

Research Article

Need-fear Analysis: Addressing Underlying Motivations Crucial in Decision-making

Godofredo Lapitan Senires III* 

College of Professional and Graduate Studies, De La Salle University – Dasmarinas, Dasmarinas, Philippines

Abstract

The Need-Fear Analysis Mapping Tool is a kind of an actor-oriented clarification analysis tool designed as a strategic framework to assist organizations, individuals, to address underlying motivations and deterrents that can influence their decision-making process. The Need-Fear Analysis Mapping Tool would not only focus on the “needs” of the actors, but also on the “fears” that can influence the decision. By mapping these elements, it will provide the actor with a much clearer picture or impending challenges that may hinder progress and can present a more effective approach or strategies to change the execution of their goal attainment. This kind of analysis tool visually serves as a “seesaw” to visually represent divergent factors of aspirations, requirements or desires of an individual or an organization against their anxieties and concerns related to a particular situation, problems or crisis. This “seesaw” effect pulls the argument in both directions. The challenge is to logically find the balance and weight of each side that can be crucial in decision-making. This is most applicable to any military organizations to properly and clearly map the situation, identifying other salient things to be considered to attain a more viable solution. Therefore, this Need-Fear Analysis Mapping Tool would bring focus, not only to the “needs” of the actors in any given situation, but also to the corresponding “fears” that should be equally considered by the actor as against the available means – all having influence later on the “options”. This should be the correct mindset that military organizations all over the world has to consider. “*There is no stone unturned...*” as the saying goes that will greatly influence the outcome of the situational analysis and attain a more complete and practicable solution.

Keywords

Actor-oriented Clarification Analysis, Need-fear Analysis Mapping Tool, Decision-making

1. Introduction

This Need-Fear Analysis Mapping Tool is a strategic framework relative to the behavioral decision theory, designed to assist organizations, or even individuals, to address underlying motivations (needs) and deterrents (fears) that can influence their decision-making process. Mapping these elements will provide a much clearer picture or impending challenges that may hinder progress and can present a more

effective approach or strategies to change the execution of their goal attainment.

This Need-Fear Analysis Mapping Tool is a kind of actor-oriented clarification analysis tool that would focus, not only on the “needs” of the actors in any situation, but also on the “fears” that can influence the decision and should equally be considered. “Aside from laying out the needs and fears, it

*Corresponding author: viking_gpi@yahoo.com (Godofredo Lapitan Senires III)



should also consider the different issues, interests, and possible options for each actor [1].” All these factors can have a tremendous influence on the outcome of the analysis. In normal circumstances, several organizations, most especially the military, only satisfies or comply with the needs of their organization without any serious consideration for possible problems that might occur in critical situations. Nevertheless, this analysis tool can greatly help organizations to properly and clearly map the situation, identify what are the other salient things to be considered to attain a more viable solution.

At the core, the Need-Fear Analysis Mapping Tool visually serves as a “seesaw” that can visually represent divergent factors of aspirations, requirements or desires of an individual or organization against their anxieties and concerns related to a particular situation, problems or crisis. This “seesaw” effect pulls the argument in both directions, pulling towards something (the needs), and the other things that can push the argument away (the fears). The challenge therefore is to logically find the balance and weight of each side that can be crucial in decision-making.

The following are the components that can be used in the Need-Fear Analysis Mapping Tool:

As Needs. These are the objectives, intent or desires, that are usually positive outcomes or even solutions to the problems that the person or group intends to attain or resolve. Samples of which include:

- 1). Security
- 2). Growth
- 3). Recognition
- 4). Efficiency
- 5). Victory or Success
- 6). Accomplishment
- 7). Problem or Conflict Resolution

As Fears. These components present the negative outcomes, concerns, potential losses or even risks that the person or group would want to avoid. These components present what could go wrong or lost. Examples would include:

- 1). Failure
- 2). Financial Risk
- 3). Rejection
- 4). Loss of Control
- 5). Catastrophe or Disaster
- 6). Uncertainty
- 7). Wasted Time or Effort

Maslow’s motivational theory ‘hierarchy of needs’ explains

how human needs are built from the basic to complex. His hierarchy of needs proposes that people must first meet their essential physiological and safety needs before they can focus on a higher-level need like belonging, esteem and their self-actualization. Often illustrated as a pyramid in Figure 1, the models would help explain why unmet basic needs are often harder to pursue like personal growth and fulfillment. [2].



Figure 1. Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs [3].

In consideration of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, this Need-Fear Analysis Mapping Tool will be most practical for use in the military, not just looking at what the military needs, but also to any contravening factors that may or can affect its complex military operations, like enemies, risks and other challenges. For Maslow, the needs of humans were arranged in a hierarchy. From its physiological or survival needs at the bottom, up to a more creative and intellectually oriented ‘self-actualization’ needs at the top [4].

2. Discussion

The person or group of people that will be using this Need-Fear Analysis needs to consider these components, in a matrix format, that should emanate from the Actor, as shown in Figure 2:

ACTOR	NEEDS	FEARS	MEANS	OPTION
-------	-------	-------	-------	--------

Figure 2. The Need-Fear Analysis Mapping Tool Components.

(a) The Actor. The “actor”, or the stakeholder, will be the first component to be considered since their participation is key to the viable results of the analysis. The

analysis can initially consider the internal actors that would later be expanded towards the external actors, or stakeholders.

- (b) The Needs. As the word clearly suggests, are all the “needs”, or personal interests, of the corresponding actor should be listed herein. This is what motivates the actor into action.
- (c) The Fears. This component should list what the actors fear, probable challenges or issues that the organization would want to avoid from happening. The “fears” can also influence the behavior of each actor.
- (d) Means. This component will be listing what the actor already has or may be available or permissible to be used in the situation being considered. This is what they can easily use at the present.
- (e) Options. This component will list down what the actor can do from existing “means” that they or can have to be able to attain their desired outcome. This component would present all the possible solutions or remedies to the situation being considered. Maslow even said that *“in any given moment, we have two options: to step forward into growth or to step back into safety.”* This is what he would call the two-button approach in life [5].

After weighing in on the needs as against the fears, and with the available means present, the actor could later derive what options that they need to do. The option, or options, would list the decision of the actor involved. Despite what would come out with the “Options” it will remain at the discretion of the one performing the Need-Fear Analysis Mapping Tool to make their own final decision.

3. Case Example

A simple example of this would be the Philippine military’s “need” for transportation equipment with their ground military operations. Since the “need” was identified, and without considering the “fear”, one would think that they just need to buy any vehicles offered them – even from foreign suppliers. However, what was not considered in this case – the fear – that the said transportation equipment would be utilized in extreme and rugged conditions. This is in consideration that military operations are usually done in rugged terrains, difficult, dangerous or even extreme environments. Naturally, the said transportation equipment could easily fail and may disrupt the military operations. If it fails, the military mission fails?

Another such example would be the use of firearms for soldiers. The research paper titled: “The Legend of the Colt.45 Semi-Automatic Pistol and the Moros” by Robert A. Fulton, includes the annual report of General Leonard Wood of June 1904 stating that: *“Instances have repeatedly been reported during the past year where the natives have been shot through and through several times with a .38 caliber revolver, and have come on, cutting up the unfortunate individual armed with it. The .45 caliber revolver stops a man on his tracks, usually knocking him down”*. With that, “the Bureau of Ordnance later approved the Colt.45 DA Model 1909

as the new service revolver of the American troops. [6]”. The inadequacies of their .38 caliber revolver finally surfaced. Army Ordnance quickly decided that the Army needs a new weapon. To determine the force required, Ordnance officers experimented with various bullets by firing at slaughterhouse cattle and donated human cadavers. Their experiment showed that a .45 caliber cartridge has the most effective stopping power [7]. With that, “the Bureau of Ordnance later approved the Colt.45 DA Model 1909 as the new service revolver of the American troops [8].”

As presented herein, then US General Leonard Wood realized that although American troops were issued with the .38 caliber revolver – as a need – the fear of not stopping the natives made them realize there must be something to be done to remedy this issue. With the means to evaluate and later remedy this issue – as lesson learned – was to make the caliber a bit bigger. Hence, as the option, the .45 caliber revolver became their standard issue to soldiers.

Militaries all over the world have made it as part of its standard “Soldier’s System” – a concept that had been developed cooperatively “to enhance the effectiveness and warfighting capability of the soldier on the battlefield and has a direct effect on the soldier’s performance. [9]” Decisions on what type of firearms that the soldiers are given, therefore, should fit the mission that will make the effectiveness and warfighting capabilities of the soldiers on the battlefield – and mission accomplishments.

As a demonstration, this Need-Fear Analysis Mapping Tool can be used in this simple scenario – deploying troops in the public parade as laid out in Table 1. An example event is a public parade that will be held to commemorate a public holiday. In this example, the military is requested to provide 200 personnel to provide a human barricade along the route of the public parade that will commence from 8:00 am until 10:00 am. Hence, the military needs to be deployed and in position as early as 6:00 am along the route of the parade.

In this demonstration, Table 1 presents three (3) actors in this given scenario: the ground commander, the team leader and the individual soldier. Although each actor would have a common mission to accomplish, it would entail different needs and fears that will be presented based on their different “means” available and the “options” available or allowable for each actor.

The actor “Ground Commander” needs to deploy 200 troops as human barricade in a public parade as early as 6:00 am. These 200 troops were also divided into four (4) teams, as such an additional “Team Leader” is added as one of the actors. Aside from being given troops, he was given his operational and contingency funds to be used during the operations. Being responsible for the order and success of the parade, the Ground Commander’s fears could be: miscoordination, logistics, theft and pandemonium of the crowd during the parade.

Table 1. Need-Fear Analysis Mapping Tool (For Simple Demonstration Only).

ACTOR	NEEDS	FEARS	MEANS	OPTION
Ground Commander	To deploy 200 troops as human barricade in a public parade as early as 6:00 am	Responsibility for the Parade being disrupted or discontinued	Command Authority	Mission Briefing with personnel prior to deployment
		Miscoordination with other Agencies	Deploy troops along the parade route	Advance deployment
Team Leader	Operational and Contingency Funds Orderly conduct Secure assigned sectors Logistics Support	Logistics	Communication equipment	Redundant Communication System
		Theft		
		Pandemonium	Operational Funds	Emergency Funds
		Delays	Presence of Law Enforcement Agencies	Coordination with Law Enforcement Agencies
Soldiers	Obey Orders Personnel Sustainment	Misdemeanors Hunger & thirst of deployed personnel	Crowd control	Maximum tolerance
			Deploy nearby	Other sources
			Follow Orders or Instructions	Organize into Squads or Teams
			Break Ranks of Line	Food packs to be delivered

Situation: Public Parade

The available “means” to the Ground Commander indicates that he was given command authority to the 200 troops, can deploy these troops along the parade route, was issued with communication equipment, operational funds and tasked with crowd control. The available “option” for the Ground Commander to do is to provide mission briefing with his personnel, including reserve personnel if needed, prior to deployment so that the mission is clear to the teams, as well as the soldiers. Added to that, the Ground Commander has the option to coordinate with Law Enforcement Agencies (LEAs) to counter incidents such as theft and pandemonium of the crowd.

For the Team Leader, needing operational and contingency funds, is tasked to secure their assigned sector and the necessary logistics to perform their given tasks. Similar to the Ground Commander, the Team Leader fears that the responsibility for the parade being disrupted or even discontinued is what they want to avoid. However, the same “fear” applies to miscoordination, logistics, theft and pandemonium are shared with the Ground Commander. The “means”, therefore, is the same with the Ground Commander, including the “options”.

Nevertheless, the soldiers are expected – as a “need” – to obey orders and receive logistics support for “fear” of being punished with misdemeanor. However, considering the time of deployment, the Ground Commander, as well as the Team Leader, must consider that soldiers may experience hunger and thirst. The “means” therefore for the soldiers to remedy hunger and thirst is to break ranks or the line just to get food and water. The results may become unpleasant. Hence, the

given “option” for this situation is for the Ground Commander or Team leader to bring food packs to be delivered and distributed to soldiers. Doing this will prevent the soldiers from breaking ranks or the line.

This happened with the Joint Task Group – Civil Disturbance Management (JTG-CDM) of the AFP’s Joint Task Force – Pope (JTF-POPE) during the visit of Pope Francis in the Philippines last 15 – 19 January 2015. Food packs and water were periodically distributed to all military personnel deployed along the route of the Pope during the said Visit that is why soldiers didn’t break the barricade, denying eager spectators from disrupting the route of Pope Francis.

4. Need-fear Analysis in a Humanitarian Crisis

Another good example of using the Need-Fear Analysis Mapping Tool can be used with a bigger or geopolitical scenario such as the Poland-Belarus Border Crisis in 2021 – a Humanitarian Crisis that transpired between the borders of Poland and Belarus in Europe, as shown in [Figure 3](#).

The Poland-Belarus Border Crisis that happened in the Winter of 2021 on both country’s border involved thousands of illegal migrants that were trying to get towards Poland, which is generally suspected as migrants coming from the Middle East. Poland, on its part, needs to protect its border from these alleged illegal migrants’ entry that is believed to be

their entry corridor towards the European Union (EU) countries. Considering the spurious intent of Belarus of “herding” these migrants towards Poland, the country is apprehensive of allowing “undesirables” from gaining illegal entry to Poland.



Figure 3. Poland and Belarus Contiguous Border [4].

Human lives were caught up in a political tussle between the Belarus’ leader, Alexander Lukashenko and the EU. Accordingly, Lukashenko funneled migrants to Poland, through Belarus, in order to destabilize EU nations as his revenge for sanctions imposed upon Belarus. It appears that this action is the revenge of Belarus for the EU bloc’s criticism of Lukashenko’s crackdown on the opposition that is currently intensifying as a geopolitical dispute.

According to the Polish Border Agency: “There have been more than 5,000 attempts by migrants to cross the border into Poland from Belarus, as compared to just 88 in the whole of last year [10].” Since the mid-2021, Poland’s border with Belarus became the site of an escalating humanitarian and human rights crisis. Belarus began issuing visas to

third-country nationals as part of a route going to the EU, that drew many from conflict-affected regions in Africa and the Middle East – with few safe options to seek asylum. Thousands, however, have even attempted to cross the heavily militarized border, risking life-threatening conditions in the forests [11].

For the EU, “the Belarusian regime has reached out to potential travelers through seemingly official channels, through diplomatic representations or travel agencies.” That invitation was for them to visit Belarus by offering visas and guiding them to the EU border. European Commission President, Ursula von der Leyen, claimed that the situation in the Belarus-Poland border is not a migration crisis, but an attempt by Belarus to try to destabilize its democratic neighbors in Europe. She also added that “this method is a particularly cruel form of a hybrid threat that has emerged with a state-sponsored instrumentalization of people for their political ends [12].”

With the rapidly increasing number of refugees crossing irregularly from Belarus, Poland amended a law to provide for legal basis to justify expulsion, or pushbacks, of what they deemed unlawful under the Constitution of the Republic of Poland. Once they crossed into Polish territory, refugees were being escorted back to the barrier and forced to cross back to the other side of the fence. Humanitarian assistance became de facto criminalized with several legal cases brought against people who were providing first aid and lifesaving assistance to the people on the move [13].

Groups that are working with these refugees say that the repression of NGOs in Belarus has led to many other organizations stopping their aid work for migrants, leaving them with limited or no humanitarian help. Since the start of the refugee crisis in the summer of 2021, rights groups have spoken out over the brutal refugee ‘pushbacks’ by guards on both sides of the border [14].

The main State-actors for this Fear-Need Analysis matrix would be the countries Poland and Belarus and is laid out in Table 2.

Table 2. The Poland-Belarus Border Crisis in 2021 [16].

Countries	NEEDS	FEARS	MEANS	OPTION
Poland	Protection of the border	Migrants will stay in Poland; immigrants will compete with the locals	Forbidding barbed wire fence and masses of security forces deployed by Warsaw barring their way.	Call on NATO, EU to reinforce Polish borders
	Control of illegal migrants’ entry to EU	Terrorist mixed with asylum seekers	Blockage with Armed Guard; water cannon and physically restraining people:	Trade embargo or sanctions for Belarus
	Deny entry of “undesirables” to EU countries	Russian Military Forces in Ukraine might be used to occupy former Soviet countries	State of Emergency	Close monitoring of all border sites on the Belarus & Ukraine areas
Belarus	Allegedly, revenge against	Additional EU sanctions	Deliberately sent illegal	Request assistance from the

Countries	NEEDS	FEARS	MEANS	OPTION
	Europe on sanctions imposed on Belarus		migrants towards the Polish border Add military forces to guard Belarus border	Russian Federation
Lithuania	Protection of the border Control of illegal immigrants' entry to EU Deny entry of "undesirables" to EU	Entry of Terrorists Entry of Russian spies	Close the Lithuanian border from illegal immigrants State of Emergency	Call on NATO, EU to re-inforce Polish borders Trade embargo or sanctions for Belarus
EU	Mitigate the humanitarian crisis from unfolding and to ensure that migrants can be safely returned to their country of origin, with the support of their national authorities. Deny entry of "undesirables" to EU countries	Humanitarian crisis in EU Possible Terrorist Threat to EU countries	Weighing whether to impose yet more sanctions against Minsk in response to the border crisis. The measures, which reportedly could also target airlines the bloc deems to be involved in the situation	Monitor the migration crisis in Poland-Belarus border area. Monitor any unauthorized military movement in other areas
Russia	Prevent the US-headed transatlantic NATO military alliance on its western flank. Russia reclaiming its former territories of its former U.S.S.R.	U.S. and UK will step-in and meddle the geopolitical issue	Sent paratroopers to Belarus on Nov. 12 for military drills. It had deployed two nuclear-capable strategic bombers on patrol missions over Belarus for the two days prior, on November 10 and 11.	Has an option to do nothing Monitor the situation if NATO, US or UK add military to aid Poland Can impose trade embargo to Poland and Lithuania
Migrants	Asylum status to EU	Deportation Hunger, survival, health concerns	hoping to travel on from Poland deeper into Europe. makeshift camps	Look for alternate border sites to cross towards Poland
UN	Human Rights and Welfare of the migrants at the Poland border	Welfare of the people not being guaranteed or provided for by both Poland and Belarus	Sent an International Coalition of peacekeeping forces in the area	Send relief to both sides of the border
North Atlantic Treaty Alliance	Security and Defense of NATO-member countries Verify real intent of Belarus & Russia	Humanitarian crisis will escalate into a "shooting" war or conflict with Belarus	Availability of NATO forces Increase intelligence operations in the area	Put military forces on standby alert Monitor any unauthorized or unplanned military movement in the Balkan area
Human Rights Group	Human Rights Abuses Raised concerns for their wellbeing, pointing to a spate of reported deaths on both sides of the border as evidence of the treacherous conditions they face as winter sets in.	Welfare of the people not being guaranteed or provided for by both Poland and Belarus	Send monitoring team to both sides of the border	Call on the UN or Media on the situation of the migrants at the Poland-Belarus border areas. Ask the Polish and Belarussian governments to send aid to trapped migrants File Human Rights Abuse case against Poland and Belarus
Turkey	Interests or attention of Turkey is focused on the millions of refugees from	If Poland will call on NATO countries, Turkey might be brought into the	As a NATO country, increase military intelligence in the crisis-affected area.	Close monitoring of refugees inside Turkey because the Poland-Belarus area

Countries	NEEDS	FEARS	MEANS	OPTION
	Syria and other countries actually inside Turkey.	issue to assist co-NATO country Poland.	Turkey must also be prepared in case NATO calls them to assist. Since Turkey has a humanitarian foreign policy, perhaps Turkey can provide neutral humanitarian assistance (such as food, water, winter clothing) to those refugees stranded in the neutral zone between the Poland and Belarus.	might just be a distraction on possible terrorist attack on other areas.

This increased in tension in this part of the region “has rattled European officials, and any confrontation with Belarus, who is a close Russian ally, raised new security concerns [16].”

Poland, for its part, called on NATO countries of the situation in their border and is also considering additional trade embargo sanctions against Belarus. Moreover, the Polish military, acting on the declaration of a State of Emergency, has been closely monitoring all their border sites for possible illegal entries.

This deliberate act of Belarus to use humans to stir up a border crisis, prompted the Polish Government to issue a State of Emergency for fears of these illegal migrants will stay in Poland and compete with the locals. But the worst fears would be that terrorists might be mixed with these asylum seekers in order to cause chaos and do harm to Polish citizens. And while that is being done, Russian Military Forces were detected to be gathered at the Ukrainian border that raises suspicions, not only of Poland but the EU-countries as well.

On the other hand, Belarus is seen as deliberately sending them towards EU in an alleged revenge against Europe on sanctions imposed upon Belarus. But despite having to receive additional EU sanctions, Belarus continues to send these illegal migrants towards the Polish border and preventing them from returning back to Minsk.

This Poland-Belarus Border Crisis could be analogously compared into a “Hostage Situation”, wherein this type of hybrid warfare being waged by Belarus, and suspiciously supported by the Russian Federation, might force Poland and the EU countries into a regional conflict. However, if Poland thinks that they can go toe-to-toe with Belarus, only, they would not have called the attention of the EU countries into this brewing humanitarian crisis. But there is now an air of mistrust among the countries getting involved in the crisis and it was made obvious that the EU countries remain skeptical of the geopolitical agenda of the Russian Federation.

This border and humanitarian crisis at the Poland-Belarus border area is slowly brewing into a geopolitical tussle between the West and the East – Europe and Russia. The days of the Soviet Union is slowly appearing in the different assess-

ments considering that Belarus used to be Belorussia, or White Russia, a Slavic State that was formerly part of the Soviet Union. So suddenly, the thousands of migrants caught between the Poland-Belarus border became merely a “tool” and is not growing “insignificant” due to the geopolitical crisis that is developing in the region.

As the crisis progressed, and is becoming more complicated, “even the U.S. and the UK were compelled to get involved in the muddle that could trigger a further escalation of the brewing crisis. This, unfortunately, starkly stimulates a ‘polarity of nations’ that could be a prelude to an impending war [15].”

5. Conclusion

In conclusion thereof, this Need-Fear Analysis Mapping Tool would bring focus, not only to the “needs” of the actors in any given situation, but also to the corresponding “fears” that should be equally considered by the actor as against the available means – all having influence later on the “options”. This should be the correct mindset that military organizations all over the world has to consider – not simply minding their organization’s needs but should always attach a possible “fear” component that will influence the outcome of their requirement. This is greatly applicable, not only in procuring weapons or equipment, even for the required education and training, recruitment of personnel, or tactics and maneuvers.

Nonetheless, this strategic framework for the Need-Fear Analysis Mapping Tool could also be used even by individuals by addressing other underlying motivations who need to make crucial decisions in their lives.

“*There is no stone unturned...*” as the saying goes that will greatly influence the outcome of the situational analysis and attain a more complete and practicable decision-making process.

Abbreviations

DA	Double Action
EU	European Union

JTF – POPE	Joint Task Force – Pope
JTG – CDM	Joint Task Group – Civil Disturbance Management
LEA	Law Enforcement Agencies
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
UK	United Kingdom
US	United States
U.S.S.R.	Union of Soviet Socialist Republic

Author Contributions

Godofredo Lapitan Senires III is the sole author. The author read and approved the final manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest

There is no conflict of interest in this article.

References

- [1] Wageningen. (n.d.). *Needs-Fears Mapping*. Retrieved from Wageningen University & Research: <http://www.managingforimpact.org/tool/needs-fears-mapping>
- [2] Cherry, MDEd, K. (2025, November 14). *How Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Explains Human Motivation*. Retrieved from verywellmind: <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-maslows-hierarchy-of-needs-4136760>
- [3] Rodriguez, A. (2025, November 02). *What is Maslow's hierarchy of needs?* Retrieved from Instagantt: https://www.instagantt.com/gantt-chart-experts/maslows-hierarchy-of-needs?gad_source=1&gad_campaignid=17748210235&gbrad=0AAAAAC-Csp1NAXa5aAdra1e1cO5Tpthn0&gclid=CjwKCAiAw9vIBhBBEiwAraSATm_m2L1CzRVhjkRfPpVxSa5-f8cR_qDBMSod_fxPDedNfOZVyCS0hoCsSoQAvD_BwE
- [4] McLeod, PhD, S. (2025, October 23). *Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs*. Retrieved from Simply Psychology: <https://www.simplypsychology.org/maslow.html>
- [5] Oppong, T. (2024, March 3). *Maslow: In Any Given Moment, You Have 2 Options*. Retrieved from Medium: <https://medium.com/personal-growth/maslow-in-any-given-moment-you-have-2-options-ef1816a08a13>
- [6] Mallari, P. S. (2010, May 4). *The Jarumentados and the Development of the Colt.45 caliber Model 1911*. Retrieved from FMA Pulse: <https://fmapulse.com/fma-corner/fma-corner-juramentados-and-development-colt-45-caliber-model-1911/>
- [7] Sharpe, M. (n.d.). *M1911.45 Caliber Pistol*. Retrieved from The Army Historical Foundation: <https://armyhistory.org/m1911-45-caliber-pistol/>
- [8] Simpson, J. A., & Symington, L. E. (1991). The Solder System - The Army's Futurer Vision.[3 *Sage Journals Volume 35, Issue 17*, 1186-1189.
- [9] CRS. (2021, November 29). *Migrant Crisis on the Belarus-Poland Border*. Retrieved from: <https://www.everycrsreport.com/reports/IF11983.html>
- [10] Rosenberg, S. (2021, November 16). *Poland border crisis: Migrants tear-gassed trying to cross from Belarus*. Retrieved from BBC News: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-59302919>
- [11] OXFAM International. (2025). *Brutal Barriers: Pushbacks, violence and the violation of human rights on the Poland-Belarus border*. Retrieved from OXFAM International: <https://www.oxfam.org/en/brutal-barriers-pushbacks-violence-and-violation-human-rights-poland-belarus-border>
- [12] Szucs, A. (2021, November 24). *Belarusian opposition warns EU of new threat from Lukashenko regime*. Retrieved from AA Anadolu Agency: <https://www.aa.com.tr/en/europe/belarusian-opposition-warns-eu-of-new-threat-from-lukashenko-regime/2429605>
- [13] Norwegian Refugee Council. (2024). *Briefing Note: Refugees trapped in Europe's "death zone"*. Oslo, Norway: Norwegian Refugee Council.
- [14] Holt, E. (2025, April 25). *Conditions worsen for Belarus migrants stuck in 'death zone' on EU border*. Retrieved from reliefweb: <https://reliefweb.int/report/belarus/conditions-worsen-belarus-migrants-stuck-death-zone-eu-border>
- [15] Hallara, J. P., Florenda, O. V., Hagada, M. V., & Senires, G. L. (2021). *Regional Conflict Analysis. Poland - Belarus Border Crisis*. Quezon City: Special Intelligence Training School, Intelligence Service Armed Forces of the Philippines.
- [16] Trojanovski, A., Pronczuk, M., & Magdzairz, A. (2021, November 9). *West Accuses Belarus of Orchestrating Migrant Crisis at Polish Border*. Retrieved from The New York Times: <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/11/09/world/europe/poland-belarus-border-crisis.html>

Biography

Godofredo Lapitan Senires III, Ph.D., is a Part-time Professor with the College of Professional and Graduate Studies, De la Salle University – Dasmarinas Campus; Professor and Fellow with the Philippine Public Safety College (PPSC); Subject-Matter-Expert with the National Defense College of the Philippines (NDCP); Regular Lecturer at the Armed Forces of the Philippines Civil-Military Operations School (AFPCMO) and the Armed Forces of the Philippines Military Service School (AFP MSS); former Visiting Fellow with the Office of Strategic and Special Studies (OSSS) of the AFP; and a former Consultant with the Department of National Defense (DND) on Defense Policy. Dr. Senires has a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Management and a Post Graduate Course in Political Economy from the International Academy of Management and Economics (IAME). He is now working on finishing his Second Ph.D. Course on Peace and Security Administration with the Bicol University (BU).