

array of complex capabilities²⁶. This is also the approach to external defence taken by Latin American countries where few alliances exist and forces are developed to deal with an attack by immediate neighbours as is the case in Chile, Argentina and Brazil.

The second way is to be a deterrent force that may be capable of being defeated by likely adversaries but at such a considerable cost so as to not be worthwhile. This is an approach taken by smaller non-aligned countries like Finland and Switzerland where large conscript based militia forces can mobilise in the event of crisis and inflict significant losses and casualties on an aggressor. Finland used this strategy to avoid annexation by the Soviet Union in the Winter and Continuation Wars of the 1940s²⁷. Switzerland mobilized its forces during the Second World War and despite Hitler having a plan for the conquest of Switzerland called Operation Tannenbaum it was never implemented, in part because the scale of 11 German Divisions it would take would be too large an undertaking given Germany's other commitments at the time²⁸.

The third way is to be a contributing force that provides capabilities as part of a collective security arrangement. This is the approach taken by NATO countries and those in alliance relationships with the United States like South Korea, Japan and Australia. This is also the case for smaller regional security arrangements such as the Regional Security System in the Caribbean where small states pool small military resources to create a force capable of meeting the low-level threats that the region presents²⁹.

Naturally there are also combinations of the above with the US, UK and France being capable of fighting alone but they are also a part of NATO and possess nuclear deterrent capabilities. Estonia and Norway maintain a strategy of militia-based conventional deterrence within the framework of the NATO alliance.

Each state will make assessments around the nature of the threat posed to it and the tools that are available to defend against that threat. The relationship between military activity and

²⁶ Mary Kaldor and Joseph E. Stiglitz, **Protection Without Protectionism and the Challenge of Global Governance**, in Joseph E. Stiglitz and Mary Kaldor (eds.), *The Quest for Security: Protection Without Protectionism and the Challenge of Global Governance*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013), 3-4.

²⁷ Colin S. Gray, **War, Peace and International Relations**, (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007), 147-148.

²⁸ Vagts, Detlev F. "Switzerland, International Law and World War II." *The American Journal of International Law* 91, no. 3 (1997), 467-469.

²⁹ <http://www.rss.org.bb/about-us.html>