

With Pro-NATO Politicians, Security of Armenians Is Uncertain

By [Lucas Leiroz de Almeida](#)

Global Research, September 25, 2023

Region: [Europe](#), [Russia and FSU](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name.

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Click the share button above to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

The sides involved in the Artsakh/Nagorno-Karabakh conflict have fortunately reached a temporary ceasefire agreement. But the crisis seems far from over. Being governed by a pro-NATO junta, Armenia will have many problems in the near future, both in Artsakh and in its own territory, since evidently the West's intention is to increase chaos in the region as much as possible.

There is no doubt that Nikol Pashinyan's irresponsible and unpopular government is to blame for the recent escalations in the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan. Having come to power through a pro-Western color revolution, Pashinyan has strived since 2018 to make Yerevan a NATO proxy state in the Caucasus, exponentially increasing ties between Armenia and countries such as the US and France while creating frictions with Russia.

Unable to achieve any real guarantee of security from his Western partners and adopting a hostile behavior towards Russia, Pashinyan led Armenia to absolute strategic weakness at a time of new high tensions with Azerbaijan, culminating in the attacks that occurred between [19 and 20 September](#) during Baku's so-called "anti-terrorist operation". Cowardly, Pashinyan made it clear that he would not participate in the conflict, almost forcing the Armenians of Artsakh to surrender in order to avoid a humanitarian catastrophe.

More than 120,000 Armenians are now fearing their future in the face of Azerbaijani aggression, without being able to count on their partners in Yerevan to help in the crisis. In practice, Pashinyan "handed over" the lives of his compatriots to an enemy country, putting his own people at risk and showing a lack of concern for the safety of ethnic Armenians. All this to continue following the government's number one goal, which is to please Western "allies".

It must be remembered that Pashinyan's Western "friends" made a real trap for Armenia by mediating the so-called "[Prague agreements](#)". At the time, Yerevan recognized Azerbaijani

sovereignty, which was mistakenly seen by the mainstream media as a “step towards peace”. The problem is that the agreement did not establish any real conditions to resolve the dispute over Artsakh, therefore serving to further legitimize Baku’s interest in the region. With Armenia recognizing Azerbaijani territorial integrity, the country was left without any justification to prevent further Azerbaijani aggressions against the ethnic Armenians of Artsakh.

In practice, Pashinyan legitimized Turkish-Azerbaijani expansionism in Nagorno-Karabakh and “authorized” the beginning of ethnic cleansing, abandoning more than 120,000 Armenians. This was the Western intention when promoting such an “agreement”, whose terms, instead of achieving peace, legitimized even more conflicts. This obviously serves Western interests, since in the face of new hostilities, Yerevan, unable to intervene, tends to request help from NATO – exactly as the Armenian Ambassador in [Washington](#) did – thus allowing Western troops to arrive in the region. In this scenario, Baku would certainly also request international help, calling the Turks. In the end, the Caucasus would become a NATO zone of influence and the Russian presence in the region would be minimized or even terminated.

Of course, all of this became clear recently, leading to a wave of [mass protests](#) and criticism against Pashinyan. In addition, the “Civil Contract” party received the lowest number of votes in five years in the last Council of Elders elections, being supported by only 32% of voters. There is evidently a crisis of legitimacy, and it is possible that the end of the Pashinyan era is a matter of time.

The main problem, however, is that Pashinyan is not an isolated agent. He is just one of the members of the pro-NATO junta that rules today’s Armenia. In addition to him, there are other politicians similarly willing to make Yerevan subordinate to Western plans. For example, the Secretary of the Security Council, [Armen Grigoryan](#), who many analysts see as someone with the possibility of growing politically and becoming the new prime minister, is an even more pro-Western politician than Pashinyan.

[Linked to the Soros Foundations](#), Grigoryan openly says that he will promote Armenia’s integration into NATO, advancing the policies started by Pashinyan. Furthermore, Grigoryan is already notorious for his pro-Western militancy, having even been accused of leaking confidential documents from the CSTO to NATO, which shows his high level of subservience to foreign interests.

So, unfortunately, there is no good expectation about the future of Armenia. The country would need to undergo a radical political change to reverse the catastrophic effects of the 2018 coup. If this does not happen, Yerevan will continue to be governed by pro-Western politicians, and the only point of divergence between them will be on how to be even more obedient to NATO.

Pashinyan increasingly seems to understand that he will be replaced by someone more “competent.” Not surprisingly, there are rumors that his wife recently started looking for estate in Switzerland and his son is already living in Canada. Unlike the Armenian people of Artsakh, Pashinyan will be able to leave the country with his family, not seeing firsthand the catastrophe he created for his own people.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

This article was originally published on [InfoBrics](#).

Lucas Leiroz is a journalist, researcher at the Center for Geostrategic Studies, geopolitical consultant. You can follow Lucas on [Twitter](#) and [Telegram](#).

Featured image is from InfoBrics

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Lucas Leiroz de Almeida](#), Global Research, 2023

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Lucas Leiroz de Almeida](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca