



GÖTEBORGS
UNIVERSITET

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Should The Swedish State Export War Munition?

A normative study on whether war munition export contradicts
Sweden's democratic values

Noor Alkhamisi

Bachelor Thesis: 15 credits

Program: Political Science

Spring 2022

Supervisor: Sofia Wiman

Word count: 11 987

Abstract

The following thesis invites the reader for a discussion on Swedish war munition export and in specific the moral justification of the export. Sweden is ranked as one of the countries with highest democracy and is at the same time one of the world's top exporters of munitions. From a normative perspective, this study takes a look at whether Sweden should export war munition or not and if the export we have today contradict the Swedish democratic values. With the export a tension is created and manipulated between what is right and wrong, what should be and what shouldn't: *Should the Swedish state export war munition?* There is a division between the two sides and as the topic is sensitive in its nature this paper will test the two most extreme points against each other. To find out whether, and, if so, how the arguments contradict the Swedish democratic principles. With argumentation-analysis as methodology I was able to analyze the relevance, durability and conclusive power of the arguments from each side in comparison to each other. The results showed that the pro-export arguments were drastically weaker in comparison to the contra export arguments due to weakness to support the thesis that the Swedish state should export. Further the pro-arguments lacked in-depth explanations to be able to reject the contra-side. This is because it is more difficult for the Swedish state to morally justify the export as equally imperative as democratic values, fighting for human rights and combating terrorism.

Keywords: *Swedish war munition export, argumentation-analysis, normative study, pro et contra model.*

Table of content

1. Introduction	3
2. Purpose and research question	6
2.1 Research question	6
2.2 Purpose	6
2.3 Research gap	7
3. Previous research and theoretical framework	8
3.1 Swedish war munition export	8
3.2 Democracy	11
3.3 Human rights	11
3.4 Swedish interests and security policy	11
3.5 Rules and regulations	12
3.6 International co-operation	13
3.7 The war against terrorism	13
3.8 Military-industrial complex	13
4. Material	14
5. Design and methodology	15
6. Analysis	17
6.1 Presenting the arguments	17
6.1 1 Arguments against war munition export	17
6.1 2 Arguments in favor of war munition export	18
6.2 Conducting the analysis	18
7. Results	27
8. Concluding remarks	28
9. Bibliography	30

1. Introduction

Sweden has for the first time since World War II, sent munitions to another state in connection with an armed conflict and for a non-commercial reason (SVT, 2022). The Swedish state's response to the ongoing war in Ukraine has come as a surprise as war munitions often come as a result of agreements, profit contracts and networks between Sweden and the receiving countries (Åkerström, 2016: p. 21-22). Sweden usually conducts war munition export for profit-making purposes, making the war in Ukraine an exception (Svenska Freds, 2022). Swedish arms exports have long been operating and despite criticism from non-violence organizations such as Amnesty and Svenska Freds the Swedish state continues to export war munitions to both democratic and undemocratic states. The rather contradictory repercussions are twofold (1) the consequences of such export on the quality of the democracy and (2) the opportunities created for more war (Quistbergh, 2010: pp. 5-7).

There are two factors that play an important role in Swedish foreign politics: security and neutrality (Åkerström, 2016: p. 14-15). The Swedish state embraces a neutral foreign policy, and proclaims values such as human rights. Some – like Svenska Freds and Amnesty – believe that the arms industry contradicts values and principles such as human rights, world peace, and results in supporting terror groups (Amnesty, n.d; Svenska Freds, n.d). The neutral politics refer to the fact that Sweden isn't in any military alliance except for the European Union and its common security guidelines (Ikegami, 2013: p. 437). This means that the state has had to stand on its own feet to 'survive' but it also has not been restricted by alliances making it easier to have relations and export to whoever the Swedish state deem as fitting (Åkerström, 2016: pp. 7-10). With the Swedish state being politically independent, the results are the freedom to export military technology, arms, war strategies, in other words having a market for war munition export. The key solution that made it possible for Sweden to stay out of the world wars and the cold war was 'armed neutrality'. The Swedish government realized that for the neutrality to survive, Sweden had to have a powerful military defense and for the munition to be produced domestically (Åkerström, 2016: pp. 23-25).

The survival factor has created a tension between the need to gain economic security, international position etc. and living up to the expectations of democracy (Ikegami, 2013: p. 436). Sweden may advocate democracy, but advocating and arguing for democracy is not necessarily the same as practically implementing such values and principles. Thus, with

Sweden's continued export of war munitions, we can discern a tension between what is being said, and what is being done. The combination of security and neutral foreign policy in the Swedish case can be seen as a backbone to the war munitions export (Åkerström, 2016: 7-10). Through time, Sweden has developed a need for greater security (in all fairness so has almost every other state). The alliance-free politics is a main factor for the Swedish state's need for security, which has forced the state to act upon strategies to build up their position in the international arena (Ikegami, 2013: p. 440, 442). This came as a result as Sweden's neighbors Denmark and Norwegian joined the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949 making Sweden the only (exception: Finland) state between its neighbors without a military alliance (Bäck, Larsson & Erlingsson, 2008: p. 317). As a result of being alliance-free Sweden obtained both independence (to invest in war munition and export) and insecurity to survive in the international arena on its own with the help only from traditional allies (Ikegami, 2013: p. 440, 442).

In this essay, I wish to study the strength and validity of the pro and contra arguments for war munition export as made by Swedish foreign policy. The material will center on a yearly rapport on Sweden's war munition export. The selection of Sweden came naturally and will be assessed thoroughly under the next section. It was a tactical selection as the state fit the criteria of being both democratic and being one of the world's largest exporters (Ikegami, 2013: p. 446). In this case, an argumentation-analysis is vital to review the pro and against stands and the validity of the strongest arguments from both sides. The benefits of such an analysis, is that it has the ability to explore how circumstances ought to be (Eemeren, Grootendorst & Snoeck Henkemans, 2002: pp. 52-53; Ejvegård, 2005: p. 31, 33). By doing an argumentation-analysis there will be further clarity if the export is causing harm to our democracy. If the results show that the war munition export does contradict Sweden's democratic values, we will have supported the thesis that Sweden ought not export munition. If, on the other hand, the results show that such export does not contradict Sweden's democratic values, this means that Sweden is justified in its munitions export. This result would not nullify the importance of this study, because previous research has yet to identify the main reason for the export in a concise and summarized way from a democratic perspective (Åkerström, 2016: 7-10). If the results show that Sweden should keep exporting, critics would be more "silenced" and convinced of the value of the export. The research field would also especially benefit from more consensus for future studies going forward as the field consists of two extreme points: either pro or against.

The terms “government” and “state” will be used interchangeably. Democratic values and principles will also be used interchangeably. For clarity, there are also multiple words to describe the export; “arms export” and “weapon export” are two candidates that will be replaced with the term “war munition export”. While arms/weapon export are more popular words to address the term, munition is the broad and all-inclusive term for the kind of export Sweden usually produces. The term fluctuates with the context, in some contracts Sweden sends ready-to-use arms and in other situations it is war munitions that need further preparation to be usable (Åkerström, 2016: p. 10). With the all-inclusive term - war munition; military technology, advanced strategies, information, arms and parts of arms which can be constructed to be weapons of mass destruction are included and more (Åkerström, 2016: p. 26).

It is plausible to believe that there will be reasonable arguments both for and against weapon export. What is interesting is how morality and ethics are evoked in the arguments. Since the aim of the study is to have one ‘winning’ side, which factors and aspects of life are more important is the side that will win. Are human rights more important than state security or vice versa? Is not sending war munition to not risk them benefiting a terrorist group more important than international co-operation? These are the types of moral justifications and discussion which will eventually give us an answer on which is morally justified and appropriate. Human rights, combating terrorism, international co-operation, security policy interest and rules and regulations are all vital points in Swedish democracy and politics and will be further assessed in the theory section.

In the upcoming section (2), I will present the purpose of this thesis, the current gap in research on the issue which I aim to fill, and lastly outline the research question that is guiding this thesis. Thereafter, section (3) will provide the theoretical framework and previous research, and section (4) addresses the case and material. Further, section (5) will provide a discussion on design and methodology. Section (6) will discuss the analysis, and section (7), will contain the discussion on results. Lastly section (8) will present the concluding remarks.

2. Purpose and research question

“Sweden must be a country that consistently stands up for democracy and rule of the people, a country that actively works for peace and disarmament and a country that condemns every violation of human rights, regardless of where, by whom or for what motives they are committed. Sweden has every opportunity to be such a voice, but then it is required that we stop arming authoritarian regimes, countries that are at war and states that commit serious and extensive violations of human rights. If we do not do that, we will not be credible in our work for human rights, disarmament, peace and equality.” (2020/21:UU9, p. 15)¹

2.1 Research question

The relevance of studying this issue lies in the importance of this topic in the political arena, democracy and how war munition export relates to human rights, ‘the war against terrorism’, international co-operation, security policy and rules and regulations. As the quote implies there is a tension and contradiction between the Swedish democratic values and the war munition export. For the democracy in Sweden to be sustainable and not become exhausted the leadership must live up to the democratic values the nation is set up to realize. The ambition of this thesis is therefore to contribute to a broader understanding of the arguments made by the Swedish state and in contrast to the arguments against war munition export in the case of Sweden. The main interest is to analyze whether, and, if so, how the arguments pro the export contradict the Swedish democratic principles. The importance of this topic lies in the moral justification of munition export. If the Swedish state cannot morally justify its export, normatively it would be wrong to keep exporting. The purpose is to understand whether or not the Swedish contradicts its own democratic principles by allowing and continuing the export. The research question to be answered is thus; *Should the Swedish state export war munition?* The main question will be answered with the help of a sub-question: *Does Swedish war munition export contradict its own democratic principles?*

2.2 Purpose

The purpose of this thesis is to decide whether Sweden should export war munitions or not by studying which "side" - pro or contra - is most credible. Further, the aim is to decide whether the argumentation in the debate is in line with democratic principles and whether the arguments for/against are credible and strong. In the light of that we can decide whether Sweden should export weapons. This is important because continued exports can lead to

¹ My translation

decreased trust in democratic (because it may go against democratic principles). It is further along up to the results and analysis to provide further clarity.

The specific argumentation analysis to be applied is a pro et contra model, which has the advantage that arguments for and against can be clearly presented and illuminated, in this thesis the contra side is presented first and then the pro-side. In this report, the method is relevant to get the extreme counter-points, i.e. what stands for arms exports not being justified (Bergström & Boréus, 2005: 94). After reading this thesis I wish for the reader to gain extensive knowledge on how the war munitions export has been argued for and against to further clear up whether the export goes against the Swedish democratic values or not. Moreover, a normative study can help the author to examine how a society should be structured. This can also help decision-makers at different times as this is the basis for a discourse analysis. An argumentations-analysis can be used for authorities as a foundation for decision-taking with the help of a pro et contra overview (Esaiasson, Gilljam, Oscarsson, Towns, & Wängnerud, 2017: p. 18, 20; NE, n.d). This is for the most part the extracurricular relevance this thesis has to offer and what we can learn for future reference and going further. As for the internal validity, the theoretical starting point (democracy and the case of Swedish war munition), is the contribution. This study will provide cumulative knowledge to the normative research in the area.

2.3 Research gap

Previous research has not reached consensus on the question whether Sweden should continue to export munitions or not as there is large division in the field (Åkerström, 2016: p. 23). With the methodology of argumentation-analysis this thesis will be able to point out the major arguments from both sides and analyze their validity. The diversion between what is said and what is done has created what can only be described as confusion and disparity in what democracy stands for. What is specifically missing in previous research are motives for arms exports in comparison with the arguments that are opposed (Ikegami, 2013: p. 440; Åkerström, 2016: 23). One reason for the lack of research in the field is because Sweden has historically been seen as a small state with neutral politics making the motives for Sweden as one of the world's largest exporters an even more important matter to unpack (Åkerström, 2016: p. 15).

By doing an argumentation analysis, this thesis poses as an example to gain further insight into arguments in favor of keeping the export and the arguments against. With the knowledge we can compare which is best to proceed with and with the normative element of what is *right* to keep in mind for future studies. What is ‘right’ will be shown by the analysis - either Sweden ought to export war munition or not. In this thesis, this is to be determined by the following concepts and how they stand in relation to one another: human rights, combating terrorism, international co-operation, security policy and rules and regulations. With this, let me turn to the theoretical framework.

3. Previous research and theoretical framework

This section will address what previous research has studied and the theoretical framework that will form the basis of analysis to answer the question; *Should the Swedish state export war munition?* The central concepts will be presented by breaking down the research question to identify the theoretical starting point. In order to answer the question, Swedish war munition export, democracy and the central themes - that is, human rights, ‘the war against terrorism’, international co-operation, security policy and rules and regulations will be defined and discussed.

3.1 Swedish war munition export

The discussion for Swedish nuclear weapons was highly mainstream from the late 1950s to the 1960s. There, the bourgeois press, the right wing, commander-in-chief and the military leadership were the ones who strongly wanted Swedish nuclear weapons. The opposition consisted of religious, pacifist, communist advocates and the Social Democratic Women's Union (Bäck et al., 2008: pp. 306-307). Despite the opposition, the first commercial reactor came in 1972. This was a crucial turning point in Swedish war munition development. This worked because the leading Social Democrats and the established government was supporting the development of Swedish nuclear weapons at the time (Bäck et al, 2008: pp. 306-307). Due to the weakness of the opposition, Sweden could begin to integrate with the rest of the European states to develop its weapons policy. In summary, it was an elite group of people with political power and influence whose interest lies in keeping the Swedish military armed with nuclear weapons. The opposition was kept suppressed and with this grew the Swedish arms exports we have today (Bäck et al, 2008: p. 307, 313).

The organization Svenska Freds deem that in order for Sweden to be regarded as a perfect democracy, the dark figures from arms exports must come out of hiding. Svenska Freds is an established, politically and religiously independent organization whose main interest is to monitor conflicts, peacekeeping and non-violence. Today, this is the largest organization against war munition export in Sweden that works with spreading information and facts about the export and its consequences (Svenska Freds n.d). This organization plays a big role in influencing politicians to rethink the current regulations. Svenska Freds claims that the arms industry is driven by three aspects, namely: (1) without openness; (2) with a special interest; and (3) by resource dependency (Åkerström, 2016: pp. 25-27). These are the factors that do not align with the Swedish democratic grounds (Svenska Freds, 2022). As Sweden is producing and exporting war munition it is contributing to the opportunities of war which Svenska Freds points out as an 'undemocratic export' (Åkerström, 2020). Svenska Freds further claims that the munition industry does not aim to improve democracy or ensure the security of the Swedish people. Rather the organization claims that the export is a way to ensure economic gains and is justified by the fact that it is not the government producing but it is done through investments in the production (Svenska Freds, n.d).

It is estimated that Sweden is today one of the world's top ten largest munition exporters (Amnesty, n.d). Sweden has exported weapons to as well democratic as to non-democratic states such as Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Jordan, Qatar and more. The export in 2021 was valued at 20 billion in Swedish currency. This has been criticized precisely because it goes against the democratic principles that Sweden is supposed to align with such as human rights, advocates for peace and democracy (Fägersten & Jerdén, 2018: 345). Given the criteria of Freedom House in 2019, it is estimated that in 2019 one third of the war munitions exported were sold to undemocratic states (Svenska Freds, n.d; Åkerström, 2020). In the meantime there has also been pursuits to further restrict Swedish exports to states such as the United Arab Emirates, Jordan and Qatar. Despite attempts to reduce the export, new permits to export were granted to deepen co-operation in international relations. Sweden and for example Saudi Arabia have slowly started to regain the relation they had before the crisis in 2015. This was something which Sweden as a democratic state condemned (Fägersten & Jerdén, 2018: p. 345). Since then, there has been regulation in the jurisdiction and there have been attempts to both sharpen and open up for export opportunities to several of the states mentioned above. The reformed regulations addressed the Swedish government's relation

with the buying states in relation to the undemocratic contradictions such as human rights violence, strengthening terror groups and engagement in war and international conflicts.

In the Swedish case, it is private producers of war munition who, with state help and support from foreign policy, can stand on their own two feet and constitute their own economy (Quistbergh, 2010: pp. 5-7). When Sweden first started to produce munitions it was only meant for the national defense as it was necessary for the neutrality politics and for security policies. That however changed as other countries started to also produce and sell internationally and Sweden felt a pressure to also sell internationally to not lose opportunities and to not seem less interesting in the international arena (Lundmark, 2019: p. 298). There was also another reason, it was not profitability optimal to only produce for national defense. For economic gains, international exports grew larger (Ikegami, 2013: p. 443). With that the contract between private producers and the government increased and today one hundred and fifty companies have permission to export war munition and many are owned by foreign concerns. Some of the largest exporters are “Saab, BAE Systems Hägglunds, FFV Ordnance AB, Norma Precision and Eurenco Bofors” (ISP, 2017: p. 19).

The governmental support consists of “political representation, marketing, the state as reference, loans and export credit (making it possible for companies to sell without financial risks in certain cases)” (Åkerström, 2016: p. 185). This means that it is not the government who has official relations to the buyers or are the ones in charge of the production. It however does not mean that the direct investments to the business removes the state from accountability, considering the aftereffect of supporting the war munition export. When it comes to arms exports to undemocratic states today, several independent organizations, including Amnesty, have remained critical of the Swedish arms trade (Amnesty, n.d). The main factor is that the state goes against the democratic values it should be held accountable for. The fact that it is private producers has led to confusion on who is accountable. According to Åkerström (2016) it is here the tension between the commercial export and democratic values has emerged. Since it is technically not the Swedish state that operates the export but has the power to direct and finance, the accountability gets lost in the process which is where democracy at the same time becomes fragile for exposure (Åkerström, 2016: pp. 219).

3.2 Democracy

In Sweden, representative democracy is the governing body, which means that we democratically elect representatives who are then decision-makers in rounds until we elect new ones (Bäck et al, 2008: 16-18). What distinguishes democracy from other forms of governance is the norm that representatives are held “accountable for their actions” (Schmitter & Karl, 1991: p 76). Meaning that the political figures who are democratically chosen are supposed to reflect and drive the politics that is beneficial for citizens and the direction of the politics that the nation as a whole has decided to defend. The political leadership is not supposed to act on their own with a special agenda in mind - that would be a violation against Swedish democracy (Schmitter & Karl, 1991: p 76). In the 2021 report Sweden scored 100 percent by Freedom house and with Sweden being in the top 5 most democratic states worldwide the contradiction with the munitions export unveils itself (Freedom House, n.d).

3.3 Human rights

The 1948 declaration by the UN is considered the most important declaration for protection of human rights on an international level. Human rights is one of the core aspects of democracy as it regulates the state's authority over the individual (Gustavsson & Tallberg, 2014: p. 69, 72). “Human rights are universal and apply to everyone. They state that all people, regardless of country, culture and context, are born free and equal in value and rights” (Regeringskansliet, 2018). Sweden has committed to assure that the politics it pursues assures the human rights declaration (Gustavsson & Tallberg, 2014: p. 357). The Swedish left party criticizes the credibility of Swedish human rights as the party refer to the munition export as violation against peace, democracy and human rights. “Sweden will not credibly be a voice for human rights somewhere on earth as long as this arms export continues” (Motion 2017/18:3826: p. 5). According to the party, Sweden has the ability to stand up for human rights, that is however not legit unless the government starts disarming (Motion 2017/18:3826: pp. 5-6).

3.4 Swedish interests and security policy

With democracy comes a promise to protect and fulfill security for the citizens of the state. It means that the state is ‘obligated’ to acquire as much security as possible. This varies from vital needs such as water, shelter and food to political rights, economic security and high standard of living (Peoples & Vaughan-Williams, 2021: pp. 7-8). There is, however, a

difference between human security and state security. While the aspects above and human rights refer to human security, for a state, security is a broad concept with a multifaceted meaning. Within the framework of state security it can mean military capacity, contacts, position in the international arena, diplomacy or stable economy (Edström, 2016: p. 498). In this case it could be Sweden seeking for security in vast categories. Security is expressed in the legislation and regulations. There are two reasons for this: (1) to gain security and (2) not to lose control over the war munition export. For the former, there are a couple of factors for gaining security: economy, position in the international arena and military are important and habituated criteria for measuring the security of a state (Ikegami, 2013: p. 437, 446). Economic security in this case is gained by selling war munition and gaining financial independence. A liable position in the international arena is also beneficial for a state to secure its relation to others and to hold credibility in the international arena. With international security also comes trust which Sweden has gained by diplomatic relations and achieving its end of contacts. The last aspect of security, military, refers to the capacity and monopoly of the military (Ikegami, 2013: p. 446).

3.5 Rules and regulations

ISP (the inspectorate for strategic products) is the governmental authority for control of war munition export for dual use under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (ISP, n.d.a). The inspectorate works with all questions regarding Sweden's security and foreign policy. It was the year of 1996 that ISP was established after the constitution of the law (2011:849) which followed the original law (1992:1300) for war munition export (Sveriges Riksdag, n.d). After (2011:849) the control of the export was submitted to ISP which was created and ruled as an independent governmental authority. The responsibility consists of granting, assessing and co-operation and production for as well ongoing cases as new requests (ISP, n.d.a). Further there is also the Export Control Council (EKR) and military equipment act which also guide and restrict war munition export. The control council is responsible for advising and supporting ISP in matters of counseling, interpretation of the guidelines or of specific cases. ISP then makes decisions based on the material from the control council (ISP, n.d.b). When it comes to export control in regards to democracy it is twofold, first it is through EKR. Secondly it is by the yearly 'report of the committee on foreign affairs' which is the material used in this thesis (ISP, n.d.a)

3.6 International co-operation

In this thesis, the two most significant international legislations are the Common position of the EU (2008/944/CFSP) and UN arms trade treaty. Sweden has signed to obey these supranational acts as a part of international co-operation and interdependence. These are international obligations and Sweden's commitments towards its own population and in the international arena (Edström, 2016: p. 498). The UN security council has multiple charters for international co-operation, security and peace. Article 26 focuses on international co-operation to reduce human sufferings and for states to not gain economically from conflicts. Article 33 directs that if it is possible, conflicts should be settled peacefully through i.e. diplomatic resolutions (Åkerström, 2016: pp. 221-222).

3.7 The war against terrorism

Furthermore, within the frame of international co-operation a very large challenge today is the rising terror groups. Combating terrorism and not supporting terror groups (for example al-Qaeda and the Islamic State) is seen as one of the most important responsibilities to especially preserve democratic values (Edström, 2016: p. 508-509). The war was first declared after the September 11 terror attacks in the United States. Terror operations can, however, be traced further back in time, for example the first Al-Qaeda's attack occurred in 1998. Two common characterizations of terrorism are: "a pre-meditated intent to create fear; a motive to affect political behavior especially that of governments and a perception by the society within which it has taken place that something 'extra-normal' has occurred" (Peoples & Vaughan-Williams, 2021: p. 233). The terror groups often commit crimes against civilian populations in war and also outside of war which Sweden as an individual state and in international co-operation is trying to combat. Beside the human lives lost and financial costs to combat terrorism, citizens' daily life is exposed to danger (Peoples & Vaughan-Williams, 2021: pp. 232-233). The war against terrorism and the increased number of weapons of mass destruction is seen as a threat to democracy and human rights (Edström, 2016: p. 508-509).

3.8 Military-industrial complex

Military-industrial complex is a term that describes a collaboration that exists between politicians, the military and the munitions industry, also called the "iron triangle" (McCormick, Hague & Harrop, 2016: p. 309). During the rivalry between Germany and Britain in 1905-1914, military-industrial complexes (MIC) were built for the first time ever. US President Dwight Eisenhower warned that it would succeed in taking over and governing

the state. This would not work towards higher security for the state or its citizens but to drive more money. This would mean that the military is moving towards a marketing structure (McCormick et al, 2016: p. 309). Some of the literature on war munitions export trace it to the military-industrial complex which highlight it as a major factor for ignoring democratic values and remaining the export. This is important because if MIC succeeds in running the state, the consequences can lead to democratic values being squeezed or legislation being changed to benefit the for-profit arms industry (Gómez, 2009: p. 74; McCormick et al, 2016: pp. 309-310). There is no consensus on whether the state controls the military-industrial complex or whether it controls the state. However, due to the scope of this essay the focus will be on the arguments for and against war munitions export and not the driving factors that explain the export in itself. The important thing to keep in mind is that there is a complex of factors creating opportunities and need for war munition².

4. Material

As discussed above, the relation between Sweden's democratic values and action is not free of friction. As a “real case”, it pinpoints the tension between Sweden’s democratic principles, on the one hand, and its export of weapons on the other. The tension is thoroughly discussed in the material as members of the parliament gather their arguments against the prevailing government's politics. The material in this thesis which the argumentation-analysis will proceed from is the ‘report of the committee on foreign affairs’ noted as 2020/21:UU9. The title of the material is called “war munition export and military equipment with double area of use” (2020/21:UU9). Meaning the export for both the production of weapons of mass destruction or war munition and for civil use. The case was closed the tenth of June 2021 and is the latest report of the Constitutional Committee which is complete. There is an ongoing case, but it is, however, only a proposal, therefore as a material not complete. The document is retrieved from the government's website and can contribute with legitimate results. Alternatively the material could have been the Minister of defense's press conference or statements. The problem with this type of material is that it isn't the whole state rather a single spokesperson. With the written report of the Constitutional Committee the whole government is presented which strengthens the validity of the results.

² Large parts of this section were retrieved from my PM2

5. Design and methodology

The research design that is best suited to answer the main question; *Should the Swedish state export war munition?* is a normative study with the method of argumentation analysis. The reason being is that in order to identify and map in favor or against munition export, the arguments in the material have to be identified and analyzed qualitatively. The choice of a normative study has been made in the light of the fact that such a design aims to answer questions concerning; *how should it be?* (Emeren et al., 2002: pp. 4-5; Ejvegård, 2005: p. 5-6) . This theme works well together with an argumentation analysis as there is tension between the principles of democracy Sweden claims to follow and the continuous export of war munitions to many states, and this thesis poses to study how it should be (Ejvegård, 2005: p. 31, 33). In a strict sense, normative studies don't have to be distinguished between theory development or testing. Despite this, this thesis aims to contribute to theory-development in the field Swedish war munition export studies by finding justificatory and non-justificatory factors (Esaiasson et al, 2017: p. 112).

Since there are two sides to a coin, in this case pro and against arguments for munitions export, an argumentation-analysis is suited to list out both sides (Esaiasson et al., 2017: p. 214). Argumentation-analysis belongs to the family of idea analysis which aims to analyze political ideas origin, message and consequences (Beckman, 2005: pp. 12-13). The arguments in a normative study can be reconstructed and broken down into what is “acceptable human action” (Esaiasson et al, 2017: p. 30). Most often, these are due to various complex societal problems (Esaiasson et al, 2017: p. 30-31). Normative studies often consist of contexts from reality, which is what my research intends to study (Emeren et al., 2002: p. 27). With evidence from reality, the research can be driven forward with elements that criticize and analyze how a certain public debate is shaped and how it should be (Esaiasson et al, 2017: pp. 43-44). The purpose of making an argumentation analysis is to be able to set up and evaluate the strength of different arguments and when they are set up against each other (Esaiasson et al, 2017: p. 214).

Every argument consists of three parts; (1) a thesis (which can be both singular or multiple), (2) premises (assumptions) and (3) a conclusion (Bergström & Boréus, 2005: pp. 136-137). The arguments identified in this essay respectively underlie either the thesis “Sweden ought to export war munition” or the thesis “Sweden ought not export war munition”. The main

task is to find out if the premises support the conclusion. The premises prescribe the relation between the argument and the thesis (Beckman, 2005: pp. 38-41). In turn, there are three main components; (1) durability, (2) relevance and (3) conclusive power (Ejvegård, 2005: p. 54). The most important thing with this type of analysis is that the author must analyze and consider all the argument's durability, relevance and so reach the conclusive power of the thesis (Bergström & Boréus, 2005: p. 136). Relevance is the measurement of the support applicable for a durable claim. The relevance of an argument to a particular statement (argument or thesis) is a measure of the support that the argument would provide to the statement if the argument were tenable. Further, durability stands for the reasonableness of the argument and how plausible it is to accept it. Durability is not the same thing as being the truth. Rather it stands for its sustainability and the support available for the claim (Eemeren et al., 2002: p. 52-53). Conclusive power is the combination of the argument's durability and relevance; the overall strength of the argument. There is one important factor that strengthens the conclusive power in an argument: precision. In the precision of language and formulation uncertainty can be eliminated making the argument clearer and easier to understand (Ejvegård, 2005: p. 46).

In this thesis the specific model of argumentation-analysis is a pro et contra list where the end result is to reach a standpoint on what society should do. A pro et contra carries out the analysis for both pro and contra with the ambition to find an answer to the normative question of what kind(s) of human action(s) is acceptable, in this case whether it is acceptable for Sweden to export munitions. The difficulty with this type of specific argumentation analysis is that it sometimes requires the author to fully understand the thesis in each argument to be able to pick out and analyze the premises (Ejvegård, 2005: p. 52). It is important to neither exaggerate the argument, nor to fail to give justice to the full capacity (Eemeren et al., 2002: p. 51). Here it is favorable to keep a balance between analyzing what is written and what can be extrapolated underlying in the material (Bergström & Boréus, 2005: p. 137).

An alternative to the argumentation-analysis could be an interview study with questions asked to either ones responsible or other people related to the industry. The issue here would be the normativity of the study and the validity in the results as the people in charge may not be as truthful. Secrecy, obligation to observe silence and the risk of disclosing sensitive information is on the line. In short an interview study was not chosen because the topic is sensitive and it could be difficult to gather honest answers. Further it is rather difficult to

assess what 'should be' based on interviewee answers. Another method could be a toulmin-scheme which belongs to the family of argumentation-analysis. The reason why this method was not applied is because it does not compare arguments to each other and in a list of strengths. A toulmin-scheme examines the data, warrant and backing in each argument in depth which has its benefits in breaking down the structure of individual arguments and scrutinizing them. Pro et contra model has the advantage of comparing stances to each other which fulfills the purpose of the thesis.

6. Analysis

6.1 Presenting the arguments

In this section, the analysis will be conducted. Before turning to the analysis, however, I will present the arguments to be tested (section 6.1.1 and 6.1.2). Those arguments are chosen because they represent strong standings of both sides of the debate and since they are helpful in answering the research question posed in this thesis. As the original quotations are in Swedish, I have for the purpose of this thesis translated them, and I tried to do this as verbatim as possible. With this, let us look at the chosen arguments in order, starting with the arguments against export. Here the contra arguments are noted as (C) and the pro arguments as (P).

6.1.1 Arguments against war munition export

(C1) "However, there is no doubt that Sweden's continued arms exports to dictatorships and warring countries such as Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates are in direct opposition to Sweden's commitments. It also risks eroding our credibility as a voice for democracy, human rights and world peace." (2020/21:UU9, p. 26)

(C2) "Both Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, which are the largest importers of Swedish munitions, are involved in the horrific civil war in Yemen, and like other actors, they spare no means to achieve their political goals. The conflict has not only led to the world's greatest humanitarian catastrophe, but it has also strengthened al-Qaeda and the Islamic State." (2020/21:UU9, p. 26)

(C3) “The parliament supports what is stated in the motion to call on the government to use its powers to stop all arms deliveries to Saudi Arabia, including consequential deliveries, to clarify that the intentions in the Swedish arms export legislation are not to allow arms exports to nations that like Saudi Arabia clearly commit serious crimes against human rights and serious crimes against the civilian population in war, and this is announced by the parliament to the government.” (2020/21:UU9, p. 28)

6.1 2 Arguments in favor of war munition export

(P1) “An internationally competitive level of technology also contributes to Sweden remaining an interesting country for international co-operation and leads to better opportunities for Sweden to influence international co-operation in export control. It is in Sweden's security policy interest to safeguard long-term and continuous co-operation in material issues with a number of traditional partner countries, which is based on both exports and imports of munitions.” (2020/21:UU9, p. 7)

(P2) “It is important to recall that even before the renewed regulations for munitions exports, there was a principle ban on arms exports in Sweden. According to the Act (1992: 1300) on munitions, such may only be exported if there are security or defense policy reasons for it and it does not conflict with Sweden's international obligations or Sweden's foreign policy.” (2020/21:UU9, p. 18)

(P3) “The committee notes that the regulations are followed up and evaluated on an ongoing basis, e.g. through the parliament's consideration of the Government's annual letter to the Government and through consultations with the Swedish Export Control Council (EKR). Therefore, the committee does not currently see any need for further evaluation or revision of the regulations.” (2020/21:UU9, p. 7)

6.2 Conducting the analysis

As we can see from these arguments, the ones against the export mainly refer to the three following themes (the relevance of which were discussed in my theoretical framework):

- (1) Democratic principles (argument 1 against)
- (2) Human rights (argument 1 and 3 against)
- (3) Combating terrorism (argument 2 against)

The arguments in favor of weapons export, on the other hand, rely on the following themes:

- (1) International co-operation (argument 1 in favor)
- (2) Security policy interest (argument 1 and 2 in favor)
- (3) Rules and regulations (argument 2 and 3 in favor)

We can thus state that all arguments - both for and against - are relevant in themselves, (i.e. they are all relevant to the thesis (thesis for arguments against export: "Sweden should not export war munition." and the thesis pro the export: "Sweden should export war munition"). Given my theoretical framework in section 3, all have a connection to their respective thesis, and are important features of democracy. All arguments for and against are also sustainable in themselves because they have bearing, i.e. they are reasonable to accept, given my theoretical framework. Since all arguments are relevant for their respective thesis the second task of my analysis is to test which "cluster" of arguments are most relevant, sustainable, and therefore which thesis have the highest conclusive power. This part of the analysis examines which of these themes hold the strongest force; that is, it will discuss whether and, if so, in what ways, human rights is a more important value than competition, international co-operation, security politics, and rules and regulations. Likewise, it will examine whether supporting terrorism is "worse" than the themes mentioned in the "in favor of-section" and so on. Examining this will help answer the research question – should the Swedish state export war munition? – in the following ways: If it turns out that democracy, human rights, and avoiding to support terrorism are the more important values, we will have evidence that support the conclusion that Sweden should not export weapons. If, on the other hand, security policy etc. shows to be the more important themes, we can argue that Sweden should export weapons. As we can see from above – where the arguments refer to different "themes" – the arguments pro- and contra-munition export are not based on the same premises. They can therefore not be set up against each other in a neat list of premises. I have to test all counter-arguments against all pro-arguments, in order. The following three questions will act as a template for the analysis:

- (1) Is the argument relevant (given the premises and the thesis)?
- (2) Is the argument durable (do the premises lead to the conclusion)?
- (3) Is the argument as a whole strong (conclusive power)?

C1 (democratic principles) against P1 (international co-operation)

It is difficult to completely reject the relevance of P1 as the opportunities to export creates room for continuous relations with partners. To 'safeguard' Sweden's security policy interest is important for influencing the export in both the domestic and internationally. It is, however, not as relevant and important as keeping one's word and not risking credibility in such important categories as human rights and world peace. Regarding the relevance of the first argument, the following can be said: democracy is an important principle, and Sweden has a long tradition in valuing democratic principles. The idea that export may erode or undermine such principles – and that it may undermine Sweden's credibility as a democratic factor – is therefore highly relevant. The winning factor for C1 is the fact that credibility is important to have international co-operation and defend security interests. Therefore, in order for Sweden to have continuous co-operation it must first keep its credibility in the promised values of democracy.

With the durability of P1, it is weaker than C1. The argument focuses on securing better opportunities for the Swedish state which is by no means more acute than valuing the current democratic values. Further, what makes this argument weak is the fact that Sweden may as well be able to keep influencing the laws and regulations without exporting themselves. Sweden is already part of the EU and the United Nations regulations for export control. The Swedish state's export cannot be justified with this argument as there are other ways the export can be controlled through such as diplomatic relations, legislation and reinforcement of supranational co-operation. Also, the war munition is not the only international market for Sweden to remain interesting as the state has foreign policy and connections with several states. The fact that it is important to safeguard traditional relations is not enough proof to justify the export in what is morally right. While both can be fairly accepted, C1 has higher durability. Since Sweden exports also to dictatorships and warring countries this argument becomes stronger. P1 would be able to further withstand C1 if it was more crucial for Sweden's security to keep exporting war munition. Since the state's security is not at risk as the democratic principle is at risk, C1 has greater conclusive power. Undemocratic values contradict Sweden's commitments, and as such risk eroding Sweden's credibility as an advocate of democracy. The argument is more durable as the premises lead to the conclusion and the follow each other in a logical way. Here, the argument which holds the largest support for the original thesis and largest conclusive power is C1.

C1 (democratic principles) against P2 (security policy interests and regulations)

Given the premises C1 is highly relevant because there is evidence to prove that there is a contradiction between the commitment Sweden has to democracy and what the war munition stands for. There are clear causes that risk the Swedish state as a credible voice for “democracy, human rights and world peace” (2020/21:UU9, p. 26). If the Swedish state keeps advocating for democracy and still entertain the export it means that the words are empty, empty promises of democracy and international human rights justice. The examples given in C1 are more forceful and relevant than the examples presented in P1. In C1 it is clear to understand that the export is risking Sweden's credibility. In P1, however, the lack of referencing to the relevant laws weakens its durability. It is true that the original law regulates other laws but there have been in the meantime exceptions to the law which makes the initial law secondary. Empty promises paint the state as an unreliable actor which in turn leads to consequences such as distrust etc. While P2 has relevance the argument only supports Swedish foreign policy and international obligations leaving the domestic democratic principles unannounced. Here the argument would benefit from mentioning how and why the export does not contradict the Swedish democracy.

C1 has stronger durability than P2. Following the theme on national security, the second argument in favor of the export, also supports the idea that the export is not contradictory to Sweden's obligations. Rather, the argument centers around the idea that the export is following the Act (1992: 1300) and that the export is only allowed for “security or defense policy reason’s (2020/21:UU9, p. 18). The ‘principle ban’ do, however, not align with the amount of export. If there really was a principle ban and there had to be a ‘security or defense’ reason, wouldn't then the export be very limited? There is a lack of convincing power that shows how important the export is to both Sweden and the receiving countries. Furthermore P2 contradicts P1, as a matter of facts they disprove each other even though they seek to support the same thesis. There is incoherence between- Sweden values its relation with long-term traditional partners- and for the principle ban to exist at the same time. Some states perhaps use the war munition to fight against terrorist groups, that could be a convincing reason for defense reasons. That argument is however not in the material which could have strong conclusive power for this type of argument. Since there is no strong evidence or examples of the need for defense, the argument lacks conclusive power and the conclusion drawn does not completely follow the original thesis. While the statement needs arguments that support the need to keep exporting, the argument focuses on

the circumstances under which Sweden is permitted to export. Hence, C1 has the stronger conclusive power and wins in this comparison.

C1 (democratic principles) against P3 (rules and regulations)

The relevance for C1 stands as highly supportive for the thesis as there is tension between what the democratic values stand for and what the export has potential to create, the argument has strong conclusive power. As support to the thesis that the Swedish state should not export war munition the argument provides a clear example on the contradiction between what is said and what is done. Without war munition many wars cannot happen, strategic plans, arms and technology is needed for an actor to gain insight on its 'opponent' and attack. If the Swedish state simply would not provide war munition in exchange for economic gains the potential of war would be less. Sweden, of course, does not stand as a sole responsible for war munition. That however does not take from the fact that Swedish war munition is being used in wars committed in human catastrophes. Argument number three (P3) can be summarized by: the exports do not go against the legislation - there is no reason to revise the regulations. For P3 the relevance is also large, it is however not enough to reject C1 as the committee's reasoning regarding the regulations. The Swedish Export Control Council (EKR) is still under governmental control which makes it possible for the military-industrial complex to be an influence on the export or another underlying factor.

The committee notes that the regulations are followed up and evaluated on an ongoing basis, e.g. through the parliament's consideration of the Government's annual letter to the Government and through consultations with the Swedish Export Control Council (EKR). Therefore, the committee does not currently see any need for further evaluation or revision of the regulations." (2020/21:UU9, p. 7). The argument that the regulations are being followed up is durable, there is however no place in the argument that reassures the reader of the results from the evaluations and or how they are being done. The argument would be more durable if it was less vague as there may be more details for the argument to present. There is, also, no evidence to prove that the law is what is morally right or what we should keep doing. The conclusion is that the committee sees no need for further evaluation making the support to the original thesis weak. If the argument was more developed it would have more potential to have stronger conclusive power and greater support for the favor of the export.

C2 (combating terrorism) against P1 (international co-operation)

The second argument against the export focuses on the war in Yemen and makes two points: (1) the world's biggest humanitarian crisis and (2) the fact that it has strengthened terrorism. First off, there are many actors involved in the conflict, and among them there is both Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates which also are among the biggest importers of Swedish war munition. The conflict has led to an unbearable amount of causality and human rights violations. Since the states involved do not plan on changing their political goals in the conflict: is it right to keep exporting to them? For the second point, the war has also strengthened the terrorist groups al-Qaeda and the Islamic State. While both arguments are relevant, C2 rejects P1 as the export cannot be morally justified for the Swedish state on the basis of the 'strengthening opportunities' and gaining further security interest. It is difficult to elaborate that Sweden's continuous export to traditional partners is more morally important over what C2 presents. For P1 to win the argument need a security cause enough that shows signs of threat, vulnerability or insecurity. Therefore, C2 has greater relevance.

For durability, C2 wins. With the war in Yemen, human lives are being lost. For Sweden it should be more important to stand up for their democratic values and not send war munitions than to preserve its position in the international arena and remain an 'interesting' country. For Sweden to in the first place remain interesting and influence the export it must not lose its credibility in a category as important as being one of the world's strongest democracies. To preserve a position in the international arena also means keeping the 'domestic promise'. It is also highly likely that the war in Yemen might not have been as great without the Swedish war munitions. The war munitions has been used to strengthen terrorism in other parts of the world which point out exactly why the Swedish state should not keep exporting. These two factors combined have built the argument with durability and relevance to withstand resistance. As the analysis conducted, C2 has stronger conclusive power as it is more reasonable that human rights are more important for the Swedish democracy than Sweden's preferred export to its partners.

C2 (combating terrorism) against P2 (security policy interests and regulations)

With the test of C2 against P2 the subjects overlap as they are related to each other. Within the frame of security politics, combating terrorism plays an important part. And in the politics on how to oppose terrorism, security politics is also a priority topic. With the relevance for their thesis the arguments reject each other. Here, the case of the export to

Ukraine as an example becomes relevant. According to P2 Sweden exports if there is a defense reason and in this case the munitions are used to combat a humanitarian catastrophe (war in Ukraine) making the arguments reject each other, they are equally relevant.

Even though it was not decided which of the arguments had greater relevance, the question of durability is clearer. With P2 the main backing is that if war munition would be exported it should not “conflict with Sweden's international obligations or Sweden's foreign policy.” (2020/21:UU9, p. 18). Here the contradiction between what is being said and what is being done is presented well because as C2 demonstrates that is not the truth. Swedish war munition is being used in the war in Yemen which is the “greatest humanitarian catastrophe”(2020/21:UU9, p. 26) making P2 an unreasonable argument in comparison with C2. As the arguments have as high relevance as each other and the greater durability landed on C2, making C2 the argument with stronger conclusive power.

C2 (combating terrorism) against P3 (rules and regulations)

P3 does not have enough power to reject C2 as for relevance, C2 has the advantage. If there are no signs of the receiving countries using the war munition for better ends there should be a change in the regulation to stop exporting to countries that go against universal democratic values. Otherwise, the Swedish democracy would be contradicted and only applied to the Swedish state and not its foreign policy. One cannot preach democracy and disregard it as a part of foreign policy. Therefore, it is more important to stand up for human rights and prevent humanitarian catastrophes than keeping the regulations as they are.

Many of the actors that Sweden sent war munition to have no means to (at least so far) to change their political decisions in the war in Yemen as C2 describes. With P3, the arguments state that there are yearly evaluations of the regulations. How come the committee is following up on an ongoing basis without noticing that the war munition is being used to kill civilians and strengthen terrorist groups? The durability of C2 is far greater than P3. In summary, the conclusive power of C2 is larger than P3.

C3 (human rights) against P1 (international co-operation)

Moving on, the third argument, clarifies the intention of the Swedish export not only to Saudi Arabia but also to other nations that openly commit crimes against civilians and go against human rights. Regarding its relevance, the argument has high relevance which supports the

thesis that the Swedish state should not export war munition to straighten out the violation between democratic values and what the export is standing for. The argument has forceful conclusive power and supports the original statement.

When comparing C3 against P1 we are putting the importance of not supporting governments that are committing serious crimes to both their own civilian population and participation in war against Sweden's security interest and better opportunities. It is more fair to accept that Sweden should put aside their interest for the sake of saving lives. Furthermore, there may be an even stronger chance for Sweden to influence the export control by stopping the export. One can believe that if one of the world's top exporters stops exporting it would lead to a controversy and be an influence by itself. Hence, Sweden does not have to be exporting themselves to influence the export, making P1 unable to reject C3.

C3 (human rights) against P2 (security policy interests and regulations)

When comparing C3 and P2 we are putting the Swedish states credibility against continuous exceptions which is the exact reason for the contradiction between what is being said and what is being done. It is more important for the Swedish state's democracy to keep its credibility and for the intentions of the war munition to not land in the hands of states committing serious crimes against humanity. For the government to refer to the act (1992: 1300) and still make exceptions with the support that the export is allowed as long as it “does not conflict with Sweden's international obligations or Sweden's foreign policy” (2020/21:UU9, p. 18). Here the problem is that the ‘defense’ reason is going to be for nations such as Saudi Arabia and their gains in the war in Yemen. Even if the export does not contradict Sweden's international obligations its intentions still stand as supportive of the crimes committed with the help of the munitions exported. Therefore P2 is not relevant enough to reject C3 as C3 has stronger morally justifiable evidence and hence more relevant to its thesis.

It is not reasonable that the security and defense policy that the Swedish state is sending war munition for is resulting in “nations that like Saudi Arabia clearly commit serious crimes against human rights and serious crimes against the civilian population in war” (2020/21:UU9, p. 28). C3 clearly demonstrates the morally unjustifiable export that Sweden is exporting to states as Saudi Arabia. In the meantime P2 points out that there must have been security or defense policy for the export to happen. There may be policy reasons for

the export, since they however are not mentioned anywhere (in the material overall) we cannot conclude how necessary they are. For P2 to be able to reject C3 examples of what the security and defense policy means must be shown and examples given. Otherwise it can be the security of anything, as the security for a state involved in a war or their economic security. Since there is no example of the kind of policy reason P2 cannot be morally justified over the crimes committed by the munitions. Therefore C3 has stronger durability and conclusive power.

C3 (human rights) against P3 (rules and regulations)

There is tension between C3 and P3 as on one hand the parliament suggests that the government should stop all exports to Saudi Arabia and nations with similar politics to set the tune for the Swedish intentions. On the other hand, the committee notes that there is no reason to revise the regulations. Between these two arguments the greater relevance is delivered by C3 as the arguments precisely details the negative outcomes of Swedish war munition which P3 does not have the strength to reject. For P3 to reject C3 it must give an example on why the Sweish state does not need to change the regulations.

Even though P3 has strong durability it is not sufficient enough to be more justifiable than C3. The export control committee is yet to analyze the consequences of war munition as C3 describes it as. For this test C3 has stronger durability than P3. The fact that the committee does evaluations and follows up and concludes that a revision on the regulation is not needed is not enough to reject C3. Sweden is allowing the export to nations such as Saudi Arabia and without following up, the accountability for the consequences of war munition is being lost. If Sweden is willing to send arms etc. and Saudi Arabia is free to use it in crimes against human lives no one is held accountable and the cycle continues. C3 has stronger support to its thesis as it presents how and why the Swedish state should not export as it cannot be morally justified against the crimes committed with the help of Swedish munition. For the strongest conclusive power C3 is the winner as P3 lacks the support for its thesis to conclude how it can be morally justifiable to keep exporting. P3 presents why we can keep exporting, not if we should.

7. Results

C1	C2	C3
P1 tested Relevance: weaker Durability: weaker Conclusive power: rejected	P1 tested Relevance: weaker Durability: weaker Conclusive power: rejected	P1 tested Relevance: weaker Durability: weaker Conclusive power: rejected
P2 tested Relevance: weaker Durability: weaker Conclusive power: rejected	P2 tested Relevance: equal Durability: weaker Conclusive power: rejected	P2 tested Relevance: weaker Durability: weaker Conclusive power: rejected
P3 tested Relevance: weaker Durability: weaker Conclusive power: rejected	P3 tested Relevance: weaker Durability: weaker Conclusive power: rejected	P3 tested Relevance: weaker Durability: weaker Conclusive power: rejected

As we can see from the analysis above, the arguments against the export seem to hold the most conclusive power in that they are more relevant and durable. It is more reasonable to accept the importance of the argument of human rights in comparison to arguments of international co-operation, security interests, and rules and regulations. The same holds for the other arguments, contra-arguments about credibility are more reasonable to accept in comparison to co-operation and so on for all arguments tested against each other. From this, we can conclude that the answer to the question: “should the Swedish state export war munition”? is no. This is because the arguments against the export turned out to be the stronger arguments when compared to the arguments in favor of such export. Because Swedish weapon exports clearly go against Swedish principles, Sweden should not export munitions. In addition to the discussion above, there seem to also be contradictions between the arguments in the pro-side making it harder to accept the pro-export stance.

Democratic states have the tendency to advocate for democracy, which is the case for Sweden, making the Swedish state contradictive. The export has the ability to undermine Sweden's credibility as an advocacy of democratic principles. This is troublesome on both the international and the national level. Because the Swedish government is advocating for democracy and is one of the world's largest exporters they are speaking against themselves in the attempts to proclaim democracy. Therefore, the argumentation pro the export is non-plausible. The justification for arms exports for commercial reasons reflects the reality we have today, which partially shows that profit is more important than fighting wars in other parts of the world. Furthermore it shows that the Swedish government prioritizes their own agenda, interests and securing better opportunities over preserving democratic values and human rights.

8. Concluding remarks

When it comes to generalizability to other cases such as the export of other democratic states it is difficult to estimate how the results from this thesis can be generalized in specific to other cases. We need to keep in mind that Sweden is a rather special case with strong democracy and is yet one of the largest exporters in the world. However, the relevance, durability and conclusive power of the arguments still stand and can in other tests with similar pro-arguments generate similar results. The fact that Sweden also exports war munition even to undemocratic states (as evident from the arguments and mentioned in section 3), constitutes a further problem for advocates of continued export. This strengthens my conclusions even more, because it seems extra morally awful to export to countries that obviously violate democratic principles.

However, the arguments analyzed in this thesis are of course not the only arguments made from either side. This thesis chooses to test the arguments in sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 because they hold important information, which brings at least a piece to the puzzle of whether Sweden ought to export weapons. The outcome of the thesis could be different with other arguments, for example if there were arguments that pointed to the strong need for economic gains from the export. Even with that I think that the argument on human rights, democratic principles and combating terrorism hold great(er) relevance, durability and conclusive power. One specific argument which would hold great relevance and durability against contra-arguments would be security arguments and in specific if the Swedish

security for human rights was at risk. The same 'security' logic can be applied to the war in Ukraine where Sweden exported munitions for the sake of democracy, human rights and international security. Moreover, there was also more in the material regarding permit examination, laws and the obstacles to granting a permit which need to be further examined.

There are likewise many more aspects of democracy and theoretical starting points that need to be assessed in future studies. For example, due to the scope of this essay, concepts such as "freedom" and "justice" were not included. Had concepts such as these been analyzed, it is possible that my conclusions would have differed. The same applies to the Swedish import of war munition which also is an important factor for the relation between Sweden and its partners. Questions to keep in mind for future studies are: *How has the Swedish state justified arms export to explicitly undemocratic states? If Sweden should export, normatively speaking, who should it export to? Should any state export?*

At the time of writing this thesis the Social Democrats' party board has decided to apply for NATO membership to strengthen Swedish security. This could have definitive effects on the Swedish war munition as nearly two hundred years of alliance-free politics comes to an end. With time to tell the future of Swedish foreign policy on security policy and military this thesis is concluded.

9. Bibliography

Amnesty. (n.d) *Vapenhandel*. Retrieved 2022-03-11 from

<https://www.amnesty.se/vara-rattighetsfragor/kris-och-konflikt/vapenhandel/>

Beckman, Ludvig. (2005) *Grundbok I Idéanalys: Det Kritiska Studiet Av Politiska Texter Och Idéer*. Print.

Bergström Göran and Boréus Kristina. (2005) *Textens mening och makt: metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text-och diskursanalys*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Bäck, Henry, Torbjörn Larsson and Gissur Erlingsson. (2008) *Den svenska politiken: struktur, processer och resultat. (2:e upplagan)* Malmö: Liber.

Edström, Håkan. (2016) *Efter EU-medlemskapet. Nya linjer i svensk utrikespolitik?*. *Statsvetenskaplig tidskrift*, 118(4).

Eemeren, Frans H. Van, Rob Grootendorst, and Arnolda Francisca Snoeck Henkemans. (2002) *Argumentation : Analysis, Evaluation, Presentation*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates. Print.

Ejvegård, Rolf. (2005) *Argumentationsanalys*. Print

Esaiasson, Peter, Gilljam, Mikael, Oscarsson, Henrik, Wängnerud, Lena. (2017) *Metodpraktikan*. Nordstedts förlag. 5th edition

Freedom House. (n.d) *Freedom in the World 2021 Country Report*. Retrieved 2022-05-19 from <https://freedomhouse.org/country/sweden/freedom-world/2021>

Fägersten, Björn, & Jerdén, Björn. (2018) *En moralisk stormakt i post-neutral tappning: Svensk utrikespolitik 2011–2018*. *Internasjonal Politikk*, 76(4), 343-354.

Gómez, Christina. *Commentary: Organizing Tensions—From the Prison to the Military-Industrial Complex*. (2009) *Social Justice*, 36(2), 116.

Gustavsson, Jakob and Jonas Tallberg (red). (2014) Internationella relationer. Stockholm: Studentlitteratur. 3rd edition

Ikegami, Masako. (2013) The End of a 'National' Defence Industry?: Impacts of Globalization on the Swedish Defence Industry. *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 38(4), 436-457.

Inspektionen för strategiska produkter. (n.d.a) *Introduktion till försvarsmateriel*. Retrieved 2022-05-05 from

<https://isp.se/krigsmateriel/introduktion-till-krigsmateriel-och-tekniskt-bistand/>

Inspektionen för strategiska produkter. (n.d.b) *Exportkontrollrådet*. Retrieved 2022-05-19 from <https://isp.se/om-isp/vara-rad/exportkontrollradet/>

Inspektionen för strategiska produkter. (2017) Annual Report 2017.

https://isp.se/media/1269/isp_annualreport2017_web.pdf (retrieved 2022-05-15)

Lundmark, Martin. (2019) 15 The Swedish defence industry. *The Economics of the Global Defence Industry*.

McCormick, John, Hague & Rod, Harrop, Martin. (2016) *Comparative Government and Politics. An Introduction* (10:e upplagan). Palgrave.

Motion 2017/18:3826. *Svensk försvarsindustri*

<https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/83BABFD5-38EC-463F-880A-C5555309C951>

Nationalencyklopedin. (n.d) *argumentationsanalys*. Retrieved 2022-05-05 from

<http://www.ne.se/uppslagsverk/encyklopedi/lång/argumentationsanalys>

Peoples, Columba & Nick Vaughan-Williams. (2014) *Critical Security Studies. An Introduction*. London: Routledge. 2nd edition

Quistbergh, Fredrik. (2010) Så snurrar vapenkarusellen. Rapport/ Svenska freds-och skiljedomsföreningen. Stockholm: Svenska freds- och skiljedomsföreningen.

Regeringskansliet. (2018). *Vad är mänskliga rättigheter?* Retrieved 2022-05-02 from <https://www.regeringen.se/regeringens-politik/demokrati-och-manskliga-rattigheter/fakta-om-manskliga-rattigheter/vad-ar-manskliga-rattigheter/>

Schmitter, Philippe C., and Terry Lynn Karl. (1991) "What democracy is... and is not." *Journal of democracy* 2.3. 75-88.

Sveriges Riksdag. (n.d) *Lag (1992:1300) om krigsmaterial*. Retrieved 2022-05-06 from <http://www.riksdagen.se/webbnav/index.aspx?nid=3911&bet=1992:1300>

Svenska Freds. (n.d) *FAQ Vapenexport*. Retrieved 2022-03-11 from <https://www.svenskafreds.se/vad-vi-gor/vapenexport/faq-vapenexport/>

Svenska Freds. (2022) *Kommentar: Svensk vapenexport till Ukraina*. Retrieved 2022-03-11 from <https://www.svenskafreds.se/upptack/forsvars-och-sakerhetspolitik/vapenexportentillukraina/>

SVT. (2022) *Sverige skickar fler vapen till Ukraina*. Retrieved 2022-04-23 from <https://www.svt.se/nyheter/inrikes/sverige-skickar-fler-vapen-till-ukraina>

Åkerström, Linda, and Svenska Freds- Och Skiljedomsföreningen. (2016) *Den Svenska Vapenexporten* Print.

Åkerström, Linda. (2020) *Nära en tredjedel av vapenexporten 2019 till ickedemokratier*. Retrieved 2022-04-29 from <https://www.svenskafreds.se/upptack/nedrustning/nara-en-tredjedelav-vapenexporten-2019-till-ickedemokratier/>

2020/21:UU9. *Strategisk exportkontroll 2020 - krigsmateriel och produkter med dubbla användningsområden*. <https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/59F179DC-AB1B-4D78-AD93-147408CF102A>