“military strategies of the Nordic courses”

The suggestion that all states should persue the same strategies is false. It doesn’t take account of “unit level characteristics” such as

1. historical experiences
2. national geographical characteristics,
3. power asymmetries between different categories of states
4. regional security complex
5. attitudes toward the liberal international order

Betts 2000 “Is strategy an illusion? “Strategy is the essential ingredient for making war either politically effective or morally tenable. It is the link between military means and the political ends, the scheme for how to make one produce the other

Geography allows you perhaps to focus on expeditionary warfare and not national defence

“for small states there is very often an imbalance between ends, ways and means”. We could ignore that imbalance – we do not need to have a balance. The Swedish politicians removed the ends for national defence in favour of CMO. But if you have made a mistake about the imbalance, such as the system (environment) changing (such as Russia’s current actions in the context of Swedish), it very much changes the situation.

You can try fix the balance by increasing the means. Sweden has 4X military spending since 2014. However, the time frame for military deveoplmet is really about 20 years.

Sweden gives priority to money for national defence and less to CMO etc. this prioritisation doesn’t effect the balance of ends to means. Hence, they have started working on the means, through NATO and Nordic collective defence. But collective defence isn’t enough. Finland said that NATO integration was essential. Once Finland did that, Sweden had to follow.

Small states have to adjust to big changes to big power changes and the local system. Hence they must be very agile.

“military strategy is interconnected ideas how politically defined military strategic ends should be achieved through the choice of suitable strategic ways of employing military means (forces). Furthermore, dfence strategy includes ides on how current and future military capacities should be created (Force generation).

Alignment strategics are ways of interacting on a political level with other states and organisations in matters related to national sercuriyt and defence. Alignment strategics may be pursued both withn and outside an alliance and difference members of an alliance pursue different slignmnet strategies.
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Economically he thinks Ireland is a minor middle power. Militarily we are nowhere near that.

Denmark’s population 6m and spends 5.4 billion USD. Ireland spends 1.3 billion USD. Explain this by geography. We perceived ourselves as less exposed to traditional military ythreats. Ireland is very much exposed to hybrid threats. Our historical experience focus on Britain so we may not react as fast to threats from Russia than other staes.

Robert Rothstein “Alliance and Small Powers 1968 p 29”, “a small power is a state which recognises that it cannot obtain security primarily by its own capabilities and that it must rely fundamentally on the aid of other states, institutions, processes or developments to do so.” Alliance are no free lunch.
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Small states will only succeed if the great powers see them as strategically irrelevant.

Until Sweden joined the EU, the thought was that they couldn’t because their political and economic alliance would undermine the credibility of their military neutrality.

For countries which seek an ends comprising influence, would you agree that credibility is the centre of gravity to achieving this using their ways and means

Their active efforts for bandwagoning for profit through cooperation with stronger states. You must be perceived as a willing and capable actor to have credibility. The size of your contribution is very important – relative to your size. Denmark for example excelled with its cooperation with the united states. In terms of mediation/bridge building, it’s also credibility however regarding the credibility of being neutral to represent a third position. The way credibility comes out is a function of the size of your state and the type of influence you seek.

The small states with 20% military GDP for example still can’t produce the same military capabilities as the larger states – such as poand in this example

Nordic countries no are national defence and multinational cooperation as their preferred means.