacks. This information, including spreading messages of any nature to all members of the movement, can be instantaneously transmitted via Twitter. Finally, activists can film the proceedings with their cell phones and upload movement-friendly (and potentially misleading and/or edited) videos to Youtube. They can then use the same or separate Twitter and Facebook accounts to advertise their videos on the internet in an attempt to get as many hits as possible. Hashtags help to organize the information for quick search retrieval and make it easier for Google and other search algorithms to pick up. One of the goals is to make the Color Revolution movement “go viral”, gaining it international (Western) exposure and thereby providing the opening for the US and other governments to issue public statements and diplomatically attempt to get involved in the sovereign affairs of an independent state amid supportive domestic public fanfare. Per the Adaptive Approach outlined in the Introduction, this can then eventually lead to a military operation, but it is important to recognize that this entire destabilization owes its genesis to the role of social media.

Chapter 2.3.1: The Tactics and Practice of Color Revolutions

This section discusses some of the Color Revolution tactics in practice. It provides the reader with knowledge about what physically happens on the streets once the Color Revolution starts.

Chapter 2.3.2: “The Machiavelli of Non-Violence”

Gene Sharp may be the individual most single-handedly responsible for the success of Color Revolutions. Deemed “the Machiavelli of non-violence”\(^{62}\), he has written extensively about how non-violent methods can be used to destabilize a government and undermine its authority. Believing himself to be on an epic quest to liberate people all across the world from what he views as dictatorship and autocracy\(^{63}\), Sharp has dedicated his life to creating innovative and disruptive non-violent techniques that Color Revolutionaries can use to great effect. His first notable work was “From Dictatorship to Democracy: A Conceptual Framework for Liberation”\(^{64}\), which Sharp states he was inspired to pen to overthrow the government of Myanmar in 1993. In it, he provides expert consultation on how to organize non-violent resistance groups aimed at toppling the government, and he also elaborates upon what he views as the institutional vulnerabilities of strong centralized governments (“dictatorships”). Former US Army Colonel Robert Helvey cooperated with Sharp and is even credited by him with forming the concept of “mass political defiance”. The information is too detailed and lengthy to be included within this work, and it is recommended that interested individuals skim Sharp’s book themselves to grasp the strategic scope of this work. Still, a few excerpts deserve to be highlighted:

“On some basic issues there should be no compromise. Only a shift in power relations in favor of the democrats can adequately safeguard the basic issues at stake. Such a shift will occur through struggle, not negotiations.”

“...withdrawal of popular and institutional cooperation with aggressors and dictators diminishes, and may sever, the availability of the sources of power on which all rulers depend. Without availability of those sources, the rulers’ power weakens and finally dissolves.”

---


“Nonviolent struggle is a much more complex and varied means of struggle than is violence. Instead, the struggle is fought by psychological, social, economic, and political weapons applied by the population and the institutions of the society.”

“Strategists need to remember that the conflict in which political defiance is applied is a constantly changing field of struggle with continuing interplay of moves and countermoves. Nothing is static.”

“Mass non-cooperation and defiance can so change social and political situations, especially power relationships, that the dictators’ ability to control the economic, social, and political processes of government and the society is in fact taken away.”

“The cumulative effect of well-conducted and successful political defiance campaigns is to strengthen the resistance and to establish and expand areas of the society where the dictatorship faces limits on its effective control.”

As can be seen from the above, “From Dictatorship to Democracy” is the manifesto and non-violent call to arms for Color Revolutionaries all across the world.

Chapter 2.3.3: The Color Revolution Field Manual

Capitalizing off of the decade-long success of “From Dictatorship to Democracy” and its widespread acceptance by subversive groups worldwide, Sharp wrote a follow-up text in 2003 entitled “There Are Realistic Alternatives”65. Whereas his first book was the manifesto and strategy, this one can be seen as the action plan and tactics since it outlined 198 specific methods of non-violent resistance66 that he thought of and/or saw in action previously. Most of them deal with conventional mass defiance techniques that should by now be well-known to Color Revolution observers:

1. Public Speeches
2. Slogans, caricatures, and symbols

Marches
47. Assemblies of protest or support
63. Social disobedience
124. Boycott of elections
131. Refusal to accept appointed officials
173. Nonviolent occupation
183. Nonviolent land seizure
198. Dual sovereignty and parallel government

Others are more innovative, to say the least:

12. Skywriting and earthwriting
22. Protest disrobing
30. Rude gestures
32. Taunting officials
44. Mock funerals
69. Collective disappearance
140. Hiding, escape, and false identities
158. Self-exposure to the elements
159. The fast
178. Guerrilla theater

These and more constitute the non-violent methods of resistance that Color Revolutionaries engage in, but one must be reminded that violent unconventional warfare actions (especially in the instance of the Syrian Crisis and EuroMaidan) are also commonly employed by urban insurgents in their crusade against the government. Most of the active methods that the Color Revolution’s members partake in, especially the violent ones, are made more effective by swarming.

The application of Sharp’s teachings can be seen in all of the Color Revolutions to date, and this was even observed by Engdahl. In what may not be a coincidence, the US government- and previously CIA-funded Voice of America quickly credited
Sharp with influencing the Arab Spring events on 5 June, 2011\textsuperscript{67}. Importantly, this wasn’t presented as an opinion, but rather as factual “news”. The Telegraph repeated this a month later\textsuperscript{68}, and then in September 2011, a documentary about his life and work called “How to Start a Revolution” was released, which also continued this story line\textsuperscript{69}. This narrative was then echoed in CNN\textsuperscript{70} and The New York Times\textsuperscript{71} the following year. Quite clearly, Western media wanted to trumpet the fact that Sharp’s writings have been very influential in the theater-wide Color Revolution nicknamed the “Arab Spring”.

To place everything into a geopolitical perspective, it is necessary to recall the Eurasian Balkans, Rimland, and Shatterbelt concepts from Chapter One. If placed on a map, the locations of the traditional Color Revolutions and the Arab Spring (which the 2014 Moscow Conference on International Security identified as a wave of Color Revolutions) correlate with these geopolitical theories. Therefore, Sharp’s writings have been successfully employed in some of the most politically volatile areas of the world to carry out chaotic destabilization and regime change. This further proves the ironic lethality that his “non-violent” methods have had for legitimate governments, to say nothing of the personal collateral damage that they have indirectly led to in Syria and Ukraine.

Chapter 2.4.1: Notable Color Revolution Practitioners

There are two notable US government employees who must be mentioned in regards to practicing Color Revolutions, John Tefft and Frank Archibald. These two individuals are strongly associated with this pillar of Hybrid War and their influence has been profound.

\textsuperscript{69} How to start a revolution. Dir. Ruaridh Arrow., Op. Cit.
Chapter 2.4.2: John Tefft

The first one is John Tefft, the new US Ambassador to Russia. Prior to his most recent position, he occupied a few prominent posts during key time periods. The Voice of Russia has detailed his history and reports that he was the Deputy Mission Chief at the US Embassy in Moscow from 1996 to 1999\(^72\), between the First and Second Chechen Wars. He then served as the US Ambassador to Lithuania between 2000 to 2003 as the country was preparing to join the EU and NATO in 2004. Afterwards he took a break from diplomacy and served for one year as the International Affairs Advisor at the National War College in Washington, DC. from 2003 to 2004. Returning to his job as an ambassador, he worked in Georgia from 2005 to 2009. This is exceptionally notable as it coincides with the 2008 Russian-Georgian War, and in the run-up to this, Georgia was an important US client state for arms imports\(^73\) and participation in the Afghanistan and Iraq Wars\(^74\).

Most relevant to the book, however, is Tefft’s assignment as the US Ambassador to Ukraine from 2009 to 2013. It was during this time that the Color Revolution against Viktor Yanukovich, who returned to office in 2010, was prepared. In the same article about Tefft’s history, the Voice of Russia asked Dmitry Polikanov, the Vice President of The PIR Center and Chairman of the Trialogue International Club, what he thought about the new US Ambassador to Russia. He said the following:

"On the one hand, Ambassador Tefft became notorious in Moscow for his deep involvement in the domestic affairs of Georgia and Ukraine. Many Russian officials will keep in mind some of his previous statements and his track record as an advisor to the “Orange Revolution,” and, hence, he will most likely enjoy very dry and formal communications. Moreover, while Michael McFaul was allegedly called one of the “theorists of change,” John Tefft was at the center of the practice of change in Georgia and Ukraine." (emphasis added)

This shows that Tefft could therefore be referred to as a practitioner of Color Revolution change in the former Soviet periphery, as he supported the Rose Government in Georgia during its war with Russia and helped to bring about the overthrow of Yanukovich. These two countries are important geopolitical


outposts of US influence near Russia’s borders (especially in light of the geopolitical contexts explored in Chapter One), thereby elevating Tefft’s importance even more. Additionally, considering the relatively rapid replacement of Russian influence in Ukraine with that of the US and NATO since the February Coup (with the important exception being the Crimean Reunification), he can be seen as having been very effective in carrying out his anti-Russian duties. More than likely, his appointment as the US Ambassador is the crowning reward for his history of intensive US foreign policy promotion in the former Soviet sphere. It may even be that he plans on organizing the necessary infrastructure for carrying out a future Color Revolution in Russia.

Chapter 2.4.3: Frank Archibald

Frank Archibald was the head of the CIA’s National Clandestine Service (NCS), the branch of the agency that is in charge of covert operations, until early 2015. These can range from anything from coups (Color Revolutions) to assassinations. Not much is known about Archibald besides a brief background of his history that was reported by Newsweek Magazine in October 2013, almost half a year after his appointment. It was in May 2013 that a former Washington Post reporter exposed Archibald’s identity as the new NCS leader on Twitter, and Newsweek’s article was meant to provide some vague background filler as to his career history. The most critical and relevant thing that was mentioned was that the Associated Press wrote that he was “a weapons man” during the Bosnian Civil War and he “once ran the covert action that helped remove Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic from power.” The importance of this cannot be overstated. When an expert in paramilitary campaigns and Color Revolutions, incidentally the individual who carried out the first successful one in history, is elevated to the top of the NCS, then any and all Color Revolutionary movements should rightfully be suspected of being CIA operations, as should any unconventional war that supports American interests. Archibald’s appointment also shows that such methods will likely become more widespread and commonly employed by the US than ever before.

Chapter 2.5: Chapter Conclusion

This chapter explored the theoretical genesis of Color Revolutionss and their modern-day application. It was evidenced that they owe their basic founding to the mass psychological techniques that Edward Bernays first put forth in “Propaganda”. This is due to the fact that Color Revolutions are first and foremost about proselytizing a certain message (e.g. anti-government) to a large audience,

and this is where Bernays’ teachings are most applicable. Importantly, this message is external in its origin and is designed to subvert the authority of the targeted government. It targets the individual’s psyche to motivate them to fight, giving it the characteristic of reverse neocortical warfare. On a large scale and aided by modern-day developments in information-communication technology, this becomes network-centric and network warfare. The goal is to get as large a number of people as possible to enter into the Color Revolution movement’s social network and spread the idea in the same manner as a virus spreads its infection across a biological or technological system.

The US military and private technology firms (in the book’s specific case study, Facebook) have joined forces to maximize the effect of social network warfare in the 21st century. The goal is to create a hive mind of countless individuals who are dedicated to the anti-government crusade and become “all of one mind”. The hive can then be manipulated into tactical swarming attacks that are the manifestation of weaponized Chaos Theory and are extremely difficult for the authorities to prepare for and repel. The methods of Gene Sharp are heavily utilized during this swarming stage and they provide innovative ways for the swarm to destabilize society. This patterned approach has been seen in every Color Revolution and during the theater-wide Color Revolution known as the “Arab Spring”. Furthermore, the age of Color Revolutions is far from over, as two of the most prominent practitioners have been promoted to some of the most important positions in the US government. John Tefft, the mastermind of EuroMaidan, is now the US Ambassador to Russia, and Frank Archibald, a former CIA “weapons man” in Bosnia and the engineer of the first-ever successful Color Revolution in Serbia in 2000, was in charge of the CIA’s NCS from late 2013-early 2015. All of this combines to prove that the world has only just begun to experience the Hybrid War revolution in military strategy.
CHAPTER 3: UNCONVENTIONAL WARFARE

APPLICATION

Chapter 3.1: What is Unconventional Warfare?

Before beginning the chapter, it is important to define exactly what Unconventional Warfare is and how it is understood within this book. Lieutenant Colonel Brian Petit, writing for “Special Warfare”, the official quarterly publication of the United States Army John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School, defines Unconventional Warfare as such:

““activities conducted to enable a resistance movement or insurgency to coerce, disrupt or overthrow a government or occupying power by operating through or with an underground, auxiliary and guerrilla force in a denied area.” [Unconventional Warfare] is not a mechanism for creating revolutionary conditions — rather, it seizes on and supports existing political, military and social infrastructure to accelerate, stimulate and support decisive action based on calculated political gain and U.S. national interests.”76

It is important to highlight the last part of Petit’s Unconventional Warfare description. Unconventional Warfare does not just happen by itself; instead, it is the continuation of an already existing conflict within society, and the role of Unconventional Warfare is to assist the anti-government movement operating within this conflict to overthrow the authorities. Hybrid War theorizes that the existing conflict in question is an externally manufactured Color Revolution, and that Unconventional Warfare can be covertly initiated almost immediately after the Color Revolution begins in order to act as a force multiplier. The Unconventional Warfare campaign builds in intensity until the targeted government is overthrown. If the Color Revolution fails, however, then Unconventional Warfare openly morphs into its insurgency stage and begins emphasizing extreme lethality in its methods. Unconventional Warfare basically grows out of a Color Revolution, which in itself is a strategically planted seed to justify the growth of the “democratic liberation struggle”, as it is commonly and misleadingly painted in the Western media.

Within this book, Unconventional Warfare is also meant to be any nonconventional form of warfare, including guerrilla fighting, urban insurgency,

sabotage, and terrorism (irregular warfare). It specifically includes nonconventional combatants such as mercenaries and other non-state actors, as well as uniformed special forces operatives. It is not composed of tanks, standard conscripts, and clear-cut battle lines, making it extremely non-linear and chaotic, and it often attacks the enemy in an indirect way. It is to the tangible what Color Revolutions are to the intangible, which is weaponized and directed chaos with the intent to fulfill regime change.

Chapter 3.2: History and Advantages

The US has a long history of engaging in Unconventional Warfare campaigns. The Office for Strategic Services, the precursor to the CIA, was active in India, Myanmar, and China in fomenting anti-Japanese guerrilla movements during World War II77. During the Cold War, the CIA took the lead in trying to overthrow more than 50 national governments78, although the US only admitted to seven of its successes79. Some of these attempts involved Unconventional Warfare, such as the CIA’s covert war to train Tibetan paramilitaries to fight against the Chinese communists80. The US’ employment of Unconventional Warfare strategies saw a huge surge during the 1980s with the Reagan Doctrine81, when Washington supported violent anti-communist insurgencies in Angola, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, and Nicaragua. The successful simultaneous handling of so many unconventional wars all across the world gave the US priceless experience in perfecting this strategy, which is currently being practiced in Syria.

Unconventional Warfare has certain perks that make it an attractive instrument for achieving foreign policy goals. Firstly, it is a strategy of indirect regime change, and it can be useful for targeted states where the US, for whatever reason (political, military, the orientation of the international system, etc.), cannot directly intervene in the same fashion as it did in Iraq in 2003, for example. Additionally, because it amounts to an indirect proxy war, the US is absolved of direct culpability for whatever actions (including war crimes) its parties carry out during the conflict. Supporting proxy groups is also cheaper and more economic

than sending in the conventional US military. If the Unconventional Warfare operation is successful, then the US can accomplish for a fraction of the cost the same goal that an expensive conventional intervention would have brought. Finally, Unconventional Warfare is the perfect example of weaponized chaos, and as such, it gives the practitioner the strategic initiative during the conflict.

Chapter 3.3: The Rise of Non-State Actors and Special Forces

The end of the Cold War led to a dramatic change in actors influencing the international environment. During the 1990s, the role of non-state actors rapidly increased as that of nation states decreased\(^2\). Jahangir Arasli of the Dubai-based Institute of Near East and Gulf Military Analysis writes that the end of the Cold War resulted in the "emergence of a multiple and diverse pool of violent and defiant Non-State Actors, empowered by the globalization impact and diminishing role of states, and enabled by radical ideologies, access to finance and open-source technologies", leading to the prevalence of asymmetric warfare in 21\(^{st}\)-century conflicts. For the sake of understanding, asymmetric warfare and Unconventional Warfare are interchangeable within this book.

Besides anti-government movements, some of the most influential non-state actors that have risen to global notoriety are terrorists and mercenaries. The reader should already be familiar with the contributions of terrorism to international relations, as the 9/11 attacks served as the pretext for the US’ Global War on Terrorism and its offensive military involvement all across the world. The influence of mercenaries, however, has been more subdued and has largely evaded the public eye. Nicolai Due-Gundersen writes for Small Wars Journal that private military companies and private security contractors (the legal institutions selling mercenary services) saw an explosive growth after the Cold War\(^3\). As the 2007 Blackwater Baghdad Shooting illustrates\(^4\), these groups can occasionally act rampantly and partake in massive carnage. Besides this incident, however, scant public attention has been paid to mercenary companies, although


they are actively being employed in two of the world’s most significant conflicts, Syria and Ukraine.

In both conflict zones, all three abovementioned categories of non-state actors (anti-government movements, terrorists, and mercenaries) have been patched together into the same network. In Syria, the anti-government agitators that initiated the Color Revolution attempt fight for the same regime change goals as international terrorists (and in many cases have become one and the same) and openly employ fighters whose salaries are bankrolled by foreign governments. The situation looks somewhat different in Ukraine, but the pattern is the same. Some of the EuroMaidan members were reportedly trained in Poland prior to the destabilization, and the movement’s violent activity was coordinated by the ultra-extreme but highly effective Pravy Sektor, which became known for its terrorist tactic of throwing explosive devices at law enforcement officers. The connection between Color Revolutions, Unconventional Warfare, US regime change objectives, and non-state actors provides yet more proof confirming the Hybrid War theory.

To top it off, the US is gradually moving away from its dependence on bulky conventional forces and is transitioning towards a more lean and mobile military that places heavy emphasis on special forces. This is part of the fundamental shift that is related to the Lead From Behind strategy. The Pentagon is actually reducing the army to pre-World War II levels while pumping more resources into bolstering its special forces and intelligence capabilities and employing

---

ever more private military companies. Thus, the US is placing itself in a position where it can more effectively wage Hybrid Wars in the future.

Chapter 3.4.1: Unconventional Warfare Strategy

Unconventional Warfare, like its social Color Revolution counterpart, follows certain strategies in order to maximize its regime change efforts. The following subsections will review the military theories that had been previously discussed, adapting them for the specialities of Unconventional Warfare.

Chapter 3.4.2: The Five Rings

Warden’s Five Rings form the foundation of all Unconventional Warfare strategy. In fact, they are more directly applicable for Unconventional Warfare than Color Revolution because the concept can be used in its pure form without any modification. Insurgent and guerrilla groups are well-suited for attacking the system essentials, infrastructure, and population of a society without notice and then dispersing back into the citizenry or countryside. They can blur the differentiating line between civilian and militant, making them even harder for the authorities to detect and thereby allowing themselves to get closer to their intended targets. Unconventional Warfare practitioners can be “everywhere and nowhere” at once, meaning that they can theoretically pose a simultaneous threat to every one of the five rings.

As was earlier stated, the inner three rings are the most convenient to be attacked as the unconventional warriors are generally not properly suited to directly confront the military on frequent occasions, nor do they have many opportunities to strike at military or political leaders. Battles with the military most certainly occur when the Unconventional Warfare group tries to gain and hold territory, but this is not its speciality and is more along the lines of conventional warfare, and although they may not have many chances to attack the establishment’s leaders, they can, however, terrorize civilian leaders to great effect.

---
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Chapter 3.4.3: The Indirect Approach and the OODA Loop

The indirect approach occupies an important place within Unconventional Warfare doctrine. By the way that the US commands Unconventional Warfare, it utilizes non-state actor proxy forces to do its bidding in select states, meaning that there is an added degree of indirect influence being undertaken. Other states are able to directly carry out Unconventional Warfare under certain circumstances, but in the context of this book, that is not the case. Rather, states are on the defensive end of an Unconventional Warfare waged by non-state actors “led from behind” by the US.

Most of the time, the direct Unconventional Warfare practitioners, by the very nature of the tactics they are employing, do not have the conventional capabilities of achieving their objectives directly. For example, they may not be able to march columns of soldiers into a city before attacking it. What they can do, however, is infiltrate their members into the city’s civilian population and then “activate” them from within when the time is appropriate. Such a strategy was employed by the communists prior to the 1968 Tet Offensive\textsuperscript{96} with resounding success. Alternatively, instead of launching a conventional attack to destroy critical infrastructure such as power plants, terrorist attacks can be utilized to knock them out of commission instead\textsuperscript{97}. As opposed to powerlessly dictating concessions from the authorities, the anti-government movement can ambush police officers and hold dozens of them hostage\textsuperscript{98} in order to ratchet up the pressure and increase the chances of securing their political demands.

All in all, there are a near infinite number of ways in which the Unconventional Warfare practitioners can go about an indirect way in advancing their objectives. What is integral to remember is that Unconventional Warfare is indirect warfare. They are one and the same and cannot be separated from one another. Although Unconventional Warfare does at times incorporate conventional methods, it is primarily unconventional to the core. It is nonlinear, dynamic, and chaotic, presenting an ever-changing mix of tactics that is designed to throw the authorities off balance. As was mentioned in Chapter One, this approach disrupts the target’s OODA loop and either results in rash, poorly planned responses or critically delays proper responses to the point where they lose their effectiveness.

The indirect approach (Unconventional Warfare) is thus a means towards neutralizing the OODA Loop and paralyzing the defender, thereby leaving them open to a variety of attacks that may not otherwise be possible to pull off.

Chapter 3.4.4: Network War and Swarming

Unconventional Warfare also exploits the phenomena of network war and swarming. As regards the former, it capitalizes off of social network outreach to recruit its fighters and spread its message. This can take the form of ISIL using Twitter to gain new converts and advertise its exploits\(^\text{99}\) or Pravy Sektor encouraging Chechen terrorists to join forces with them and carry out attacks inside Russia\(^\text{100}\). So effective has ISIL been at utilizing social media, for example, that the head of Dutch Intelligence said that it has created a “terror swarm” driven by the “horizontal communication” between its members\(^\text{101}\).

Unconventional Warfare groups can also cull their members from the networks that have already been established by the Color Revolution movement. Those distraught with the progress of the Color Revolution may be tempted or convinced to join the militants bearing arms against the government, which illustrates how a direct continuum may emerge between the individuals active in the Color Revolution and those fighting in the Unconventional War. Such a transition between Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare is one of the main themes of Hybrid War and must be kept in mind by the reader throughout the entire book.

Pertaining to swarming, this is one of the key tactics utilized by Unconventional Warfare groups. Colonel Alan Campen writes about this in his 2001 article “Swarming Attacks Challenge Western Way of War”\(^\text{102}\). He clearly describes it as follows:

---


“Swarming engagements are characterized by pulsing attacks from all quarters by an often inferior but elusive opponent. They are successful because of tactical elements such as limited objectives, adequate weaponry and communications, terrain-tailored tactics and superior situational awareness. This enables defeat, in detail, of forces that never could have been overcome by mass or maneuver. The synergy of these elements is held by some analysts to be a consistent factor in both the tactical and the strategic application of swarming—past, present and our post-Cold-War future as well. None of these elements necessarily demands cutting-edge technology. Any can be synthesized into a particularly effective tactic to confront a modern mechanized army in low-intensity conflict and unconventional warfare.”

He also references Maj. Gen. Robert Scales, Jr., who remarks that it is a way for “adaptive enemies [to] achieve victory by avoiding defeat”. This is the very essence of Unconventional Warfare’s application of the swarming model. The tactical objective is to improvise attacks in an indirect and unpredictable way, taking advantage of the strategic initiative and confusing the enemy. The alternation between swarming and dispersal (“pulsing”) can keep the offensive ongoing for longer than if it were carried out head-on, and simultaneously switching targets among the Five Rings can further throw the enemy’s command into chaos. The Unconventional War does not succeed in the traditional military way (i.e. the destruction of the enemy’s units); it succeeds by disrupting the enemy and keeping them continually off balance until the prime opportunity for a decisive strike presents itself. So long as the Unconventional War’s members can continually avoid defeat, to paraphrase Scales, victory can eventually be achieved, hence why Unconventional Warfare may be a long and drawn out process that lasts many more years than conventional conflicts.

Chapter 3.4.5: Chaos Theory

Unconventional Warfare, like Color Revolutions, boils down to the weaponization of Chaos Theory. Unconventional Warfare attacks the physical instruments of the state during its campaign and goes about this indirectly and via a nonlinear approach, as was previously discussed. Chaos is increased from the time of the Color Revolution by the presence of armed groups dedicated to overthrowing the state. This enhances the fear factor permeating society and contributes to more all-around uncertainty, with the end goal of overwhelming the OODA Loop and paralyzing the enemy.
If society and the state can be visualized as a fortified turtle, then Unconventional Warfare and Chaos Theory flips that turtle on its back, effectively paralyzing it, and exposes its vulnerable underbelly to devastating attacks which would not have been possible otherwise. Once on its back, the turtle is quickly killed. The same holds true for society and the state – if Unconventional Warfare can throw them into such chaotic turbulence that they “flip on their back”, then the coup can proceed at lightning speed and will likely succeed. Such was the case with Unconventional Warfare during the EuroMaidan coup. The non-state-actor-directed violence (small-scale Unconventional Warfare) reached such a pique that it threw the Yanukovich government off its bearings and allowed for the strategic slipups that culminated in the 21 February coup after the hastily signed resolution agreement.

Chapter 3.5.1: The Unconventional Warfare Field Manual

Just as Color Revolutions have their field manual in Gene Sharp’s writings, so too does Unconventional Warfare have its own through the US Army’s “Special Forces Unconventional Warfare” classified training document103. The document, also known as TC 18-01, was leaked by a whistleblower and eventually published on NSNBC International’s webpage in early 2012. The news outlet noted that TC 18-01 provides a “systematic, step by step development of the insurgency and attempted subversion of the Syrian Government” due to its detailed instructions for how to provoke and organize an armed uprising.

Besides providing tactical advice for how to run the Unconventional War, the document also includes an overview of the US’ official attitude towards this strategy. It states that there are two forms of Unconventional Warfare – one in which the US is anticipated to eventually officially intervene (“general war scenario”) and the other in which this is not likely (“limited war scenario”). The former may have applied to the Syrian Crisis, especially prior to the August 2013 Chemical Weapons Incident and subsequent diplomatic aftershocks, whereas the latter most likely was the scenario for Ukraine. General war scenarios are conducted in order to prepare the battlefield for the introduction of a conventional US intervention or divert enemy forces, whereas the limited war

scenario understands the institutional constraints and merely seeks to pressure an adversary to various degrees (up to and including regime change).

For example, the handbook lists the European and Pacific World War II theaters and Iraq from 2002-2003 as instances of general war scenarios involving an Unconventional Warfare precursor, while Tibet from 1955 to 1965 and Afghanistan in the 1980s are occurrences of Unconventional Warfare with limited US involvement. It is this category which will be explored more thoroughly in the proceeding paragraphs, as it follows the theory originally put forth in the Introduction – “the closer that US destabilization operations get towards their targeted cores (Russia, Iran, China), the lower the probability of direct warfare and the higher the chances that indirect means (Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare) will be applied.” Adapted for the information that was just learned from TC 18-01, this can be held to mean that regime change operations in Russia’s sphere of influence (e.g. Ukraine) are conducted via the “limited war scenario” for Unconventional Warfare that precludes the intervention of conventional US forces.

Chapter 3.5.2: Preparing for the Unconventional War

When preparing for an Unconventional War in a targeted state, the US typically carries out a feasibility study to ascertain the probability of the operation’s success. It can do this either by meeting with anti-government representatives that travel to the US or a third-party country or by directly sending a military expert into the field. Once the decision is made for an eventual Unconventional War, the US can “render support though a coalition partner or a third-country location” when “overt U.S. support for a resistance movement is...undesirable” (the Lead From Behind strategy).

Blending the lessons discussed from the previous chapter about Color Revolutions with Unconventional Warfare, the manual speaks about “Information activities that increase dissatisfaction with the hostile regime or occupier and portray the resistance as a viable alternative [as] important components of the resistance effort” and notes that “these activities can increase support for the resistance through persuasive messages that generate sympathy among populations.” Moreover, TC 18-01 speaks about how military information support operations (MISO) can do the following:

* Determine key psychological factors in the operational environment.
* Identify actions with psychological effects that can create, change, or reinforce desired behaviors in identified target groups or individuals.

* Shape popular perceptions to support Unconventional Warfare objectives.

* Counter enemy misinformation and disinformation that can undermine the Unconventional Warfare mission.

As is seen, advance psychological and sociological research helps Unconventional Warfare campaigns craft the appropriate plans and succeed, just as it does Color Revolutions, and the intangible art of perception management plays an integral part in this.

The success of Unconventional Warfare is determined by seven key variables: leadership; ideology; objectives; environment and geography (including social); external support; phasing and timing; and organization and operational patterns. All of these factors can be modified except for the environment and geography. It is important that everything is in order before the commencement of the Unconventional War, because as Steven Mann wrote when speaking about chaos theory and strategic thought, “such “chaotic” systems (note: Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare) exhibit sensitive dependence upon initial conditions; a slight change in any of the initial inputs leads to disproportionately divergent outcomes.” If the timing of the Color Revolution (and by extension, the subsequent Unconventional War) is not correct, then the entire endeavor can prove to be a failure, much as the attempted regime change operations in Belarus and Uzbekistan came to be. This brings about the necessity of further exploring the phasing and timing of UW.

Chapter 3.5.3: Waging the Unconventional War

The phasing and timing of Unconventional Warfare can be broken down into three stages; the latent or incipient phase; guerrilla warfare; and war of movement. The first stage is very important and directly deals with the above paragraph about crafting ideal initial conditions. The reader should also by now be able to identify the overlap between Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare psy-ops outlined within the document:

“During this phase, the leadership of the resistance develops the clandestine supporting infrastructure upon which all future effort will rely. The resistance organization uses a variety of subversive techniques to prepare the population psychologically to resist. Some techniques include propaganda, demonstrations, boycotts, and sabotage. Subversive activities
frequently occur in an organized pattern without any major outbreak of armed violence...the goal is to prepare or transition the population into accepting overt military operations (guerrilla warfare) as permissible. The goal is to gain the support of the local population and weaken the power of the existing government. Although the operational goal is to win popular support, the tactical goal is to convince the local population to avoid collaboration with the government forces.”

This incipient phase also deals with the overt and clandestine resistance. The first one comprises the fighters who will directly wage war against the government, whereas the second are individuals and groups that secretly carry out political action, disseminate propaganda, conduct espionage, engage in sabotage, traffic contraband, and gather intelligence to help the anti-government movement. These entities can proactively be cultivated during the initial organizing stage of the Color Revolution.

The next stage, guerrilla warfare, requires an external event to help set it in motion and propel it throughout the population with the necessary momentum. It is stated as a matter of fact that in order for the Unconventional War to successfully begin and recruit as many people as possible, “there must be a spark that triggers insurrection,” such as a catalyzing event that ignites popular support against the government power and a dynamic insurgent leadership that is able to exploit the situation” (emphasis added). This “spark”, as it is so aptly called, is identified by Hybrid War theory as being a Color Revolution, and in conjunction with the networks that it builds up prior to its onset, it galvanizes strategic segments of the population against the authorities and increases the inertia working towards regime change.

Once the insurrection has been triggered (be it the failure of the Color Revolution, the provoking of the authorities into forcibly defending themselves, etc.), then the transition to guerrilla warfare can commence. This can take place either in urban or rural areas. Ukraine only experienced small-scale urban guerrilla warfare during EuroMaidan, but Syria is currently still undergoing both intensive urban and rural guerrilla combat. As the manual writes, “The objective of this phase is to degrade the government’s security apparatus (the military and police elements of national power) to the point where the government is susceptible to defeat.” This can occur by an increase in sabotage, strategic attacks against the government forces and infrastructure, strategic communication outreach targeted at the general population (i.e. an expansion of the information infrastructure created for the Color Revolution), and the proliferation of the anti-government movement’s intelligence apparatus. The idea is to set the stage for the third and final phase, a war of movement.
This stage is the height of the Unconventional War and was not seen in Ukraine. It will later be argued, however, that the EuroMaidan revolutionaries were preparing for this stage, but as a result of the “turtle flipping on its back” on 21 February, the coup was able to be carried out without resorting to this method. Anyhow, TC 18-01 describes the objective of the war of movement as “[bringing] about the collapse of the established government (military or internal actions)...the insurgency does not necessarily need to transform into a conventional military, but it must position itself to defeat the government or occupying power. For example, the insurgency might degrade the enemy’s capabilities to a point that an urban uprising against the presidential palace would topple the government. This tactic can only succeed if the insurgency effectively removes the military first.”

It is coined a “war of movement” because the anti-government insurgents are making strides against the government in “liberating” people and territory which must then be administered. The fighters are “on the move”, so to speak, and they are actively working to overthrow the government. At this point, they may even combine conventional methods and seized weapons into their repertoire in their attempt to bring the revolution to a close. If it is beaten back, however, the war of movement may revert to a guerrilla war until it recuperates its physical strength and is able to launch the counteroffensive necessary to return the conflict to its heightened stage.

Chapter 3.6: Unconventional War in Ukraine

The characteristics of the Unconventional War in Syria should by now be common knowledge to observers of international relations and current events, and it therefore is not seen as necessary to repeat these facts. What is not well known, however, is the Unconventional Warfare that was being prepared for and was partially implemented in Ukraine. Contrary to commonly held public opinion, Ukraine experienced not only a Color Revolution, but also elements of Unconventional War during the EuroMaidan destabilization. Since Unconventional Warfare was described throughout this chapter, the reader now has a fresh and appropriate enough understanding of this topic to be guided through key underreported events from EuroMaidan that clearly illustrate the Unconventional War in its early preparatory stages.

Unlike previous Color Revolutions, the recent one in Ukraine was violent almost from the get-go, and this shows the tactical influence of the Arab Spring Color Revolutions over the events in the country. The first thing to recall is the terrorist-like tactics of Pravy Sektor and other armed urban insurgents during the EuroMaidan riots, when they began throwing Molotov cocktails at law
enforcement bodies on 1 December\textsuperscript{105}, ten days after the original protests began. This militancy quickly became the norm, as the armed groups used their makeshift camps on Maidan as headquarters for launching continued volleys at the authorities throughout the destabilization. Eventually, nearly all of the participants in Maidan became militarized anti-government insurgents. Photographer Tom Jamieson, who ventured into the fray to visually document the homemade weapons used by the “protesters”, remarked that “Every single person without fail had a club or a bat or something like that...it was crazy.”\textsuperscript{106} Thus, it can be ascertained that a vanguard of violent subversives willing to actively fight against the government, one of the necessary preconditions for Unconventional War, had been established in the core of the capital.

Even so, this development, as well as the rising militancy of the EuroMaidan movement, had been observed and broadcast by some elements of the news media\textsuperscript{107}. What did not receive as much attention, however, was the seizure of the Lvov administrative building by armed protesters and the forced resignation of that region’s governor in late January 2013\textsuperscript{108}. A few days after this, ABC News casually reports, “All the local government offices in largely pro-opposition western Ukraine - except for the Transcarpathia region – [were] occupied.”\textsuperscript{109} The situation remained tense but static until the run-up to the 21 February coup. In an extremely rapid series of events, the government of Lvov Oblast declared independence on 19 February\textsuperscript{110} in conjunction with the seizure of a border crossing with NATO-state Poland\textsuperscript{111}. That same day, Reuters reports that some of the police there were robbed of their body armor as cars were torched, the main police station was set ablaze in Ternopol Oblast, and one of the headquarters of the state security service was attacked in Khmelnitsky Oblast, in what the news


organization reported as a “rampage”\textsuperscript{112}. The blockading and effective neutralizing of the Interior Ministry’s western region command by violent “protesters” a few days earlier\textsuperscript{113} likely prevented the state from stopping the orgy of violence that surged through the area that day.

It is of the utmost significance that the declaration of independence and anti-government rampage took place in the western region of Lvov. Formerly known as Galicia, this is the cradle of Ukrainian nationalism and it crucially borders Poland, a NATO state. It was earlier mentioned that “a coalition partner or a third country location” can funnel aid to the insurgents during an Unconventional War, and with Poland fulfilling this simple criteria, it is very possible that the plan was for it to become the “Slavic Turkey” of NATO destabilization vis-à-vis Ukraine in the same manner that Turkey has been to Syria\textsuperscript{114}. The proclamation of independence by Lvov, the border crossing takeover, the seizure of “army units and arms depots” by the insurgents\textsuperscript{115}, and the de-facto elimination of central control over the western region all clearly and evidently point to the beginning of an Unconventional Warfare campaign.

In fact, the situation had become so dire by that time that Newsweek Magazine published an article on 20 February called “Ukraine: Heading for Civil War”\textsuperscript{116}. It notes that “What’s clear is that much of the country has become ungovernable. Even the capital remains in the hands of the rebels”. Interestingly, this is the first major instance of a Western news publication referring to the insurgents as “rebels”, further supporting the theory that an Unconventional Warfare scenario was being hatched for Ukraine. Nonetheless, this scenario was avoided after the suspicious and lethal sniper fire that began a few days before (to which the Estonian Foreign Minister strongly believed had been ordered by the leaders of EuroMaidan themselves\textsuperscript{117}) broke the OODA Loop and will of the government and quickly led to the coup events of 21 February. Had this not occurred, though, it is very likely that an Unconventional War was on the verge of being officially rolled

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{114}{Korybko, Andrew. "Poland as the 'Slavic Turkey' of NATO Destabilization.". Oriental Review, Op. Cit.
\end{footnotes}
out in Ukraine à la Syria to force regime change onto the country and further destabilize Russia’s vulnerable western flank.

**Chapter 3.7: Chapter Conclusion**

In closing, Unconventional Warfare comprises the second and final pillar of Hybrid War theory. It seamlessly evolves out of the Color Revolution that precedes it and builds upon its established network of connected individuals. Just like Color Revolutions, Unconventional Warfare follows a certain patterns of military and strategic theory in working towards its ultimate goal of regime change. The leaked TC 18-01 document proves the dependence of Unconventional Warfare on social and information networks in order to succeed. It also provides the most authoritative and detailed description to date about how Unconventional Warfare is planned and managed. After perusing the document and researching underreported news prior to Yanukovich’s overthrow, one can see clear shades of Unconventional War in Ukraine’s recent EuroMaidan coup. This builds on the previous evidence that has been discussed to fulfill the argument that Unconventional Warfare is the second, more lethal stage of regime change that begins with a Color Revolution. Additionally, both Syria and Ukraine have now experienced this exact same patterned approach, showing that it is transferable to different theaters. Chapter Four will thus tie up any remaining loose ends between the two cases and finish the process of connecting Color Revolutions with Unconventional Wars in the framework of a unified Hybrid War theory.
CHAPTER 4: THE BRIDGE

Chapter 4.1: Introduction

This chapter can be seen as the “glue” that sticks the entire Hybrid War theory together. It brings together all that was previously been learned about Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare in order to bridge together any remaining gaps between the two and prove that there is a seamless transition in strategic thought in moving from one to the other. This will demonstrate that there is an intentional, patterned approach, a “method behind the madness”, if one will, that when taken together as a unified package becomes Hybrid War. To get to this point, comparative analysis will thus predominate the chapter.

Chapter 4.2: Geopolitical Relationship

Both pillars of Hybrid War have a direct relation to geopolitics. Chapter One introduced the idea of Brzezinksi’s Eurasian Balkans, which basically amounts to the implementation of Chaos Theory in international relations. The purpose is to engage in de-facto or de-jure strategic state fracturing to destabilize the Eurasian Great Powers (Russia, China, Iran) and prolong American primacy over the supercontinent. The targeted state is broken up and neutralized, with social and physical “scorched earth” tactics employed to keep it in a collapsed or near-collapsed state long after the destabilization campaign has concluded. The result is a geopolitical Black Hole, with the intention being that the chaos-driven gravitational pull can suck in neighboring states (the indirect, albeit true, targets of the destabilization campaign).

Whether they get politically or physically involved, the effect is the same – the indirectly affected state must now urgently deal in some way or another with the asymmetric threat of a pseudo-failed state on its border, and the opportunity costs in doing so deprive it of the strategic initiative in other geopolitical domains. In fact, in the “best case” scenario for American strategic planners, the Black Hole is not contained and actually expands into the neighboring state (the true target, as has been discussed), thereby indirectly destabilizing it on behalf of the US and unleashing uncontrollable chaos (the strongest, most “natural” form that there is) that threatens to rip it apart and retire the targeted Great Power from the geopolitical game.

The most efficient way to actualize the Eurasian Balkans grand strategy is via the indirect approach of Color Revolutions and Unconventional Wars. As was mentioned in the Introduction, the movement towards multipolarity has placed
certain restrictions on the US’ ability to directly intervene in Eurasia at will, thereby increasing the attractiveness and necessity of indirect methods. One need only to recall the attractiveness and necessity of indirect methods. One need only to recall the theory introduced at this time to see the pattern: “the closer that US destabilization operations get towards their targeted cores (Russia, Iran, China), the lower the probability of direct warfare and the higher the chances that indirect means (Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare) will be applied.” Accordingly, when one considers the chaotic nature encoded in the DNA of Color Revolutions and Unconventional Wars, they thus become the most perfect indirect tools for constructing the Eurasian Balkans. No other strategies can lead to the same degree of constructive/creative/managed chaos that these two can.

Chapter 4.3: The Field Manuals

Color Revolutions and Unconventional Wars each have their own field manuals, written by Gene Sharp and the US Army, respectively. These authoritative texts provide the practitioners of each method with the strategic and tactical guidance necessary for successfully realizing their grand objectives. Gene Sharp focuses on the overall mindset of the Color Revolution movement and its supporters, as well as providing advice for how to motivate on-the-fence individuals to rebel against their governments. The larger idea is to assemble a network of activists and passive supporters that will enable the movement to succeed once it officially starts to engage in the coup attempt. Once these individuals have been assembled, Sharp then recommends 198 methods of non-violent resistance that they can carry out. These are designed with various goals in mind, be they to confuse the authorities, damage their legitimacy, enact economic hardships against them, generate favorable international media coverage, or so on and so forth.

TC 18-01, the Army manual for Unconventional Warfare, also speaks about the necessity of establishing supportive social networks, but it obviously places more emphasis on preparing for military operations and violence against the state. Regardless, the social backbone of the Unconventional Warfare is still identified as very important to its success, and Hybrid War theorizes that if the population can first become aware of and supportive of Sharp’s writings while preparing for their Color Revolution, then the odds of Unconventional Warfare generating the necessary popular support for its oncoming operations will dramatically increase. Through this logic, the works of Gene Sharp can actually be seen as laying the psychological ground for the eventual introduction of Unconventional Warfare in situations where the Color Revolution does not succeed. After all, TC 18-01
emphasizes that a feasibility study must first be undertaken prior to the onset of Unconventional War, and should the population already be largely indoctrinated with an anti-government bias and ready to sacrifice and take on the hardships associated with armed insurrection against the state, then operational planning can move forward.

Therefore, Gene Sharp’s publications can be seen as “Part I” of the Hybrid War field manual, with TC 18-01 and other related Unconventional Warfare writings serving as “Part II”. It is the hope that this book can serve as “Part III”, in that it bridges the gap between both pillars and unifies their strategies into an integrated and workable theory of warfare.

Chapter 4.4: Shared Strategies

Color Revolutions and Unconventional Wars share the same strategies and are different sides of the same regime change coin. Both methods seek to overthrow governments that are unfavorable or noncompliant to the US and its foreign policy goals, with a Color Revolution being the soft coup and Unconventional Warfare being the hard one. As was discussed above, another goal is to create constructive chaos to accompany the US’ advance deeper into Eurasia. The eventual goal is to encircle and neutralize the Eurasian Great Powers with a noose of pro-American governments and Black Holes.

Both Color Revolutions and Unconventional Wars accomplish this through the use of proxy actors. Color Revolutions exploit political and social proxies in order to disrupt the social fabric of the targeted state, whereas Unconventional Wars use military proxies to physically sever the connection between all elements of society. The transition from Color Revolution to Unconventional War is also a transition from intangible war to tangible war. Both stages use widespread virtual and physical networks (Lead From Behind) and rely heavily on psy-ops and perception management techniques.

As regards military strategy, the two pillars of Hybrid War adhere to the same concepts. They are both manifestations of Fourth-Generation Warfare in that they are nonlinear, indirect, and dynamic. They each target their respective Five Rings in order to pursue their goals. The indirect approach is definitive for each model and contributes to the disruption of the OODA Loop, and they both use their own version of swarming. Finally, all of this means that they are examples of weaponized Chaos Theory, with Unconventional Wars being a more violent, intensive, and all-encompassing form of Color Revolutions.
Chapter 4.5: Side-By-Side Comparison

Before concluding this brief chapter, it is now appropriate to conduct a side-by-side comparison of some of the major characteristics of Color Revolutions and Unconventional Wars. This will illustrate how Unconventional Warfare grows out of and is the seamless evolution of a Color Revolution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color Revolutions</th>
<th>Unconventional War</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* limited violence</td>
<td>* all-out violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* urban</td>
<td>* urban and rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* social</td>
<td>* mostly physical, some social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* chaos against the authorities</td>
<td>* chaos against everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* cheaper</td>
<td>* more expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* social networks</td>
<td>* physical networks (builds off of previously established social networks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* divides society’s social links</td>
<td>* divides all links in society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter 4.6: Archibald Crosses the Rubicon

The most definitive proof physically linking together Color Revolutions and Unconventional Wars in US grand strategy is the 2013 appointment of Frank Archibald to lead the NCS. It was mentioned in Chapter Two that Archibald worked as a “weapons man” in Bosnia and ran the first-ever successful Color Revolution in Serbia. This means that his career has been littered with extensive hands-on experience conducting Unconventional Wars and Color Revolutions. The very presence of such an individual in commanding the CIA’s special operations should ring alarm bells all across the foreign intelligence community. Through his appointment, the US is signalling that it has crossed the Rubicon and that there is no going back from Hybrid War. Archibald has the skill set necessary to link together Color Revolutions and Unconventional Wars into a unified and patterned approach. Of course, this was already being experimented with in Syria beginning in 2011 and most recently in Ukraine starting at the end of 2013, but with Archibald having led the NCS for a 15-month stint, this strategy is expected to have been perfected, standardized, and packaged for deployment in forthcoming theaters across the world.
CONCLUSION

Conclusion 5.1: Limited Forecast

It is difficult to forecast the exact direction of Hybrid War into the future, owing to the fact that it is such a recent phenomenon and is still being constructed. Notwithstanding that, a few vague forecasts can still be made as to its worldwide implementation.

As it currently stands, the US is the only country currently engaging in Hybrid War. Russia has only tangentially recognized this new development in May 2014 at the Moscow Conference on International Security. It still does not understand what it is witnessing and is struggling to make sense of it all. The Chinese and Iranians have not officially responded to the findings of Conference, but as with Russia, they too are existentially affected by its findings. It may thus take at least half a decade for any other country to adequately understand Hybrid War to the point of being able to defend against it, let alone practice it on its own.

Hybrid War is such that it is counterproductive for any of the Eurasian Powers to attempt it in their region. This is because the creation of Black Holes of instability and chaos near their borders, no matter what the intent, would inadvertently be fulfilling the US’ grand strategic objectives. Rather, it may be that if a Eurasian Power can garner the necessary soft power and social networking ability to penetrate the societies of the Western Hemisphere, Europe, or Africa (which may likely take years to do in each case), then they could theoretically safely attempt Hybrid War without fear of any negative blowback to their interests. Nonetheless, it still remains to be seen whether these necessary intangible preconditions can be created outside of the civilizational space of each Eurasian Power, thereby strongly decreasing the likelihood that they will practice Hybrid War within the next decade or two, if at all.

Conclusion 5.2: General Recommendations

It is anticipated that the US will exercise a full monopoly on Hybrid War for at least the next decade, if not in perpetuity owing to the unique international circumstances in which it is waged. Therefore, it becomes critical for the Eurasian Powers to craft appropriate defensive strategies to pre-empt Hybrid War from even starting, or if it does, to lessen the impact and prevent the chaotic swarms from inflicting crippling damage and overthrowing the state. As with any defensive strategy, it is impossible to fully protect oneself from the innovative initiatives launched by the aggressive side, but in the interest of security, it is
necessary to at least brainstorm some methods that could be utilized, even if they are not perfect or yet fully developed.

The strongest deterrent to Hybrid War is the establishment of civilizational safeguards. By this, it is meant that if the members of society largely feel themselves to be part of “something greater than themselves” and if they identify their government as corresponding to this larger supranational concept, then they will be less likely to engage in subversive activity against it. In fact, the strong promotion of patriotic (in the sense of national or civilizational) ideas by the state and its affiliated NGOs can lead to the eventual creation of a pro-government hive mind that can engage in counter swarms against any anti-establishment insurgents. It is important that the ideology, if one will, is inclusive and can bring together the varied social, ethnic, religious, and economic demographics residing within the state, much in the same way that subversive ideas of “liberal democracy” can unite the myriad groupings of a targeted state (even if only temporarily) in the common goal of overthrowing their “undemocratic” government.

As an added precaution, it is also recommended that national internets be established. This is not to be confused with censorship, as it merely seeks to make sure that the state can monitor the internet and identify the origin of certain information that enters the country. Of course, this is extremely ambitious and very difficult to implement, and in some cases (e.g. China), this can take the form of actual censorship and blacklisting. For the Russian application and as regards its soft power objectives in the world, it is not recommended that such measures be taken. Instead, there should be a strong push by the state to encourage the “nationalization” of social media and the internet by its citizens. The promotion of the “Runet” would bolster the country’s civilizational identity and, to a degree, decrease the direct influence of subversive Western and American information campaigns. The end goal is to pursue social and information autarky, whereby the reliance on Western mediums for these two is strictly and voluntarily avoided by the majority of the populace.

**Conclusion 5.3: Concluding Thoughts**

The aim of the book was to prove the existence of Hybrid War, the indirect adaptive approach to regime change that combines Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare into a unified strategy. Geopolitics dictates US strategy in this regard and identifies future targets, while Hybrid War tactically carries out the plans and unleashes weaponized chaos. It abides by several primary military
theories in order to result in the dominance of chaotic dynamics. Effective information outreach campaigns and the construction of social networks over a period of time can lead to the development of a hive mind of anti-government activists. These individuals can then be guided via the teachings of Gene Sharp into strategic swarms that work to overwhelm the authorities and initiate a soft coup. Should the Color Revolution fail in overthrowing the government, then the transition to Unconventional Warfare occurs, whereby the social infrastructure of the Color Revolution becomes the foundation of the violent campaign being waged by the anti-government movement. It is at this point that the hard coup commences and all elements of the state are thrown into strategically engineered chaos.

As has been argued throughout this book, Hybrid War is the new horizon of US regime change strategy. It incubates the US from the political and military risks associated with direct intervention and it is much more cost-efficient. It indirectly uses a hodgepodge of proxy groups to accomplish for Washington what half a million US soldiers may not be able to directly do. It is thus extremely attractive to American decision makers as their country reluctantly lurches towards multipolarity, and the successful multi-theater implementation of Hybrid War could actually reverse this process and refresh the unipolar moment for an undetermined amount of time. Therefore, it is conclusively in the interests of multipolar-oriented states to master their understanding of Hybrid War in order to effectively craft strategies to neutralize its successful application across the Eurasian supercontinent and prevent the return of unipolarity.
APPENDIX I: AN EXPOSE OF THE CORE COLOR REVOLUTION MECHANICS

Purpose:

Color Revolutions are one of the newest models of state destabilization. They allow external actors to plead plausible deniability when accused of illegally interfering in the domestic affairs of a sovereign state, and their mass mobilization of ‘people power’ renders them highly effective in the eyes of the global media. Additionally, the conglomerate of large numbers of civilians protesting the government also increases pressure on that said government and limits its options in effectively dealing with the ongoing destabilization. All Color Revolutions closely follow the same template, and understanding the nature of this applied tactic of destabilization will allow states to craft suitable countermeasures against it.

I Model

Color Revolutions are formed through a complex interaction of many factors, however, they can be subdivided into several primary infrastructural categories:

- Ideology
- Finance
- Social
- Training
- Information
- Media

These factors interact with one another in a specific way in a five-tiered hierarchy:
The interplay of the above factors creates a Movement (m) that combines with two other variables in order to produce a Color Revolution:

- ‘The Event’ (e)
- Physical Infrastructure (p)

The resultant formula for a Color Revolution (R) is as follows:

\[ m + e + p = R \]

The following chapters of the exposition will definitely detail what these variables are, as well as explain the interaction between them.

II Description of Variables

This section will detail the specific contributing factors that define each of the variables.

1. Ideology

Ideology is the central focus of any change within the world, and it is the guiding idea that motivates all of the other factors affecting a Color Revolution. Without
ideology, everything that follows is empty and devoid of meaning and purpose. The traditional ideology motivating all Color Revolutions is Liberal Democracy, and it seeks to ‘free’ targeted states from perceived anti-Liberal Democratic (non-Western) governments.

Liberal Democracy, in its current post-modern manifestation, is expansionist and aggressive. It is not content with alternative ideological and value systems and must steamroll over them in its pursuit of global dominance. Besides waging direct war against societies resisting its advance (i.e. Serbia, Libya), Liberal Democratic states (the West) have learned to pursue other methods of defeating targeted states. These methods are less direct than outright war, but no less efficient. The ideological penetration of a society eventually embodies itself in a physical outburst inside the state itself, guided by a segment of the state’s own citizenry. The state (and society as a whole) must combat a part of itself that is ‘rising up’ against the status quo, leading to a conflict of interest and a social civil war. Depending upon the level of provocation that the pro-Liberal Democratic protesters initiate, as well as instances of mismanagement by the state in dealing with this social uprising, the social civil war may eventually turn violent and briefly resemble an actual civil war. This is especially so if the protesters have been armed by forces outside of the country, and if they decide to attack the security services tasked with dispersing the Color Revolution’s physical manifestations.

Ideology is thus the initiator of all Color Revolutions. It presents an opposite form of development for a domestic society, and it motivates sympathetic segments of the population to engage in tangible demonstrations to demand change. It will later be seen that the vast majority of these active protesters may not even be aware that their activities are being orchestrated by a higher power (NGO, foreign government). Rather, most of them, as a result of a heavy-handed information campaign promoting the destabilizing ideology, have truly been led to believe that their actions are spontaneous and ‘natural’, and that they represent the inevitable ‘progress’ that all areas of the world are bound to experience sooner or later. The ideology of the individual over the collective (the social aspect of Liberal-Democracy) empowers each and every protester to feel that they are making a unique and significant impact in bringing about this change.
2. Finance

Any ideology needs to have a financial infrastructure in order to facilitate its permeation of a society. Money lubricates society and provides additional means for spreading influence. Unless there is a strong level of pre-existing support for the penetrating ideology within the targeted country, then the initial capital will likely come from abroad (the host state[s] promoting the ideology). This was the case with the first wave of Color Revolutions and the Arab Spring. Foreign financial backers provided the capital needed to keep the fledgling Movements growing in their early stages. Even if the outside ideological influence builds its own social infrastructure of sorts without resorting to financial means, that social variable will be severely limited in its outreach and effectiveness if it does not have a solid financial basis backing its promotional activities and training.

Finance is the backbone of the entire Color Revolution. It transforms the ideas of the social Movement into tangible action (physical infrastructure), and it provides a ‘nest’ for ideological nurturing. Such nests are various pro-democracy and human rights (as defined by the West) institutions and organizations. Most commonly, they may misleadingly be referred to as NGOs, even if they do have a direct link to a foreign government or elements of the institutional political opposition. Such institutions and centers need money in order to operate, and this brings about the critical importance of having a financial infrastructure in place.

The financial infrastructure must continuously pump money into its endeavors, as any halt (however brief) will directly affect the effectiveness of its on-the-ground and cyber operations. Grants from established institutions and foreign governments can provide the initial start-up capital to create a domestic penetrating institution/organization within the targeted state, but in the future, proper training will teach activists how to raise funds on their own. Fundraising works to provide a certain level of financial self-sufficiency that achieves three aims:

1) Limit the negative impact that any halt in foreign financing would create

2) Create a domestic financial network that can evade the watchful government eye over international money transfers and the illegal smuggling of cash between borders
3) Entrench the institution/organization even further into domestic society through fundraising outreach activities

Finance allows the Color Revolution to firmly establish itself in society, as well as disseminate its ideas throughout. The more finance, the greater the number of institutions/organizations and the people that they employ. Taken in combination with Social Infrastructure, it is directly supported by Ideology.

3. Social

This type of infrastructure deals with the actual people that are involved in the Color Revolution, and it is defined through institutions/organizations. It is the Revolution’s direct engine of engagement. Prior to ‘The Event’, this can be divided into three levels:

1) Core (Vanguard)
2) Cohorts (Workers)
3) Civilians (Sympathizers)

‘The Event’ leads to all three of these levels coalescing into a singular unit, thereby giving the Color Revolution the impression of being a unified grassroots initiative. It is argued that the Social Infrastructure is very hierarchical, and that a small cabal of vanguard individuals controls the entire Movement. This fact is usually lost not only on the outside observer, but also among the civilian sympathizers as well, however, it is extremely important to acknowledge and understand in order to comprehend the organization of the Social Infrastructure.

3a) Core

These individuals are the vanguard of the Color Revolution. They are the people who control the institutions/organizations that are set in bringing about the Liberal-Democratic change. They are highly trained and maintain direct contact with the external patron (ideological and/or financial). The core constitutes a small amount of activists who are dedicated to the cause. In the sense that they are dead-set against the existing status quo and actively seek to disrupt it, they can be defined as ‘ideological extremists’. They are the most powerful people within the targeted country, and when the decision is made to initiate the Color Revolution, they may either prominently deliver motivating speeches to the
public in favor of it, or they may continue their shadow role in organizing the Movement. The capture or compromise of a Core individual severely offsets the organizational effectiveness of the Color Revolution.

3b) Cohorts

These people comprise the workers that are positioned below the Core. They carry out administrative or recruiting tasks under the employ of the institution/organization. The Cohorts are the ‘face’ of the organization that most civilians will initially come into contact with. They also perform most of the work for the institution/organization, thereby making them the labor backbone. Cohorts are dedicated to the cause, but they have yet to prove their absolute loyalty and enter into the elite Core. All Cohorts aspire to enter the Core, hence their dedicated activism and public demonstrations in favor of their ideology. Seeing as how the individual Cohort is not as integral to the Movement as a Core member is, they are easily disposable and replaced by the organization if need be (i.e. they are ordered into provocative publicized actions and subsequently arrested). A large number of Cohorts are powerful and valuable to the institution/organization, a single Cohort is nothing more than a pawn.

3c) Civilians

The Civilians are the regular citizens who the Cohorts come into contact with. They enter into the Social Infrastructure only when they become sympathizers to the cause. Civilians may or may not enter into the Physical Infrastructure (i.e. participate in marches of solidarity with the Color Revolution), but when they do, they provide a valuable soft power advantage. Media footage of thousands of civilians partaking in a Color Revolution rally may influence other civilians to also take part in such activities. As with the Cohorts, a single Civilian is a pawn, but large amounts of them are a ‘weapon’.

In terms of influence, the pattern is thus:

Core > Cohorts > Civilians

In terms of numbers, the pattern is reversed:

Civilians > Cohorts > Core
As the Social Infrastructure builds upon itself and adds new members, it will also increase the funds available to the institution/organization through the Cohorts’ fundraising activities.

4. Training

Training is indispensible to any Color Revolution, as it forms the third part of the Unholy Triangle (to be explained later). This level of infrastructure enhances the capabilities of its Finance, Social, and Information counterparts:

Finance: Cohorts learn fundraising techniques

Social: Cohorts learn how to successfully conduct outreach activities to increase their ranks and gather more Civilian sympathizers.

Information: Cohorts learn how to create better websites, craft more effective promotional materials, and exploit social media

Training can either take place within the country or outside. The Core may be trained outside, whereas the Cohorts will likely be trained inside the country by the Core. It is important for the institution/organization to establish plausible deniability in terms of foreign involvement otherwise their domestic operations will be discredited. This makes it more probable that the elite Core may do the traveling, while the many Cohorts remain within the country for their training.

Training can either be in-person or virtual. In the event that it dangerous or suspicious for the Core to leave the country for training, it will be conducted via the internet. However, the most effective training occurs in person, and online ‘tutorials’ are no substitute for face-to-face interaction between the Core and their sponsors. It may occur that the sponsors send a training representative into the target country to conduct training under such circumstances, although such a move is risky for the sponsor. If caught red-handed, both the sponsor and the institute/organization will lose credibility among the domestic audience, thereby mitigating many of their previous gains.

An institution/organization without effective training is incomplete, handicapped, and incapable of reaching its full potential.
5. Information

This level of infrastructure deals with ideological dissemination, and it is extremely important in assisting with Social Infrastructure recruitment (Cohorts and Civilians). It has two primary elements:

- Social Media
- Propaganda Materials

These elements are explained below.

5a) Social Media

Social Media is exploited to spread the Ideology and create a Social Network, which in turn will either turn into Cohorts of Civilian sympathizers. Effective Social Media outreach by the institution/organization will further the Color Revolution by immeasurable bounds. Civilians will use the Social Media outlets to keep in touch with news and developments about the Movement, and it will pose a challenge to the official media outlets supporting the governmental establishment. In this way, successful Social Media skills have the end goal of creating an alternative information outlet.

5b) Propaganda Materials

Propaganda Materials are integral in furthering the cause of the Movement and making it appear larger than it is. Graffiti, leaflets strewn across side streets and posted on buildings, and catchy slogans, logos, and colors can spread the Movement throughout the public psyche on a new non-stop basis. It reminds even those Civilians that are not sympathizers of the Movement that the underpinnings of a future Color Revolution exist and are present in their society. In fact, these Civilians may then think that such a Movement is inevitable and has larger support than it really does, making them follow a ‘bandwagon’ mentality of latching onto what they feel will be the ‘winning side’. Propaganda also simplifies the Movement’s message, makes it all-encompassing to each social class (preferably), and creates easy-to-digest images and concepts for foreign and domestic audiences.
Information Infrastructure is also responsible for the following:

- Creating software and strategies to map/plan upcoming protests
- Connecting the Institution/Organization with other likeminded ones within the country or abroad
- Choosing the most symbolic national symbols/songs/nationally significant monuments, squares, parks to associate with the Movement

Thus, this type of infrastructure connects the Movement to the outside world and enhances the effectiveness of its message.

6. Media

This level of Infrastructure is the culminating point of the Movement’s entire Infrastructure. The Media can either be New (blogs, alternative news sites) or Traditional (TV, newspapers). Finance, Social, Training, and Information Infrastructures come together to create this fifth and final tier, and this level leads to mass dissemination throughout society. It legitimizes the Ideology of the Movement, makes it seem reputable, and solidifies the perception of a strong presence in society. Most importantly, it also has a prime aim of reaching the international audience. Doing so creates international (Western) legitimacy and prompts statements from leading political figures, both within the country and abroad. The domestic politicians that support the Movement will then have the explicit support of their foreign sponsors, thereby helping to propel their political careers if the Color Revolution is successful.

Both media platforms (New and Traditional) serve to recruit more Civilians who may have been hesitant about joining the Movement, since they previously viewed it as fringe or unlikely to succeed. The New Media can even pressure the Traditional Media to report on developments concerning the Movement, especially if the Traditional Media is reluctant to do so for political reasons. It may even occur that a rift develops between the New and Traditional Medias, with the New Media on the side of the Movement, and the Traditional Media on the side of the establishment. Bloggers and ‘new journalists’ are at the forefront of the New Media, and their reporting is instrumental in expanding the influence of pro-Movement New Media.
If the Traditional Media does report on the Movement (either as a result of New Media pressure or via Movement-friendly outlets), this would make unaware Civilians cognizant of the social civil war ahead of them and provoke a government counterstatement/media response. The government, of course, will not be in favor of any Movement aimed at overthrowing it, so it is compelled to publicly proclaim its opposition to it. This enables the Movement to frame the events in a way that makes the government appear to be ‘suppressing’ the political opposition. Such accusations carry heavy weight in the Western arena of public opinion and can serve to undermine the government’s support among on-the-fence civilians.

III Unholy Triangle

This is the term used to describe the interplay between the Finance, Social, and Training Infrastructures. Each one complements the other, and taken together, they form the center of the Movement’s power and influence. The Unholy Triangle is the most important interaction that takes place within the Movement. The stronger each of the three units is, the stronger the Movement itself will become. Conversely, if one part of the Unholy Triangle is weakened, the rest of the Movement also becomes weak. This weakness will have consequences on the Information and Media Infrastructures (the spawn of the Unholy Triangle), thereby undermining the entire Color Revolution operation. Without effective Information and Media outlets, the Movement will wither and eventually collapse.

Social Infrastructure is the most important part of the Unholy Triangle, since it directly affects Tiers 2-5. Therefore, any negative developments in Finance and Training (on which Social is dependent) would ripple through the entire Movement. Although Information also affects Social, it only increases recruitment. Recruitment without quality is ineffective, and institutions/organizations without funding do not operate.

IV Explanation of m Factor Interactions

Tier 1

Ideology → Finance: justification for the entire project

Ideology → Social: motivation for individuals to join the movement
**Tier 2**

Finance → Social: provides funding for more institutions/organizations

Social → Finance: more Cohorts may lead to more activists conducting fundraising

Finance → Training: pays for more training

Social → Training: more individuals to be trained, makes training a regular occurrence

**Tier 3**

Training → Finance: teaches Cohorts fundraising activities

Training → Social: increases the effectiveness of outreach activities, improves personnel quality

**Tier 4**

Finance → Information: pays for better information campaigns and resources

Social → Information: provides more Cohorts to conduct information campaigns

Training → Information: improves the efficiency of information campaigns

Information → Social: assists with recruitment of Cohorts and Civilian sympathizers

**Tier 5**

Finance → Media: pays for media coverage

Social → Media: institutions/organizations provide a tangible and legitimate subject for reporting

Information → Media: media outlets use the information crafted by institutions/organizations
V ‘The Event’

A Color Revolution can only be officially initiated after an ‘Event’. This Event must be controversial and polarizing (or framed to be so), and it releases all of the Movement’s built-up energy. The Movement physically manifests itself in the most public way possible, and all of its parts operate to their maximum possible capacity. The Event is the ‘coming out’ for the Movement, and it is the trigger for the Color Revolution.

Events are selectively exploited, and the Movement may ignore a certain event if it does not feel that the Infrastructure necessary to successfully carry out the Color Revolution is adequate. Therefore, it will wait until another Event arises, or it may work to manufacture or provoke an Event. The Movement capitalizes upon an Event only after it has operated a successful information campaign. The Media Infrastructure may or may not be fully built by the time the decision is made to exploit the Event, as this level is closely tied to the Event itself. It may be that Media Infrastructure is not utilized until after the Event itself, in order to set the stage and prepare the public psyche for the Color Revolution. It all depends on the situation itself and the decision of the Movement and its sponsors.

Examples of Events are the following:

- A rigged election
- The jailing of an opposition leader
- The signing of (or failure to sign) a controversial piece of legislation
- A government crackdown against the opposition or the imposition of martial law
- Declaring or being involved in an unpopular war

The above are but a few of the examples of what can constitute the Event. It is not important that these events actually occur in fact or not. What is pivotal is how they are perceived, framed, and narrated to the public at large. Allegations, not proof, of the above are what is most important in creating the catalyst for an Event. It must always be remembered that the Movement can provoke any of these events (or the perception that they had occurred).
VI Physical Infrastructure

The Event and the rolling out of Physical Infrastructure go hand in hand. There are two parts of Physical Infrastructure:

1) People and their active physical engagement in support of the Color Revolution
2) Physical objects & places and their strategic placement/utilization

These two aspects are further explained below.

1. Physical Infrastructure 1

The first part is deployed when the Core gives the decision for the Cohorts and Civilian sympathizers to take to the streets to physically and publicly demonstrate their support of the Color Revolution. The following are examples:

- ‘Occupy’ Activities
- Building a Crowd
- Marches and Protests

The abovementioned prominent examples need to be explored more fully:

1a) ‘Occupied’ Activities

The Movement needs to ‘occupy’ a symbolic location in order to have a publicly presentable HQ. In many cases, this is the central square of the capital, and the occupation may be in violation of municipal law. Should it be illegal, it already creates the provocative pretext for the government to dismantle the occupied settlements and evict the protesters. Such an action, if recorded and broadcast (either via New or Traditional Media), could be spun into anti-government propaganda and could further embolden the Movement. The ‘occupation’ is made to appear spontaneous, and even if a pre-existing spontaneous occupation or protest (that supports the Color Revolution’s ideas) is present in the targeted location, then the Movement will exploit it by making it its own and using this previous occupation/protest to highlight the spontaneity of the anti-government opposition.
Tent cities and stages are usually deployed in the occupied area, as the protesters dig in for a prolonged stay. It is important for the selected area to be occupied 24/7, and a small cadre of Core members are usually always present on the ground to direct the activities. Should the government move against the protesters’ occupied area, then the arrest of Core members present there could also be a trigger for increased protest and destabilization, especially if the Core members are the official managers of a ‘pro-democracy’ institution/organization. Core members and Cohorts also engage in direct outreach to participants, some of whom may simply be interested bystanders that are curious about the events unfolding in the symbolic location. This allows the Movement to expand the Physical and Social Infrastructure and build up more Civilian sympathizers.

The HQ in the occupied area will commonly serve food and beverages to the Civilian sympathizers. This is done for a dual purpose. First, it maintains a 24/7 presence in the location, and secondly, it also attracts more possible Civilian sympathizers. By showing that they are taking care of the Civilian sympathizers, the Movement increases its soft power and appeal among the population. The giving of food and beverages also helps to build a crowd to attend the occupation and other protest events.

1b) Building a Crowd

A Color Revolution is nothing without a large crowd of supporters, therefore, techniques to build such a crowd are of prime importance for the Movement’s survival. The following are the two main methods employed:

1) Advertise on New or Traditional Media

2) Appeal to the Younger Generation (be ‘fun’)

The Movement will advertise the occupy events in order to increase the awareness of the population. The Core will call upon their Media Infrastructure contacts (in the New and Traditional Media) to gain initial exposure, but with the building of the crowd and/or provocative actions, they will attract exposure from additional domestic and international communication outlets. The creation of an alternative information system (Information Infrastructure) greatly aids in advertising.
Appealing to the younger generation is extremely important for Color Revolutions, as the presence of many young individuals provides the Movement with a youthful, energizing appearance against a stagnant, decayed system (most government leaders will not be of college age or thereabouts). This generational context is very strong and effective in highlighting the ‘freshness’ of the Color Revolution’s ideas against the seemingly perceived (and framed) outdated views of the ruling establishment. The younger generation also typically is not engaged in a life-or-death economic struggle, whereby they are absolutely compelled to go to work during the day. They have their families and other supporters that can provide for them, thereby giving them the necessary free time to constantly interact with and support the Movement and its physical manifestations. As previously explained, the occupied area needs to maintain a constant presence, and it is more probable that younger college-age individuals will stand with the Movement throughout the night than will retired pensioners or middle-aged parents.

The younger generation is attracted by the ‘fun’ emanating from the protesters’ occupation of the symbolic location. ‘Fun’ can be advertised via some of the following methods:

- Concerts
- Chants
- Celebrity Appearances
- Sports and other Games

The above examples do not even have to be explicitly political. The important thing is to attract more and more young people, and whether they are there for political or social reasons, the media will portray them as supporters of the Movement. Advertising the youthful appeal of the occupation through these methods, as well as displaying the presence of youthful protesters via the New and Traditional Media, will draw in more people from that age group. Importantly, the younger generation does not even have to be from the capital or the targeted region of the occupation and mass protest events. Instead, they can (and commonly are) bussed in from all across the country to attend the protests.
1c) Marches and Protests

These two physical manifestations are coordinated and meant to show observers the extent of support that the Color Revolution has. They also serve the purpose of energizing the Civilian sympathizers. A certain level of organizational infrastructure has to already be in place prior to the initiation of the Color Revolution in order to effectively take advantage of marches and protests. The following are examples of what must be considered and organized prior to marches and protests:

- The meeting locations and paths (including their symbolism [helps with framing the events])
- The time(s) and day(s)
- Possible blockades against the police
- Flags/marching bands/vehicles blasting nationalist music (Physical Infrastructure 2)
- Where the marches/protests will culminate (usually the occupied area or government buildings)

The directing of simultaneous protests and marches of large groups of people makes it challenging for the police to deal with the situation. At the very least, one or two of the protest marches will reach the culminating location even if the police attempt to stop them. Marches and protests make the Movement seem larger than it really is, and it also attracts more followers and bystanders. Significant media attention is centered around such events, and it therefore helps to catapult the Movement’s message across the country and possibly the world. The Core, Cohorts, and Civilian sympathizers are all energized, and they feel like they are a part of something bigger than themselves. By being marketed as an all-day activity, such events can even attract families. The more children involved, the better for the Movement’s image.

The participation of pro-opposition political figures leads to a decreased risk of a police breakup of the events. This is because the police may be hesitant in arresting a publicized government figure for fear of being accused of ‘suppressing the opposition’, even if these figures provoked a police response. Such accusations could lead to an international uproar and undermine the legitimacy of the government. Highly publicized hunger strikes, especially among prominent individuals in society, can also make the audience feel that the government is
responsible for the activists’ self-inflicted suffering. Once more, the reader must be reminded that what is most important is how the events are framed by the New and Traditional Media, not what really transpires. If the Media Infrastructure is strong enough to convince the audience that the government is in fact acting tyrannical and oppressive through its actions, then that is the impression that the audience will remember.

1d) Role of Social Media in Physical Infrastructure

Social Media provides both security and promotion for the Color Revolution, and each purpose will be subsequently discussed.

1d i) Social Media as Security

Individuals now have access to the internet and recording devices in the palm of their hands via recent advances in cellular technology. By recording the protest events, participants are working to safeguard their own security against government counteroffensives. Police and official government action is deterred, as footage of any representatives of the government engaging in (perceived) violence against the protesters will severely undercut the legitimacy and support of the ruling authorities both within the country and abroad. Even if official violence is provoked, the image of an unarmed protester being attacked by a police officer has a powerful resonance among the audience that it reaches.

1d ii) Social Media as Promotion

Non-stop video footage of the protest events (including the ‘fun’ activities) allows the Core and/or the New and Traditional Media to engage in editing techniques to frame the situation in a positive pro-opposition light. The creation of Twitter hashtags and Facebook groups assist in organizing footage and comments about the event on Social Media, thereby making it more accessible to sympathizers and interested individuals. One person sharing positive pro-opposition footage or statuses/tweets on their social network can lead to others sharing it to their friends, and so on and so forth. This leads to a social media chain reaction that results in a perceived ‘grassroots explosion’ of interest and support. The end goal is to ‘go viral’.
1e) Protesters as Human Shields of the Movement

Protesters, especially Civilian sympathizers, serve as unwitting human shields for the Movement. The presence of large groups of unarmed civilians shields the Core and Cohorts from direct police action. Although the government may make the decision to seize the organizers and activists that are camped out in the occupied area, it will have to wade through a sea of civilians in order to get to the culprits, especially if an occupation of a central location is occurring. Therefore, the risk of unintended casualties and collateral damage against civilians (especially if the Movement incites violence against it) is especially heightened. In this manner, the Core and Cohorts safely hide behind the Civilian sympathizers and use them as unwitting human shields, placing the government in a precarious position of whether or not to act against the organizers.

2. Physical Infrastructure 2

The second form of Physical Infrastructure is more traditional, as it involves stages, megaphones, banners, etc. It is the physical objects employed during the Color Revolution’s tangible manifestations and publicized media campaigns, and parts of it are closely related to Information Infrastructure. All of this has to be prepared well in advance, and none of it is spontaneous. For example, the stages that are deployed in the protest and occupied area(s) have to be obtained prior to the commencement of the Color Revolution, as do tents and adequate food and beverage supplies for the Civilian sympathizers. The stages are set up before the protest events, and the tents may be set up before or during them. It is not possible to procure everything physically needed for a successful Color Revolution on the spot or instantaneously. Therefore, networks of contacts and prior arrangements have to be created in advance.

This often overlooked logistical aspect of Color Revolutions betrays their claims of ‘spontaneity’. Carefully positioned photographers and cameramen help to frame the events in the most positive way possible for the Movement, as do the placement of opposition and/or nationalist flags and posters. Printed materials for use during the protest events also have to be stockpiled before the decision is made to initiate the Color Revolution, as sufficient propaganda supplies must be available for immediate use. Flags, banners, t-shirts, and other visible pro-Color Revolution tools have to be mass produced for use in the publicized events. A crowd of nondescript people without any visually unifying focus is not as
powerful as one that displays solidarity with the Movement by their chosen appearance.

**Concluding Thoughts**

A Color Revolution is a complex interplay of many parts operating simultaneously. The Movement has to properly build its six infrastructures prior to the onset of the public destabilization, and it needs an Event to galvanize its support and justify its actions to the targeted audiences. The Physical Infrastructures assist the Movement in gaining traction and attention, and they make the Color Revolution appear popular and spontaneous. A proper understanding of all of the working parts of a Color Revolution can enable one to better understand this new tactic of warfare being waged against national governments, as well as to identify vulnerabilities that can be exploited in crafting an effective counterrevolutionary strategy.
APPENDIX II: THE COLOR ARC

Democratic security specialists are hard at work forecasting where the next Color Revolution outbreak will occur, but those with knowledge of geopolitics already have a fairly good idea. Looking at a map of Eurasia, one can identify a clear arc of Color Revolution vulnerability stretching directly from Central Europe to Central Asia, traversing a large part of what Nicholas Spykman earlier termed the ‘Rimland’. This is described as being the territories along the Eurasian periphery which, according to his theory, occupy a much more strategic position than the Heartland itself. Keeping with this understanding, he proposed the axiom that “Who controls the Rimland rules Eurasia; who rules Eurasia controls the destinies of the world”, and this is precisely the geopolitical battle that’s being waged before the world today.

While there isn’t a perfect overlap between the Rimland and the Color Arc, it’s close enough to provide an accurate enough concept with which to understand the model. The 10 diverse states comprising this arc (Hungary, Serbia, Macedonia, Greece, Turkey, Armenia, Iran, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Kyrgyzstan) are united by the fact that not only are they vulnerable to the threat of a Color Revolution, but that a successful regime change operation there would have directly negative repercussions for Russian foreign policy and grand strategy. On a strategic level, these can be categorized into three larger groups of threats against Russia, incidentally corresponding to their geographic designations, and each of which has the potential for creating a domino destabilization within their sphere.

The appendix begins by describing the three categories of states bridging the Color Arc, and then dives into examining their specific characteristics. This investigative section sees each of the categories addressed as separate units, and the analysis proceeds in a structural way. It first looks at the unifying concept that links each of the ‘member states’ together, before discussing how each one of them has certain vulnerabilities that can be realistically exploited for fomenting a Color Revolution. Finally, each of the three categorized sections ends with proposed solutions for each strategic group, and a brief concluding paragraph wraps up the piece.
Categorizing Color Revolution Crises

The states along the Color Arc can be broken down into three geographic categories:

* Greater Balkans: Hungary, Serbia, Macedonia, Greece
* Greater Mideast: Turkey, Armenia, Iran
* Central Asia: Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan

For the most part, they correspond as threats to Russia’s following strategic interests:

* Balkan Stream
* Great Power Harmony
* Buffer Zone

The two geostrategic anomalies in this case are Turkey and Armenia, as Color Revolutions in either territory would affect more than one of Russia’s strategic interests (to be described in the following sections):

* Turkey: A coup in Ankara could lead to an anti-Russian administration intent on confronting Moscow, thereby also resulting in the inevitable death of Balkan Stream.

* Armenia: Regime change in Yerevan could be used to usher in a continuation war in Nagorno-Karabakh, which could become the catalyst not only for renewed Great Power rivalry between Russia, Turkey, and Iran, but also for a risky Russian military intervention.

Having laid out the three conceptualizations of threats linking the Color Arc countries, it’s now necessary to describe each of them in detail.
Curtailing The Multipolar Counter-Offensive

Concept:
Balkan Stream is the best possible opportunity for liberating Europe from the unipolar world and spreading multipolarity into the heart of the continent, thereby representing a major asymmetrical counter-offensive by Russia that can initiate a long-term change in the global geopolitical balance. It’s for these reasons, however, that the states along its route face the greatest risk of destabilization from the US, which is intent on seeing the project sputter out just like its South Stream predecessor. Here’s how Washington can stir chaos in each of the Balkan Stream states:

Exploitative Vulnerabilities:

Hungary

The West has been carrying out a demonization campaign against Prime Minister Vikor Orban in response to his independently assertive policies vis-à-vis EU inter-bloc policy and its external antagonism against Russia. John McCain slandered the Hungarian leader as a “neo-fascist dictator”, and just recently, EU Commission leader Juncker echoed that sentiment by also referring to him as a “dictator”. The New York Times has picked up on the Western zeitgeist against Orban by labelling him a “soft dictator” alongside the likes of Western ‘bad guys’ Putin and Erdogan. At this stage, it’s obvious that any ‘pro-democracy’ regime change movement that deploys in the country would have the full support of the West, and it would be expected to build upon the social infrastructure established during the Color Revolution test-run late last year.

Serbia

The Central Balkan country is in a precarious position when it comes to a Color Revolution, since the most likely scenario sees American covert influence hijacking legitimate resistance to the government. Prime Minister Aleksandar Vucic could trigger massive street movements if he tries to modify the
constitution to exclude occupied Kosovo as an integral part of Serbia and/or attempts to re-arrest Vojislav Seselj, who garners enthusiastic populist support in certain politically active circles. Either of these two moves could set off a grassroots process that quickly spirals out of control and becomes at risk of Color Revolution hijacking.

Even if it succeeds and a new government comes to power, Vucic’s replacement is expected to be susceptible to nationalist leanings owing to the conditions in which the change of government occurred (i.e. revolt against Vucic’s Kosovo and Seselj policies). This means that the US could more easily use Kumanovo-esque external provocations in Sandzak or the Presevo Valley to instigate a Serbian cross-border strike in occupied Kosovo, with all of the resultant American military repercussions. Not only that, but if a hyper-nationalist government happens to come to power in Budapest following a successful Color Revolution, then the US can tinker with destabilizing Vojvodina as well, all with the intention of setting the stage for a second NATO War on Serbia.

Macedonia

The author has already written much about the country’s Color Revolution vulnerability and forecasted scenarios, having been one of the only political analysts to have predicted the current crisis back in March with his article “The Future Of The Balkans Runs Through Macedonia”. To review the current situation, Zoran Zaev, the Color Revolutionary figurehead, pathetically attempted to officially kick off his regime change movement on 17 May, only to have him and his supporters shamed by the nearly 100,000 citizens that showed up for the patriotic counter-demonstration the day after. This comes on the heels of the terrorist attack that rocked the country a week prior, which was clearly a complementary attempt at destabilizing the government ahead of the Color Revolution inauguration. Due to the geography of Balkan Stream, the future of the Balkans quite literally runs through Macedonia, hence why the destabilization against Russia’s multipolar counter-offensive began in this country (discussed more in detail in the author’s piece about “US-Russia Round Three: Macedonia”). As it stands, the people have been successful in repelling the regime change attempt, although by no means should this be understood as signifying that the US has accepted defeat and isn’t strategizing a way to asymmetrically retaliate.
Greece

The current political situation in the Hellenic Republic is very unstable, since the citizens have been imbued with unrealistically high hopes in their government’s anti-austerity message. It’s extremely probable that the current financial situation in the country will mean that some form of its previous promises must be broken, inevitably leading to some segment of the population feeling let down and possibly even channeling their anger by protesting in the street. This template interestingly mirrors the situation in Cuba surrounding the Obama-Raul surrender deal (please reference the author’s “The Obama-Raul ‘Deal Exposed: How Cuba Surrendered Without A Shot” for context) and Iran as it relates to the nuclear proto-deal (with forecasts by the author noted in “Risk Analysis: The Downside To Potential Iran-US Nuclear Deal”), since any ‘unexpected’ hiccups in these complicated processes or perceived backtracking on (assumed) government promises could ‘justify’ a Color Revolution attempt by the angry mob.

The Greek Color Revolution scenario could realistically take the shape of Syriza giving in to some form of austerity by this summer, thereby getting accused of being a ‘sell-out’ by a vocally indignant public. The resultant backlash could bring about snap elections that deal a defeat to the ruling Syriza-led coalition, which in and of itself could paralyze the country’s participation in Balkan Stream. As an added factor, any rise in Golden Dawn’s popularity at the expense of Syriza might even create the conditions for exacerbated domestic tension between both groups, which might even precede a small-scale crisis. It should go without saying that the more Greeks are divided and their government remains unable to properly function, the less likely it is that any work on Balkan Stream would go forward, thus effectively stonewalling the project much as Bulgaria did before it, albeit under different circumstances and pressures.

Solutions:

The most effective way for the Greater Balkan countries along the Color Arc to counter the threat of American-initiated destabilization against them is to integrate more closely via the Balkan Corridor framework first written about in the author’s work on “A New Strategic Calculus For The Balkans”. This concept was proposed in a prior article by the author, whereby it was strongly advised that the Balkan Stream countries strategically align in order to better reinforce
their defenses against regime change and Albanian aggression (see the author’s “The Gears Of War Grind For Greater Albania” for more information on this). The examined countries must continue their resistance to unipolarity and feel encouraged by supportive actions (not just words!) from the multipolar community, such as investing in infrastructure and businesses along China’s Balkan Silk Road (described more fully in the author’s earlier publication about “How China’s Balkan Silk Road Can Resurrect South Stream”).

Complementing that, Russia should also find a way to guarantee that Greece doesn’t have to enact any form of austerity, otherwise the pragmatic Balkan Stream-friendly government there would be severely threatened by potential Color Revolution unrest (as explained above). As an added political recommendation, it’s highly advised that the Serbian government abandon its talk about changing the constitution to omit references to Kosovo, as going forward with such a proposal is a surefire way to enflame the electorate and increase the chances of domestic destabilization. Accordingly, the Serbian government mustn’t make any moves against Seselj either, since this could also elicit a similar grassroots response against the government.

Redirecting Great Power Hostility Against Russia

Concept:

Russia is able to secure its southern flank from conventional competition through the strategic harmony that it’s achieved with Turkey and Iran, the two most immediate Great Powers in that cardinal direction, and also, the two who have historical legacies in the region. What’s being referred to specifically are the Ottomans’ prior conquests in Crimea and the Caucasus, and Persia’s heritage in the Caucasus and Central Asia. Right now both contemporary Great Powers are pragmatic towards Russia and have not made any moves that indicate they’re seriously willing to engage in unfriendly competition or outright rivalry with it in these former Soviet territories.

That balance of interests could likely change, of course, if a Color Revolution succeeds in sweeping their current governments from power. In the case of Turkey, it may attempt to redirect its Neo-Ottoman ambitions away from the
Mideast and towards the Balkans, the Caucasus, and Crimea, which would then disrupt Balkan Stream (or possibly lead to its politically neutralized rerouting alongside TAP and under the Adriatic Sea to Italy), increase the risk of a Russia-NATO confrontation in the Black Sea, and destabilize the Caucasus. As regards Iran, the West would love nothing more than to have it refocus its energy away from the Gulf and towards the Caucasus and Central Asia, the latter trajectory of which is explicitly mentioned in the author’s article about how “The Hoagland-Blinken Doctrine Is Washington’s Updated Plan For Central Asia”, which reports on how the two senior American diplomats speak briefly about American support for an enhanced Iranian role in the region under the right (understood to mean post-regime change or political flip) conditions. The far-sighted objective in both cases is for the two Great Powers to become Lead From Behind proxies for shaking the security architecture that Russia has carefully constructed along its southern rim (please reference the author’s writing on “Lead From Behind: How Unipolarity Is Adapting To Multipolarity” for more details on this concept).

The reason that NATO-member Turkey is being targeted is because Erdogan continues to move ever closer to a Eurasian Pivot (explained more thoroughly by the author’s “Is Turkey Moving Towards A Full Eurasian Pivot?” article), despite formally being a member of the alliance and sharing overlapping militant interests with it in Syria. The push to create a fully domestic military industrial complex could also be interpreted as a step in this direction. Iran, on the other hand, has been defending against Western aggression since the 1979 Islamic Revolution, but the recent thawing of relations between it and the West might inadvertently pave the way for a geopolitical redirection. This ambitious scheme could be facilitated via the semi-covert mechanisms of regime change (NGOs, ethnically divisive information campaigns, etc.) that might more easily infiltrate the country during the forthcoming ‘golden age’ of Western-Iranian relations. The following is an examination of the how the West could promote a Color Revolution in each of the two Great Powers:

Exploitative Vulnerabilities:

Turkey

Gulen:

There are near limitless reasons behind the legitimate and justified domestic outrage being expressed against Erdogan, with two of the most significant being
the Gezi Park protests and the spree of wiretapping scandals. Taken together, these highly publicized (and highly suppressed) events divided Turks and galvanized the anti-government movement, some members of which are suspected of being in cahoots with US-based Fethullah Gulen, a fiery critic of Erdogan and founder of his own pseudo-religious organization and international school network. The Turkish government has lately been pressuring allied governments to close these so-called “Gulen schools” out of supposed terrorist concerns, and although these may be justified, it could also be that Erdogan is afraid that they could deepen their international regime change network (having already had well over a decade to build it). Ironically, the Gulen schools may become to Turkey what Turkey currently is to Syria, and that’s a bastion of violent regime change terrorism against the state. There are also fears that its members could form their own GLADIO-like deep state through the infiltration of government institutions.

Leftists:

Next up on the list of Turkey’s regime change vulnerabilities are the myriad leftist groups that are dedicated to overthrowing the government. Turkey experienced a spate of terrorism involving these organizations (and others of different political dispositions, it must be mentioned) in the 1970s-80s, and the latest high-profile terrorist attack in the country in March was undertaken by a notorious leftist group. Therefore, while such movements may be on the political fringe and without much grassroots support, they’re still capable of garnering headline-grabbing attention and have proven their will to wage war against the state. In future scenarios, they may form the vanguard of violent regime change action in Turkey, perhaps linking up with the tens of thousands of legitimately disgruntled citizens during a future Geza Park-like protest and using their mass as a ‘human shield’ (whether wittingly or unwittingly agreed to by the civilians themselves) to hide behind in staging forthcoming attacks. Even if they don’t go down this route, they can still be a major destabilizing force if they decide to commence a full-scale terrorist war in Turkey.

Kurds:

Last but most certainly not least are the militant Kurdish groups fighting for autonomy and/or independence. While a temporary truce has been signed with the PKK, a permanent one still remains elusive, signifying the greatest threat to
Turkey’s overall stability and territorial integrity. The US has taken advantage of this in trying to carve out a de-facto independent Kurdish state in Northern Iraq, with the ultimate intent of using it to exert direct influence into the Kurdish-inhabited portions of southeastern Turkey if Ankara decides on pivoting towards Eurasia. Since Kurds comprise nearly a fifth of the country’s population as it is, a large-scale irredentist uprising in Turkey organized from Iraqi Kurdistan could put the brakes on any independent (non-Western) political course of action that Erdogan attempts to embark upon. The Kurds are also becoming a more important political force as well, meaning that if the Kurdish issue isn’t resolutely settled in Turkish politics sometime soon, then time and demography will create a critical mass of separatist sentiment that may predictably partition the country.

Hybrid:

Looking at all three Color Revolution vulnerabilities, the nightmare situation for the Turkish government would be if they united their efforts in overthrowing the government. The Kurds already have considerable battlefield experience in fighting Ankara (and their recent exploits in Syria and Iraq have only hardened them), and connecting with their left-wing counterparts (the PKK itself is a leftist group) could increase the appeal of their cause among non-Kurds. Not only that, but combining forces can also intensify the destabilization that both actors can bring in inciting domestic unrest, either prior to or during a Color Revolution attempt. The Gulen Movement can broaden the base of the Leftist-Kurdish Color Revolutionaries by integrating the Islamist-oriented individuals in Turkish society, which would then present an odd but effective mix of destabilizing actors that could realistically overwhelm the state. Each of these three components have diametrically different views for what would come after a successful regime change operation, but they may realistically put their differences aside for later in the joint interest of getting to that point first (just as the hodgepodge of EuroMaidan groups did before them).

Before concluding this segment, it must once more be underscored that not all resistance to Erdogan’s government indicates a Color Revolution, although it is very possible that legitimate expressions of anti-government sentiment (like Gezi Park) can be hijacked by any of the three aforementioned movements in order to move the masses towards an end goal supportive of US interests over Turkey (similar to what the Muslim Brotherhood did in Egypt in 2011).
Iran

Nuclear Proto-Deal Consequences:

The biggest question swirling around Iranian domestic politics right now is about what the consequences of the nuclear proto-deal will be, assuming that nothing comes up to derail the timeline in the first place. Segments of the Iranian population have unrealistically high hopes about what the deal will lead to, and if it doesn’t live up to its living standards-boosting hype (or as mentioned, something ‘unexpectedly’ delays or sabotages its implementation, either before or after it’s agreed to), then there may be public demonstrations against the government.

In and of itself, this isn’t anything to fear, but if the organizers have links with Western NGOs and/or intelligence organizations, they could be motivated to violently escalate the situation in order to provoke a second round of the 2009 ‘Green (Color) Revolution’ attempt. The protesters might receive an unexpectedly enthusiastic welcoming among some portions of society if the destabilizing event is timed to coincide with the soft infiltration of pro-Western NGOs and anti-government information campaigns that are expected to eventually accompany any thaw in relations with the West.

‘Green Revolution’ Part II:

It’s difficult to ascertain what the impact of a second Color Revolution attempt in Iran may be, but it’s not hard to forecast that one is likely being planned right now. The original 2009 ‘Green Revolution’ was a trial run for perfecting the tactics that would later overthrow the governments in Tunisia and Egypt two years later, so it wasn’t as complete of a failure as the media made it out to be. The ‘Arab Spring’ theater-wide Color Revolutions and ongoing tactical ‘innovations’ being tested in Syria (utilizing identity violence to jump start a failed Color Revolution) show that this method of regime change is America’s currently preferred choice for removing recalcitrant governments.
The publicized ‘justification’ for restarting an active anti-government movement in Iran must be one which gives the semblance of inclusiveness and theoretical appeal to all Iranians. It is at this point where the negative social consequences of the nuclear proto-deal come into play, since they make the myth of widespread resistance to the government seemingly plausible to the international community and some of the country’s own citizens. In order to be ultimately successful, however, or at least sow enough domestic chaos to distract Iran from fully flexing its independent foreign policy, a second ‘Green Revolution’ would need to utilize ethnic vanguards from the Azeri and/or Kurdish communities.

Azeris/Kurds:

The key to the external destabilization of Iran is in manipulating strategic minority groups within the country, specifically the Azeris and Kurds. Beginning with the first one, Azeris comprise nearly 25% of the total Iranian population and are heavily concentrated along the northern and western borders. While largely assimilated into Iranian society and culture, they still retain a degree of separateness owing to their historical identity, and it is precisely through the manipulation of historical memory (e.g. the dual complementary ideas of ‘Southern Azerbaijan’ and ‘Greater Azerbaijan’) that the West can activate levers of internal Iranian destabilization.

It’s not even that important to the West whether or not the Azeri government is complicit in this plot, since the occurrence of an Azeri ‘uprising’ would be psychologically impactful enough to obtain a strong social response in Azerbaijan proper, perhaps even in the form of ‘volunteer fighters’. If vocal segments of Azerbaijan’s population support this ethnic-affiliated Color Revolution/Unconventional Warfare attempt but the government is against it, it could create a dilemma for Baku, since the authorities will be forced to initiate a domestic crackdown to prevent a full-blown international crisis from breaking out. In this way, the US can achieve the dual objective of destabilizing both Iran and Azerbaijan at the same time.

The situation with Iranian Kurds is a bit different, because unlike the Azeris, some of them have already demonstrated their will to violently rebel against the government. An underreported media story throughout May 2015 was about
how the Kurds in Mahabad near the border with Iraqi Kurdistan were staging various disturbances and were on the verge of an all-out riot. It must also be said, as was written about Turkey, that the Iraqi Kurds are being used as American proxies for destabilizing the surrounding countries where their ethnic compatriots reside (Turkey, Iran, and Syria), and their experience in fighting against ISIL has endowed them with pivotal real-time military training that they couldn’t receive anywhere else. It therefore can’t be discounted that some of the pro-American Kurdish elements in the region played a role in stirring up the violent dissent.

Iran hasn’t publicized the events likely because it’s assisting the Iraqi Kurds in their anti-ISIL operations (in which Tehran also has a military interest) and understands that not all of the latter may be on board with the US’ ethnically divisive stratagem. They understandably see this as an American move to sow division between the two anti-ISIL allies in order to create a strategic gap that the US can exploit in the future. For its part, the US is also reluctant to draw attention to the violence, albeit for a completely different reason. Washington is ‘officially’ trying to reset ties with Tehran, and although supporting ethnic insurgency is absolutely counter to the public messages of ‘trust’ and ‘friendship’ that it’s been conveying over the past few months, it still wants to maintain this diplomatic front to the international community at large. Thus, it can be surmised that the US is using the latest developments as both a test run for forthcoming Kurdish-affiliated destabilization inside of Iran and a means of applying pressure against the government before the nuclear proto-deal deadline.

Hybrid:

The most destabilizing scenario that the US could hope to achieve in Iran combines each of the three previously described elements of Color Revolution vulnerabilities. Ideally, it would see an actual nuclear deal reached with Iran by the end of June, followed by the piecemeal lifting of various sanctions. Just as the population’s hopes begin to climax, however, the US and its Western allies will predictably find a way to accuse Iran of violating the agreement so that the threat or actual reimplementation of sanctions can occur. If specifically timed to coincide with certain domestic developments (e.g. elections, scandals, soft expansion of Azeri/Kurdish nationalism via Western support, etc.), it could create the spark for activating the pre-planned ‘Green Revolution’ Part II and the vanguard involvement of the two strategic minority groups in the country. This
becomes an even more poignant threat if the US can first succeed in dislodging Iranian influence from Iraqi Kurdistan and turning the territory into a forward operating base for launching an ethnically affiliated Unconventional War against its neighbors (Iran and Turkey, in this case). The combination of widespread disappointment with the government (owing to ‘broken promises’ and failed hopes over the hyped-up nuclear deal), a crystalizing Color Revolution, and ethnic disturbances along Iran’s frontier (supported by a pro-American irredentist Kurdistan) can create a spiral of exploitable chaos that would pose a serious challenge to contain.

Solutions:

Turkey and Iran both have their own separate circumstances that make them susceptible to Color Revolution threats, but the primary factor linking the two is the US’ supreme goal of integrating the regime change movement with a Kurdish-affiliated Unconventional War. Since this represents the apex of American-directed destabilization, it must be averted at all costs. For this reason, Turkey and Iran must find joint ways to counter American influence in Iraqi Kurdistan in order to stop it from being turned into a ‘neo-Israel’ of pro-US regional expansionism. It’s not known exactly which measures may be tactically necessary to achieve this herculean task, but on the strategic level, both countries must do everything they can to guarantee Iraq’s territorial integrity and make positive outreaches (business and energy dealings, for example) to autonomous Kurdistan. Iranian Kurds, which are substantially more pro-government than their Turkish counterparts, could also be used as de-facto envoys for building trust and cooperation with their cross-border kin and eroding established American influence over the ethnic group. So long as the Kurdish Unconventional Warfare factor can remain neutralized, then Turkey and Iran will both maintain extraordinarily high odds of defeating any Color Revolution attempt the US tries to unleash against them.
Dragging Russia Into War

Concept:

The former Soviet Republics of Armenia, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Kyrgyzstan are of extreme domestic fragility, with each of them being held together by only a few tenuous political links. As will be explained, their intrinsic nature makes them extraordinarily easy to destabilize under differing sets of manufactured conditions, and the greatest danger is that their domestic turmoil might unwittingly draw Russia into a quagmire as it tries to contain the expanding chaos. The scenario of American-engineered chaos being used to physically and strategically entrap Russia was previously tested with astounding success during the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, and it’s predicted that the US will attempt such a ploy multiple times in the coming future.

After all, one could convincingly argue that Kiev’s American-supported War on Eastern Ukraine was designed to do just that, although it failed in eliciting the conventional Russian response that it anticipated. Nonetheless, it’s very probable that the abovementioned former Soviet republics could become the ‘New Ukraines’ in seeking to suck Russia into a disastrous and/or prolonged conflagration. The author previously wrote about such a tactic and had termed it ‘The Reverse Brzezinski’ in his article “The Reverse Brzezinski: The Ultimate Eurasian Dilemma”, precisely because it goes back to the roots of the former National Security Advisor’s strategy of Russian geostrategic entrapment. That being expressed, the rest of the section will detail how each of those countries could potentially become the latest version of ‘Soviet Afghanistan’ via the US’ Color Revolution intrigue.

Exploitative Vulnerabilities:

Armenia

The South Caucasus state is known for being a close Russian ally via the CSTO, however, it’s been showing an uncomfortable attraction to the West ever since the beginning of 2015. The author documented this in-depth with his online
expose “Are Armenia and Belarus Wandering Westward?”, but to summarize, Yerevan is being conned into pivoting West due to the community’s increasingly publicized disagreements with Turkey, their vocal support in recognizing the Armenian Genocide, and the carrot of profitable ‘Euro-Atlantic integration’ that they hold out in front of the economically hungry country (despite it being a Eurasian Union member). Due to the dire economic situation in the country and the increasingly regular tensions with Azerbaijan over Nagorno-Karabakh, the people are becoming ever more predisposed to nationalism, which could threateningly be used in a manner similar to EuroMaidan to goad impressionable youth into fighting against the government.

Regime change in Yerevan would likely lead to a nationalist government modeled off of the Ukrainian scenario, which would see it initiate a disastrous continuation war in Nagorno-Karabakh (more fully detailed in the author’s “Nagorno-Karabakh And The Domino Destabilization Of Disaster”). Aside from being the catalyst for renewed Great Power rivalry between Russia, Turkey, and Iran (each of which would scramble and likely clash to safeguard/promote their interests in this small geographic space), it could also dangerously involve the Russian military base in Gyumri, which would accelerate the process of mission creep and likely necessitate a more robust Russian presence to beef up its defenses. The thing is, Russia doesn’t want to become intertwined in any foreign conflicts and simply wants to keep the cold peace between the Armenia and Azerbaijan as it works on a diplomatic solution to Nagorno-Karabakh. However, with a pro-American Color Revolutionary government in Yerevan, it could quickly create the military pretexts for a renewed war that would expectedly involve Russia in some capacity or another, no matter how much Moscow tries to avoid it.

Turkmenistan

The mysterious Central Asian country of Turkmenistan has positioned itself as the central component of Russian-Chinese-Iranian strategic stability. In a previous article by the author entitled “Turkmenistan As The Three-For-One Staging Ground For Eurasian Destabilization”, it was described how Ashgabat lies at the center of Chinese energy interests, immediate Iranian security, and Russian strategic depth, meaning that a major destabilization there would send immediate ripples to the three multipolar Eurasian anchors. Unfortunately, the
prospects for domestic unrest are rather high in Turkmenistan, and this is attributable to its geopolitical and domestic peculiarities.

The state could conceivably experience a regime change process if the Taliban adopts ISIL-like tactics and invades Turkmenistan. The chaos that this would raise would be difficult to quash owing to the fact that the country’s permanent neutrality means that it doesn’t benefit from the multilateral military assistance that could be procured via CSTO or SCO membership. Accordingly, if the Taliban moves as swiftly across the Turkmen border as ISIL did across the Iraqi one (and the similar geographic situation dictates that this is entirely feasible), then the authorities could easily lose control over the frontier, thereby weakening their hold over the major cities and facilitating the success of any complementary Color Revolution attempt. Via this fashion, the hybrid regime change operation would ironically be commenced in a reverse way, with an Unconventional War preceding a Color Revolution. Suffice to say, a combined Taliban-Color Revolution outbreak in Turkmenistan wouldn’t just grab Russia’s attention, but also that of Iran and China as well, meaning that it could very well turn into a Eurasian Achilles’ heel if managed ‘properly’ by the US.

Uzbekistan

This ancient civilization-state abuts each of the other Central Asian former Soviet Republics and has the largest population of any of them, therefore making it a geopolitical heavyweight in influencing regional affairs. While Uzbekistan aims to exploit these characteristics in promoting its interests and competing with Kazakhstan for the role of regional power, a rapid meltdown of law and order in this pivotally positioned state could spell the end of both of their leadership aspirations, as well as spreading destructive chaos to the weaker peripheral states of Turkmenistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan. The author published his analysis on this back in October 2014, but “Uzbekistan’s Bubbling Pot of Destabilization” is still exceptionally relevant today. In sum, it’s argued that elderly Karimov and his extended family barely hold the country’s disparate clans and tribes together, and that following his inevitable passing, the country may enter into a period of prolonged turmoil as each of the factions fight amongst themselves for power and influence. Intensifying the drama is the rivalry between the National Security Service and the Interior Ministry, which can see the competing institutions patronize various proxy forces as they try out
outmaneuver one other in what is predicted to become a violent struggle for supremacy. The perfect social conditions for a successful Color Revolution are thus met amidst such chaotic security service infighting, teeming domestic unrest, and the gaping power void left after Karimov’s death.

But a Color Revolution isn’t the only threat that Uzbeks have to fear, since the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU) could potentially reappear as state power collapses and usher in an Unconventional War component to round out the regime change package. The terrorist organization was thought to have been wiped out during the US War on Afghanistan, but it proved its resiliency by hiding out in Pakistan during the time and becoming assertive enough to even carry out a terrorist attack against the Karachi airport in June 2014. Furthermore, the group’s leader pledged allegiance to ISIL in the fall of 2014, increasing the chances that the two could infiltrate Uzbekistan during a period of severe domestic unrest and exacerbate the nature of whatever crisis it is that the country is experiencing at that time. A deeper forecast into this possibility could see the IMU/ISIL exploiting rumored secessionist sentiment in the Karakalpak autonomous republic in western Uzbekistan much as AQ did with the Tuaregs and Azawad in Mali after 2011. It’s not ascertainable yet whether such a movement is real or imagined, but nonetheless, what’s really important is how it’s marketed, and since ISIL is already recognized for its masterful exploitation of social media, it’s possible they could lend some ‘soft power’ assistance to their IMU allies if such a Karakalpak campaign is ever commenced. This would help them acquire an illusion of ‘justification’ for their conquests and complicate efforts in investigating the true nature of what’s really going in Karakalpakstan.

Because of Uzbekistan’s central location, the destabilization occurring within it could easily radiate outwards to Eurasian Union members Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, exposed but geo-pivotal Turkmenistan, and the frontline anti-Taliban CSTO and SCO outpost of Tajikistan. For these very reasons, any spiraling disorder inside Uzbekistan might very temptingly engender a Russian intervention (whether inside the country or along its borders) in order to manage its fallout, since Moscow is aware of the dire risks of regional destabilization incubating inside of Central Asia’s core state. Washington also recognizes this security susceptibility vis-à-vis Russian interests, hence why it has an interest in fomenting the aforesaid scenarios in the first place and provoking a Russian military response.
Kyrgyzstan

The land of the Kyrgyz is also the land of Color Revolution intrigue, and it’s undergone two such regime change events in the past 10 years. Kyrgyzstan’s geostrategic location between Kazakhstan and China’s Xinjiang region, its holdings in the pivotal Fergana Valley, and the Russian air base situated in Kant make it a trophy prize for American policy planners. In the contemporary situation, the country is closely aligned with Russia and is the newest member of the Eurasian Union, officially making it the poorest member of the bunch, and consequently, the one most powerfully influenced by external manipulation. The US understands the country’s extreme vulnerabilities and has thus sent Color Revolution architect Richard Miles to Bishkek as charge d’affaires in order to prepare for a Color Revolution during the October parliamentary elections.

The author investigated this story in full for his article on “The Male Nuland And The US’ Central Asian Strategy”, but to summarize, Washington appears to be on the cusp of playing yet another Kyrgyz Color Revolution card in order to send dual shockwaves of destabilization through Russia and China. Quite possibility, depending on whether or not it feels Uzbekistan is salvageable as its Lead From Behind proxy in the area (recent Russian diplomacy has succeeded in thawing relations between Moscow and Tashkent), it might even plot a third trajectory of destabilization aimed at creating problems for the country and/or provoking a long-term crisis in its relations with Russia. For more information about this possibility, please reference the author’s article about “The Coming Color Revolution Chaos And ‘Media Crimea’ In Kyrgyzstan”, but as an overview, it deals with ethnic Uzbek irredentism in the Kyrgyz-controlled sections of the Fergana Valley.

A Color Revolution in Kyrgyzstan could also set the stage for the return of the north-south rivalry within the country, with the disturbing possibility that a lawless south may fester into a base for jihadist fighters targeting Uzbekistan and China’s Xinjiang. The creation of a black hole of chaos in an area geographically immune from conventional military intervention (the steep mountainous territory inhibits regular operations) would dramatically increase the costs of dealing with the crisis, potentially enabling its indefinite prolongation and strengthening the militant movements fighting there. If Southern Kyrgyzstan becomes an ‘Islamic State’ in Central Asia, then it could also expand its reach into the mountainous
and sparsely populated Gorno-Badakhstan autonomous region of Tajikistan, thereby establishing a land corridor to Afghanistan. ISIL’s latest strategic asset, Tajik special police force head Colonel Gulmurod Khalimov, could possibly assist with such operations since he’s intimately familiar with the country’s security contingency plans, and as such, its vulnerabilities and weaknesses. If he operates out of northern Afghanistan, he could push against Tajikistan concurrently with an ISIL-affiliated ‘Southern Kyrgyzstan’ from the opposite direction, thus creating a devastating two-pronged offensive that would assuredly result in a Russian military response.

Solutions:

Each of the four examined countries share the overlapping necessity of a SCO-centric solution in preempting (and if it comes to it, responding to) the US’ Color Revolution subterfuge. For starters, the first thing that needs to happen is for Armenia and Turkmenistan to join the organization. According to SCO General Secretary Dmitry Mezentsev, Yerevan plans on becoming an observer member at the July summit in Ufa, but Ashgabat has yet to pragmatically walk back its ‘permanent neutrality’ and join the club. This endangers the Central Asia state by leaving it outside of the massive security framework taking shape across Eurasia. Although some observers pose the question of whether the SCO is becoming bloated with so many planned admissions (India and Pakistan are expected to join as full-fledged members at the same forthcoming summit), such arguments don’t detract from the progress made so far in coordinating anti-terror and counter-destabilization measures in Central Asia. Concerning the Caucasus, in conjunction with Azerbaijan’s planned observer status in the organization, the author postulated that the group could become a force for peace and stability in the conflict-struck region, and published an article series in which he explored this avenue, with the first piece entitled “SCO Will Be The New Framework For Resolving The Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict”.

It’s inescapable that Russia and China will play some type of supervisory role in coordinating stabilization activity in Central Asia and the Caucasus (with Beijing inevitably playing a role there after Armenia and Azerbaijan join the SCO as observer members), but the question is over what degree of involvement the two Eurasian giants can yield over these areas without being baited into a conventional military intervention like the US will be tempting them to do. A fine line will have to be balanced between Moscow’s short- and long-term interests, as well as between its reactionary military instincts and grand strategic vision, and
it’s certain that the US will impeccably play the role of devil’s advocate in trying to coax a disadvantageous conventional intervention out of its rival. The key then is for Russia to understand the nature of such traps before they’re activated so that its policy makers and strategists can craft contingency plans for avoiding the disastrous scenarios that a ‘Reverse Brzezinski’ entails, but no matter what, some type of joint activity with the SCO will be necessary in order to secure the peace that Russia is trying to protect.

Concluding Thoughts

The US is dedicated to dismantling Russian influence wherever it may be, and this is certainly so for the Balkans, Mideast, Caucasus, and Central Asia. Each of these theaters contains certain opportunities and vulnerabilities for Russian grand strategy, and accordingly, key countries within them are now in America’s New Cold War firing line. These targeted states form an uninterrupted arc stretching from Hungary in Central Europe to Kyrgyzstan in Central Asia, and they’re all fair game for America’s Color Revolution plotters. Some of them are also susceptible to Unconventional Wars that can worsen their internal turmoil after the asymmetrical regime change operation has been initiated, thus making their possible destabilization doubly dangerous for Russian interests. However, it has been argued that regional cooperation in the Balkans, Mideast, and the former Soviet sphere is an inarguable prerequisite for stabilizing their respective situations and fortifying their defenses amidst the US’ destructive designs. If the Color Arc can succeed in reinforcing its respective regions from the US’ aggressive asymmetrical intrusions (Color Revolutions and Unconventional Wars), then the future of the multipolar world can be secured, but the US is not expected to give up on its unipolar crusade without a fight, and the epic struggle along this vast Eurasian fault line is expected to dominate the geopolitics of the coming decade.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Analytical Articles


Books


Film


News and Statements of Information


Official Documents and Sources


Think Tanks and Research Publications


Acknowledgements:

I first and foremost want to thank God for all that He has done in my life. My family and friends have also been very instrumental in all of their support, specifically my grandparents, Eleanor and Richard.

Special thanks go out to Andrey Fomin of Oriental Review journal and Finnish political analyst Jon Hellevig for all of their gracious time with prior publication consultations, as well as Dr. Tatyana Shakleina, whose advice and belief in me was instrumental. Additionally, I’m grateful to Andrei Bezrukov for supporting my work and encouraging me to publish it in the first place, and I’m thankful for George Filimonov and Nikita Danyuk in assisting with its physical publication. I am also very thankful for the life experiences that I have had, as they all, in one way or another, influenced my world view and perception of international relations.

This book is dedicated to Hamsa. I remember in January 2014 when you told me that what was happening in Ukraine was the exact same thing that happened in Syria before the crisis spiraled out of control there. If it wasn’t for you telling me that, I would not have thought of drawing the comparison between the two, and my theory of Hybrid War would never have been created. Out of sincere gratitude for everything, I dedicate this work to you.

ISBN 978-5-209-06595-1

The object of research is US grand strategy and the new patterned approach to regime change is the subject. The book restricts itself towards only analyzing the Color Revolution and Unconventional Warfare aspects of the Adaptive Approach, believing them to be a new theory of warfare in and of themselves. The fusion of these two can stand alone from the third step of military interference, and it will be argued that this hybrid may be more preferable than expanding the destabilization operation to Humanitarian Intervention/Responsibility to Protect. The structural events in Syria and Ukraine serve as the case studies for testing this new theory, and it will be taken for a given that the reader has some level of pre-existing knowledge about these situations. The book aims to elaborate upon and analyze the evolving US regime change template and method of warfare first described at the Moscow Conference on International Security 2014, as well as showing that the combination of Color Revolutions and Unconventional Warfare represents a new theory of state destabilization that is ready for strategic deployment all across the world.

Объект исследования — большая стратегия США, предмет — новый подход к смене режимов. Исследование ограничивается рассмотрением таких проблем, как цветные революции и аспект неконвенциональных войн в рамках адаптивного подхода, так как их можно считать новой полноценной теорией ведения войны. Их влияние может выступать в качестве самостоятельной силы на третьем этапе военного вмешательства. В исследовании утверждается, что этот гибрид может быть более предпочтительным, чем расширение операции по дестабилизации до гуманитарной интервенции или ответственности по защите. События в Сирии и на Украине рассматриваются в качестве примеров тестирования этой новой теории. Предполагается, что читатель обладает фоновыми знаниями об описываемых событиях. В монографии поставлена цель рассмотреть и проанализировать развивающуюся модель смены режимов, используемую США, а также метод ведения войны, который был впервые описан в 2014 году на Конференции по международной безопасности в Москве. Более того, цель состоит в том, чтобы показать, что комбинация технологий цветных революций и неконвенциональных войн представляет собой новую теорию дестабилизации государства, которая подготовлена к стратегическому развертыванию в любой части мира.
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