

Revisiting Finland-Russia Relations: A Flawed Narrative on Migration and Security

An In-Depth Critique of Jean-Eric Belmonte's "Weaponized Migration at the Finland-Russia Border: Towards a More Securitised EU Migration and Asylum Policy for Defence"

By [Prof. Ruel F. Pepa](#)

Global Research, January 13, 2025

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

Theme: [Law and Justice](#), [Media Disinformation](#)

Introduction

The article "[Weaponized Migration at the Finland-Russia Border: Towards a More Securitised EU Migration and Asylum Policy for Defence](#)" by Jean-Eric Belmonte advances a Western-centric perspective on migration and geopolitics, portraying Russia as a manipulative force behind Finland's recent migration challenges.

While the narrative reflects the dominant rhetoric in EU security circles, it falls short of presenting a balanced view. This critique challenges the article's premises, highlighting its oversimplifications, biases, and missed opportunities for a constructive dialogue.

Jean-Eric Belmonte

Weaponized migration at the
Finland–Russia
border: Towards a more
securitised EU migration and
asylum policy for defence?

Screenshot from [London Politica](#)

Oversimplification of Migration Dynamics

The assertion that Russia is deliberately orchestrating migration flows to Finland as a component of hybrid warfare is a significant oversimplification of a complex issue and lacks substantial supporting evidence. Migration is a multifaceted global phenomenon influenced by a wide range of factors, including economic hardship, armed conflict, political instability, environmental degradation, and the growing impacts of climate change. These drivers operate independently of any single actor's intentions, reflecting systemic challenges faced by individuals and communities worldwide.

By framing Finland's migration influx primarily as a deliberate act by Russia, such a perspective risks distorting the broader realities of migration dynamics. It simplifies a complex issue into a binary narrative of geopolitical conflict, neglecting the agency and circumstances of the migrants themselves. This reductive approach not only misrepresents the underlying causes of migration but also risks stigmatizing those who migrate. Migrants, often compelled to leave their homes due to dire circumstances, may be unfairly viewed through the lens of geopolitical manipulation rather than as individuals seeking safety, stability, or a better quality of life.

Additionally, this narrative can perpetuate harmful stereotypes and xenophobic sentiments, framing migrants as tools of statecraft rather than recognizing their inherent dignity and complex human experiences. By reducing their plight to a strategy of "hybrid warfare," such rhetoric risks exacerbating divisions within societies, fostering mistrust, and undermining the values of empathy and solidarity that are essential in addressing global migration challenges effectively.

A more balanced and evidence-based approach is crucial to understanding migration flows. This involves examining the diverse and interrelated factors that drive migration while resisting the urge to attribute such phenomena to simplistic, politically charged explanations. Recognizing the structural causes of migration and addressing them with international cooperation and humane policies is far more constructive than framing migration as a weapon in geopolitical disputes.

NATO Expansion as a Provocation

The article characterizes Finland's NATO accession as a defensive response to an aggressive Russia but fails to adequately address the provocative dimensions of NATO's eastward expansion. For decades, Moscow has repeatedly articulated its apprehensions about NATO's steady encroachment toward its borders, viewing it as a significant security threat. These concerns, whether fully justified or not, are deeply rooted in historical and geopolitical realities that shape Russia's strategic posture. Ignoring these factors oversimplifies the dynamics at play and reinforces a reductive narrative of Western virtue versus Russian aggression.

Finland's decision to abandon its longstanding policy of neutrality and align itself with NATO represents a profound shift in the security landscape of the region.

Image: Foreign minister Pekka Haavisto (L) hands over Finland's NATO accession document to US secretary of state, Antony Blinken, as secretary-general Stoltenberg looks on, Brussels, 4 Apr 2023 (Source: [Indian Punchline](#))



From Moscow's perspective, this move underscores a broader pattern of encirclement by a military alliance originally founded to counter Soviet influence during the Cold War. The inclusion of Finland into NATO not only brings the alliance closer to Russia's borders but also eliminates the buffer zone that Finland's neutrality once provided. This shift is perceived by Russia as a direct challenge to its sphere of influence and national security, further fueling its anxieties about Western intentions.

Framing NATO expansion solely as a defensive measure ignores the legitimate grievances that have been voiced by Russia over the years. It dismisses the obvious reality that NATO's growth has long been a contentious issue, even among Western analysts and policymakers. Many have warned that such expansion risks heightening tensions with Moscow, potentially provoking the very hostilities it seeks to prevent. The narrative of expansion as purely defensive disregards the broader geopolitical implications of altering the balance of power in the region and the perception of threat it creates for Russia.

This lack of contextualization reduces the discussion to a simplistic binary, casting NATO as a benevolent force for peace and Russia as an unprovoked aggressor.

Such framing not only obscures the complexities of international relations but also risks perpetuating misunderstandings and fueling further antagonism. A more balanced analysis would consider the historical context of NATO's evolution, the strategic concerns of all parties involved, and the potential consequences of actions that escalate tensions in an already volatile global environment.

Recognizing and addressing the legitimate security concerns of all stakeholders is essential for fostering a more stable and cooperative international order. Rather than dismissing Russia's objections outright, meaningful dialogue and transparency about NATO's intentions and actions could contribute to mitigating mutual distrust and reducing the risks of conflict.

Mischaracterization of Russia's Role in Migration

The article's reliance on the concept of Coercive Engineered Migration (CEM) to portray Russia as a manipulative actor in global migration dynamics reflects a selective and biased interpretation of the phenomenon. This narrative accuses Moscow of exploiting migration flows for geopolitical leverage while failing to account for similar tactics employed by other states, particularly those aligned with the West. By singling out Russia, the article perpetuates a double standard that diminishes its credibility and distorts the broader geopolitical context.

CEM refers to the deliberate use of migration to achieve political or strategic goals, often by leveraging the vulnerabilities of displaced populations to exert pressure on rival states.

While the article attributes this practice to Russia, it overlooks

well-documented instances where Western-aligned states have employed similar strategies. For example, Turkey has repeatedly used the threat of opening its borders to refugee flows as a bargaining tool in negotiations with the European Union, seeking concessions on financial aid, visa liberalization, and other political matters. This tactic highlights how migration can be weaponized across the geopolitical spectrum, yet such cases receive comparatively less scrutiny in Western narratives.

The selective application of the CEM framework to Russia reinforces a polarized view of international relations, casting Moscow as uniquely nefarious while downplaying or ignoring similar behaviors by other states. This approach not only skews the discussion but also undermines the validity of the article's arguments by failing to present a balanced assessment of how migration is politicized globally.

Moreover, it risks perpetuating a narrative that stigmatizes migrants, portraying them as pawns in geopolitical games rather than individuals fleeing hardship and seeking better lives.

A more nuanced analysis would acknowledge that the use of migration as a geopolitical tool is not exclusive to any one nation or alliance. It is a tactic that reflects the broader dynamics of power, pressure, and negotiation in international relations. By framing the issue as a uniquely Russian phenomenon, the article misses an opportunity to explore the systemic factors that enable such strategies, including the global inadequacies in addressing migration and the vulnerabilities of displaced populations.

To enhance its credibility, the article should strive for a more balanced perspective that situates Russia's actions within the broader context of state behavior.

Recognizing that multiple actors, including Western-aligned states, have employed similar strategies would provide a more accurate and comprehensive understanding of how migration intersects with geopolitics. Such an approach would not only enrich the analysis but also contribute to a more constructive dialogue on the ethical and political implications of using migration as a tool of coercion.

Historical Context: A Missed Opportunity for Nuance

The article highlights Finland's historical wariness of Russia, but it oversimplifies this complex relationship by neglecting significant periods of constructive engagement, such as the Finlandization era. This omission skews the narrative, portraying Russia as a perpetual adversary while disregarding Finland's specific and active role in managing its relationship with its larger neighbor. By glossing over these critical historical dynamics, the article undermines the depth of the analysis and misses an opportunity to provide a more balanced perspective.

During the Finlandization era, Finland navigated a delicate balance between maintaining its sovereignty and accommodating the geopolitical realities of its proximity to the Soviet Union. This period was marked by Finland's policy of neutrality, which enabled it to foster a cooperative relationship with Moscow while avoiding alignment with NATO or other Western alliances. Finlandization was not merely an imposition by the Soviet Union; it also reflected Finland's pragmatic approach to securing its national interests, preserving peace, and

ensuring economic stability in a challenging geopolitical environment.

By omitting this chapter, the article presents an incomplete picture of the Finland-Russia relationship, framing it as one of unrelenting hostility and mistrust. This narrative overlooks the ways in which Finland actively shaped its foreign policy to manage tensions and coexist with a powerful neighbor. Moreover, it disregards the successes of this approach, including periods of economic and diplomatic cooperation that contributed to regional stability.

The shift from neutrality to NATO membership represents a significant departure from Finland's historical strategy of balancing its relations with both East and West. While Finland's decision to join NATO is framed as a defensive response to perceived Russian aggression, it also serves as a provocative move that fundamentally alters the dynamics of the relationship. From Moscow's perspective, Finland's NATO accession erodes the strategic buffer that neutrality once provided, heightening its sense of encirclement and fueling tensions. This shift cannot be fully understood without acknowledging the historical context of Finland's prior neutrality and the pragmatic engagement that defined much of its Cold War-era policy.

A realistic analysis would recognize the dual nature of Finland's historical relationship with Russia—marked by both wariness and cooperation.

Acknowledging the Finlandization era as a pragmatic response to geopolitical realities would provide valuable context for understanding the current shift in Finnish policy. It would also highlight the ways in which both Finland and Russia have contributed to the evolution of their relationship over time.

By presenting this broader historical perspective, the article could move beyond the simplistic dichotomy of Russian aggression versus Finnish defensiveness. Instead, it could explore the complex interplay of history, strategy, and perception that underpins Finland's decision to align with NATO and the resulting implications for regional stability. Such an approach would offer readers a deeper and more accurate understanding of the factors driving the current escalation in tensions.

Securitization of Migration and Militarization of Borders

The article's endorsement of stronger border controls and tougher migration policies mirrors the European Union's broader trend of securitizing migration. While framed as a necessary response to perceived threats, this approach carries significant risks, including the further militarization of borders and potential violations of international human rights standards. By promoting such measures, the article not only exacerbates regional instability but also undermines the EU's professed commitment to humanitarian principles and shared global responsibilities.

The securitization of migration involves framing migrants and refugees as security threats rather than individuals seeking safety, stability, or better opportunities. This perspective often justifies the deployment of military resources, surveillance technologies, and restrictive policies to control migration flows. While these measures may address immediate political concerns, they fail to address the root causes of migration, such as conflict, poverty, and climate change. Instead, they create barriers that deepen human suffering, limit access to asylum, and perpetuate cycles of displacement.

The article's uncritical endorsement of border securitization contributes to this troubling trend. It overlooks the human cost of militarized borders, including the increased risks faced by migrants attempting to cross them and the potential erosion of international protections for refugees. Additionally, such measures can strain relations between neighboring countries, fostering mistrust and fueling geopolitical tensions.

Finland's construction of a border fence with Russia exemplifies these dynamics. While Finland argues that the fence enhances national security and manages migration flows, it also sends a provocative signal to Moscow, reinforcing the perception of escalating hostility. Russia's concerns about these developments,

including their implications for bilateral relations and regional stability, are dismissed in the article without due consideration. This omission reflects a broader reluctance to engage with the complexities of border security and its geopolitical consequences.

Moreover, the emphasis on securitization runs counter to the EU's stated commitment to upholding human rights and humanitarian values. The EU has historically positioned itself as a global leader in promoting these principles, yet the increasing militarization of its borders undermines its credibility and moral authority. By focusing on deterrence and control, the EU risks alienating its neighbors, eroding trust, and setting a troubling precedent for other regions grappling with migration challenges.

A more balanced approach would recognize the need to manage borders while addressing the systemic drivers of migration and prioritizing the protection of human rights. This requires greater investment in international cooperation, conflict resolution, and development initiatives aimed at reducing the pressures that force people to migrate. It also calls for an honest reckoning with the consequences of securitization and a commitment to policies that align with the EU's foundational values.

Rather than framing migration solely as a security challenge, the article could have explored alternative strategies for addressing migration flows in a way that respects human dignity, fosters regional stability, and mitigates geopolitical tensions. By engaging with these broader considerations, it would offer a more comprehensive and constructive perspective on a deeply complex and pressing issue.

Double Standards in EU Migration Policies

The article's critique of Russia's alleged weaponization of migration fails to address the EU's own extensive history of employing similar tactics, exposing a glaring double standard. While accusing Moscow of exploiting migration for geopolitical purposes, it overlooks how the EU has repeatedly outsourced its border control responsibilities to third countries, often with significant human rights implications. This selective outrage undermines the article's impartiality and fairness, presenting a one-sided narrative that diminishes the complexity of the issue.

The EU's approach to migration management has long relied on externalizing its borders by forming agreements with non-EU states to prevent migrants and refugees from reaching European territory. High-profile examples include the EU's 2016 agreement with Turkey, under which Turkey received financial support in exchange for curbing migration flows into Europe. Similarly, the EU has partnered with Libya, providing funding, training, and resources to its coast guard to intercept migrants attempting to cross the Mediterranean.

These arrangements have faced widespread criticism for enabling human rights abuses, including the detention, mistreatment, and exploitation of migrants in facilities often described as inhumane.



Copyright Amnesty International

Despite these well-documented practices, the article reserves its critique solely for Russia, portraying it as uniquely culpable in using migration as a geopolitical tool. This selective focus obscures the broader context of how migration has been instrumentalized by various actors, including the EU itself. By failing to scrutinize the EU's own policies, the article perpetuates a double standard that not only skews the narrative but also erodes its credibility.

Moreover, the EU's externalization strategies often come at the direct expense of migrants' rights and safety. By prioritizing deterrence and containment over humanitarian obligations, the EU has contributed to conditions that exacerbate the suffering of displaced individuals. Migrants intercepted by the Libyan coast guard, for instance, frequently face detention in overcrowded, unsafe facilities with limited access to basic necessities. Similarly, the reliance on Turkey as a migration buffer has raised concerns about the treatment of refugees and the EU's complicity in undermining international asylum standards.

This double standard in migration policies is symptomatic of a broader trend in Western narratives, which often condemn similar practices by non-Western states while justifying or ignoring their own. This lack of consistency undermines the moral high ground that the EU seeks to claim in international relations and raises questions about the fairness and objectivity of such critiques. Addressing this

imbalance requires a more even-handed analysis that holds all actors accountable for their roles in the politicization and securitization of migration.

A more reasonable discussion would recognize that the weaponization of migration is not a practice unique to any one state or region. It is a tactic that reflects broader structural inequities and the failure of the international community to address migration in a humane and sustainable manner. By highlighting the EU's reliance on similar strategies, the article could offer a more comprehensive critique of how migration is manipulated for political ends, regardless of who employs such tactics. This approach would not only enhance the credibility of the analysis but also contribute to a more balanced and constructive dialogue on the ethics and politics of migration management.

Overreliance on Western Frameworks

The article's reliance on Western theories, particularly Kelly Greenhill's concept of Coercive Engineered Migration (CEM), without critically assessing their applicability to the Finland-Russia context, reflects a narrow and Eurocentric perspective. By drawing heavily on frameworks developed within the context of Western geopolitical thought, the article risks oversimplifying the complex dynamics between Finland and Russia and marginalizing alternative viewpoints that are essential for a fuller understanding of the situation. This overreliance on Western paradigms not only limits the depth of the analysis but also risks distorting the broader geopolitical landscape in ways that ignore or downplay the perspectives and historical experiences of Russia.

Kelly Greenhill's CEM theory, which posits that states may intentionally manipulate migration flows for political or strategic gain, offers a useful lens through which to examine some migration phenomena. However, applying this framework uncritically to the Finland-Russia situation presents significant limitations. It assumes that the dynamics of migration can be easily understood through the lens of state-centric power struggles and security calculations, which may not fully capture the diverse motivations behind migration flows. Moreover, by focusing on one particular theory without exploring its relevance or limitations in a specific context, the article neglects the broader set of factors that influence migration, including economic, social, environmental, and cultural elements that transcend geopolitical rivalries.

Furthermore, such a one-sided analysis reinforces a Eurocentric perspective that prioritizes Western theories and experiences while sidelining the viewpoints of other actors involved in the situation. The framing of migration flows primarily in terms of hybrid warfare or geopolitical manipulation inherently diminishes the complexities of migration as a global phenomenon that affects all nations, not just those within the Western sphere of influence. This approach also risks overlooking Russia's own concerns, historical context, and role in shaping its interactions with neighboring countries, including Finland.

A more balanced and comprehensive analysis would seek to incorporate Russia's perspective and historical context, recognizing the strategic concerns and security dynamics that shape its response to NATO expansion and migration flows. Russia's historical experience, particularly its complex relationship with neighboring states like Finland, its security concerns over encirclement, and its own internal migration policies, provides important context for understanding how it might view the current situation. Ignoring these factors in favor of a one-dimensional, Western-centric narrative risks distorting the broader geopolitical reality.

To offer a fuller understanding of the Finland-Russia relationship, the article would benefit from integrating alternative viewpoints that reflect the diversity of international

perspectives on migration and security. This would involve critically engaging with theories and frameworks from both Western and non-Western traditions and considering how these perspectives inform the interpretation of migration flows and geopolitical tensions. A more nuanced analysis would not only enrich the discussion but also highlight the limitations of overrelying on a single theoretical framework, ultimately offering a more inclusive and multifaceted approach to understanding the intersection of migration, security, and international relations.

By considering the historical context, motivations, and perspectives of all relevant parties—including Russia—alongside Western theories, the article could provide a deeper and more objective analysis of the situation. This would allow for a more comprehensive exploration of the factors at play and avoid oversimplifying the complex geopolitical landscape surrounding Finland's migration challenges and its relationship with Russia.

Finland's Domestic Politics: A Critical Blind Spot

While the article briefly acknowledges Finland's recent rightward political shift, it fails to adequately explore the significant implications of this development on the country's policies, particularly in relation to migration and its stance toward Russia. The securitization of migration and the increasingly hostile rhetoric toward Russia, as highlighted in the article, are not only responses to external geopolitical pressures but also deeply intertwined with domestic political agendas. By overlooking this aspect, the article misses a critical element of understanding Finland's current policies and the broader public discourse shaping its response to migration and security.

Finland's political landscape has indeed shifted notably to the right in recent years, with anti-immigration and nationalist sentiment gaining traction, especially among far-right parties. These political movements have increasingly framed migration not as a humanitarian issue but as a security threat, calling for stricter border controls, greater surveillance, and more aggressive policies toward migrants. This shift is part of a broader European trend where far-right and populist parties have harnessed fears around migration to gain political power and legitimacy. In Finland, parties such as the Finns Party (*Perussuomalaiset*) have been vocal in their criticism of migration policies, aligning with the broader rhetoric of anti-immigrant, nativist movements across Europe.

This political climate has led to the growing securitization of migration, where migration flows are seen not just as a social or humanitarian issue but primarily as a national security concern. The increasing militarization of borders, including discussions of building physical barriers like the border fence with Russia, has become a key feature of Finland's response. The rhetoric around migration is often framed in stark terms, portraying migrants as potential threats or as part of a larger geopolitical strategy orchestrated by countries like Russia. This discourse mirrors the far-right's broader strategy of linking immigration to national security, economic strain, and cultural decline—narratives that resonate strongly with their base.

However, the article's failure to engage with these domestic political dynamics limits its analysis. By focusing predominantly on external geopolitical factors—such as Russia's alleged manipulation of migration—without considering how internal political agendas influence policy decisions, the article presents an incomplete picture of the motivations driving Finland's approach. The rise of right-wing populism and its influence on the national conversation about migration, Russia, and security cannot be overlooked, as these domestic

factors are central to shaping Finland's increasingly hardline policies.

A more comprehensive analysis would recognize that Finland's current stance toward migration and Russia is not just a result of external threats but also the product of domestic political forces. The growing influence of far-right parties has shifted public discourse, with migration being framed as a threat to Finland's identity and security. The public's increased concern about Russia, partly fueled by historical tensions and the broader geopolitical environment, is also shaped by the narratives promoted by these political movements.

Furthermore, understanding the role of domestic politics helps explain why certain policies are prioritized. For example, the construction of a border fence between Finland and Russia, while presented as a security measure, is likely shaped by internal political pressures and the desire to appear tough on migration and national defense. These actions also serve as signals to voters concerned about immigration, national sovereignty, and Russia's regional intentions.

By recognizing the intersection of domestic political agendas with Finland's migration and foreign policies, the article would provide a more accurate and clearer picture of the factors driving the country's approach. It would also allow for a better understanding of the role that political parties and public opinion play in shaping the discourse around migration, security, and Russia. In doing so, the article could address the complexities of Finland's policy choices, revealing that the current political climate is not solely a response to external threats, but also a reflection of the domestic political landscape and its influence on the nation's broader foreign policy.

Missed Opportunities for Diplomatic Solutions

By framing Russia as a perpetual aggressor, the article effectively closes the door on potential avenues for diplomatic engagement that could address shared challenges, such as migration and border stability. While Russia is often depicted as a threat, particularly in the context of migration and security, this portrayal oversimplifies the situation and overlooks the possibility for dialogue and cooperation. A more constructive approach would advocate for diplomatic solutions that promote mutual understanding and address the root causes of the issues at hand, rather than merely intensifying confrontation and securitization.

One of the key challenges highlighted in the article is the migration crisis, which has placed increasing strain on European borders, including Finland's. Rather than focusing solely on viewing migration flows through a security lens, a more productive approach would be to explore collaborative strategies with Russia to address the underlying causes of migration. Both Finland and Russia share a border and face similar challenges regarding irregular migration, often stemming from political instability, economic hardship, and conflict in neighboring regions. Given this shared context, diplomatic cooperation between Finland and Russia could be instrumental in developing coordinated policies that prioritize humane treatment of migrants while addressing security concerns.

Securitization, as endorsed in the article, often leads to the militarization of borders, stricter immigration policies, and heightened tensions between neighboring states. While these measures might offer short-term solutions, they rarely address the root causes of migration or lead to long-term stability. Instead, they risk exacerbating tensions, driving more migrants into dangerous routes, and further polarizing the relationship between countries. By focusing on confrontation and the security risks posed by migration, the article misses an

important opportunity to explore how Russia and Finland could engage diplomatically to find solutions that benefit both countries, as well as migrants and refugees themselves.

Diplomatic engagement in this context could involve joint efforts to improve border management, share intelligence, and enhance cooperation on addressing migration from countries like Syria or Afghanistan, where both Russia and Finland have strategic interests. Furthermore, dialogue on migration could be framed within broader regional security and economic cooperation, where mutual benefits could be realized. For example, Finland and Russia could collaborate on programs aimed at improving the economic conditions in countries of origin, which could reduce the push factors driving migration. Additionally, discussions on border stability could focus on humanitarian support for migrants and refugees, ensuring their safety while simultaneously addressing legitimate security concerns.

The focus on confrontation, particularly the portrayal of Russia as a “perpetual aggressor,” limits the potential for such collaboration. This narrative reduces the complexity of international relations to a binary conflict, where the only solutions are military or security-based. This kind of framing not only reinforces distrust and hostility but also misses the opportunity to build bridges between neighboring nations that could address common challenges.

Moreover, Russia has historically been involved in discussions on migration management with neighboring countries, and it is in both Russia’s and Finland’s interests to stabilize the region and mitigate the impact of uncontrolled migration flows. Dismissing the possibility of dialogue risks further deepening divides and prolonging tensions that are not only detrimental to the two countries involved but to the entire European region. Rather than allowing geopolitical narratives of aggression to dominate the discourse, there should be a concerted effort to engage in dialogue that seeks to find common ground, build trust, and explore diplomatic solutions that promote security, stability, and human rights.

By emphasizing diplomatic solutions rather than securitization, the article could shift the conversation from one of division to one of collaboration. A more balanced and forward-thinking approach would consider the potential for dialogue, focusing on cooperative measures that address migration flows, border stability, and security concerns in ways that align with international human rights standards. Through such an approach, Finland and Russia could work together not only to secure their borders but also to promote stability in their shared region, ultimately leading to a more peaceful and sustainable outcome for both nations and the broader international community.

Conclusion

Jean-Eric Belmonte’s article reflects a prevalent but flawed narrative that reinforces anti-Russian sentiment and securitizes migration at the expense of a more profound analysis and fairness. A balanced critique demands accountability from all parties—Russia, Finland, and the EU—and focuses on addressing the root causes of migration rather than weaponizing it as a political tool. Moving forward, fostering dialogue and mutual understanding will be essential to ensuring regional stability and upholding humanitarian values.

*

Click the share button below to email/forward this article. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [X](#) and

subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost Global Research articles with proper attribution.

Prof. Ruel F. Pepa is a Filipino philosopher based in Madrid, Spain. A retired academic (Associate Professor IV), he taught Philosophy and Social Sciences for more than fifteen years at Trinity University of Asia, an Anglican university in the Philippines. He is a regular contributor to Global Research.

Sources

FitzGerald, David, & Cook-Martin, David. *Culling the Masses: The Democratic Origins of Racist Immigration Policy in the Americas*. Harvard University Press, 2014. Provides historical context on how immigration has been shaped by political motives, shedding light on parallels with contemporary securitization trends.

Greenhill, Kelly M. *Weapons of Mass Migration: Forced Displacement, Coercion, and Foreign Policy*. Cornell University Press, 2010. A foundational text on the concept of Coercive Engineered Migration, discussing how state and non-state actors use migration as a tool of political and strategic leverage.

Hirschman, Albert O. *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Harvard University Press, 1970. While not migration-specific, this classic work explores how individuals and groups react to governance failures, providing a theoretical framework for understanding migration trends.

Mearsheimer, John J. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. W.W. Norton & Company, 2001. Offers a realist perspective on international relations, including Russia's concerns about NATO expansion and its impact on security dynamics.

Waeber, Ole, Buzan, Barry, Kelstrup, Morten, & Lemaitre, Pierre. *Identity, Migration, and the New Security Agenda in Europe*. Routledge, 1993. An early but essential analysis of how migration has been framed as a security issue within Europe.

Williams, Michael C. *Culture and Security: Symbolic Power and the Politics of International Security*. Routledge, 2007. Explores how cultural narratives influence security policies, providing insight into the securitization of migration in the EU.

Featured image is from iStock via the author

Global Research is a reader-funded media. We do not accept any funding from corporations or governments. Help us stay afloat. Click the image below to make a one-time or recurring donation.



The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Prof. Ruel F. Pepa](#), Global Research, 2025

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Prof. Ruel F. Pepa](#)

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