

Whose Security? Sweden, Finland, NATO's Expansion Towards Russia

By [Kim Petersen](#)

Global Research, April 17, 2022

Region: [Europe](#)

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the “Translate Website” drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

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

Visit and follow us on [Instagram](#), [Twitter](#) and [Facebook](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Insanity has often been defined as trying the same thing over and over and getting the same result.

Case in point, Ukraine was seeking NATO membership to bolster its security. This membership would have come at the expense of Russian security, as Russian president **Vladimir Putin** made clear. To thwart NATO's (i.e. the US's) hegemonic ambitions and preserve its own security, Russia felt compelled to address its security concerns. When these Russian security concerns were treated with contempt by the US and Ukraine, Russia took action to protect itself.

Two neutral countries, Finland and Sweden, are seriously contemplating NATO membership, as did Ukraine. Will this increase security for these two countries? There has been no warring between Russia and Finland since 1941-1944 when the Finns decided to ally with Nazi Germany during World War II and fight the Soviet Union. The last Russia-Sweden war was the [Finnish War](#) that was fought over two centuries ago (1808-1809).

On its face, one lesson to be drawn from the war between Russia and Ukraine is that Russia sees NATO membership on its border as a threat to its security, and it will act to protect its security.

Why then would any country that has been in relatively peaceful co-existence with Russians since the end of WWII seek a change in that status quo that may very well diminish or destroy that peaceful coexistence?

Sweden's **Prime Minister Magdalena Andersson** was circumspect about NATO membership noting that Sweden has to “think about the consequences.... We have to see what is best for Sweden's security.”

Finland's **Prime Minister Sanna Marin** admitted, “Of course, there are many kinds of risks

involved.... We have to be prepared for all kinds of actions from Russia...” Surely, Marin is aware of the risks that were posed by the stand off between John F Kennedy and Nikita Khrushchev over Soviet stationing of nukes in Cuba (and American nukes in Turkey).

News of further NATO expansion toward Russia has triggered a response from the Kremlin. Spokesperson [Dimitry Peskov said](#) Russia was considering militarily bolstering its western flank.



Across the pond, US State Department spokesperson **Ned Price** was welcoming of an enlarged NATO membership. He repeated, “... we believe NATO’s open door is an open door.”

However, it is quite obvious that the NATO open door has been more a closed door to Russia, as Russia has never been made a full member. It does not take a deep analysis to understand why this is so. NATO proclaims its, “purpose is to guarantee the freedom and security of its members through political and military means.” However, the *raison d’être* for such a military alliance disappears when there is no enemy on the horizon. Thus, Russia is reified as the NATO boogeyman. The existence of NATO serves well the aims of the governmental-military-industrial complex of the US.

Sweden and Finland are considering whether to formalize NATO membership — a key trigger in Russia’s military response to Ukraine. Some questions that arise:

Do Finland and Sweden not consider Russia’s security concerns valid? While the circumstances differ, why would these two Nordic countries try what failed for Ukraine and expect a benign response?

Would the presence of Russian nukes and hypersonic weapons targeting their countries make the Swedes and Finns feel more secure?

Instead of being regularly [badgered to increase military expenditures](#) as a NATO member, wouldn’t it be better to nix the insanity of spending the hard-earned cash of the Nordic workers on guns, tanks, planes, and missiles and becoming less secure as a result? Wouldn’t the money of the Nordic citizenry be put to better use for housing, road repair, poverty reduction, hospitals, recreation centers, and schools at home?

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram, Twitter and Facebook. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Kim Petersen is a scuba diver, independent writer, and former co-editor of the *Dissident Voice* newsletter. He can be emailed at: kimohp at [gmail.com](mailto:kimohp@gmail.com). Twitter: [@kimpetersen](https://twitter.com/kimpetersen). He is a regular contributor to *Global Research*.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Kim Petersen](#), Global Research, 2022

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Kim Petersen](#)

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