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Abstract

Sweden is top ranked in indexes measuring democracy, but the country is also a major weapons exporter. The contradiction is reflected upon in this paper, where Sweden as a well-established democracy seems to be going against its own democratic values when exporting weapons to non-democracies. Previous research is limited and lacks sufficient explanation to why Sweden exports weapons to non-democratic states.

The aim of this study is therefore to analyze arguments behind the Swedish weapons exportation to countries with a low degree of democratic freedom. By applying Framing theory and argumentation analysis, selected statements arguing for weapons exports, expressed by Swedish government representatives have been analyzed. The justifications for weapons exportation to dictatorships have been categorized, depending on emphasis, into four frames namely; security, development, credibility and reliability.

The research result showed that the most commonly used arguments to justify weapons exports to non-democracies include following; (1) There is a need of a defense industry for Swedish security reasons, (2) It is positive for international exchange and trade and (3) The rules for weapons exports are strict enough and well established in politics. The different ways of justifying the weapons export shows that the concerned Swedish government representatives frame their arguments in a way that supports their political opinion and the current government.

Keywords

Weapons trade, democracy, framing theory, argumentation analysis
Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my tutor Manuela Nilsson, for invaluable and patient guidance, constructive criticism and encouragement throughout the whole thesis-writing process.
List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>Arms Trade Treaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP</td>
<td>Inspectorate of Strategic Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEX</td>
<td>Parliamentary committee on Swedish Arms Export</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Krigsmaterielexportöversynskommittén)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIPRI</td>
<td>Stockholm International Peace Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFF</td>
<td>Stockholm Security &amp; Defense Industry Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAS</td>
<td>The Swedish Peace and Arbitration Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table of Contents

1 Introduction .................................................. 1
  1.1 Introduction, research problem and relevance ....................... 1
  1.2 Previous research ........................................... 5
  1.3 Objective .................................................. 7
  1.4 Research questions .......................................... 7
  1.5 Theoretical and methodological considerations ..................... 7
  1.6 Disposition .................................................. 8

2 Analytical Framework .......................................... 9
  2.1 Theoretical frameworks used for explaining weapons exports in previous research .... 9
  2.2 Framing Theory ............................................. 12

3 Methodological framework ...................................... 15
  3.1.1 Argumentation analysis ...................................... 15
  3.1.2 The data, sources and their validity ........................ 17
  3.1.3 Limitations and Delimitations ................................ 19

4 Findings and Analysis .......................................... 20
  4.1 The Swedish Weapons Exportation ................................ 20
    4.1.1 The Export of Weapons .................................... 23
  4.2 Swedish government discourses justifying weapons exports ......... 26
    4.2.1 Security-frame ........................................... 28
    4.2.2 Credibility-frame ......................................... 31
    4.2.3 Development-frame ......................................... 34
    4.2.4 Reliability-frame .......................................... 34
    4.2.5 Summary .................................................. 37

5 Conclusions .................................................... 38

References .......................................................... 1

List of Figures

Figure 1 (Regulations overview) p. 20
Figure 2 (Regulations overview) p. 21
Figure 3 (Regulations overview) p. 21
Figure 4 (Export of weapons 2016) p. 24
Figure 5 (Export of weapons 2015) p. 25
Figure 6 (Export of weapons 2014) p. 25
Figure 7 (Frame Matrix) p. 28
1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction, research problem and relevance

Sweden is ranked as one of the top countries in the world when it comes to indexes measuring democracy, sustainability, equality and human rights. Sweden has for example always been included among the 10% topping the Human Development Index (HDI) that weighs together different dimensions of human development. Currently Sweden is on the 14th place with the index 0,913 and the classification “very high human development” (Human Development Report, 2016). Freedom House (2018) provides an index for democracy levels that puts Sweden among the absolute top with the best possible scores, and the Foreign Minister of Sweden, Margot Wallström, points out that Sweden has a strong voice and high credibility internationally, thanks to a well measured foreign policy focusing on e.g. human rights, democracy and development (Regeringen, 2018). Sweden is a member of the United Nations (UN), and is today one of few member countries that meet the aid target of 0,7 gross national income (GNI). Furthermore, the Swedish government’s website points out that conflict prevention, disarmament and non-proliferation are highly prioritized within Sweden’s UN politics (Regeringen, 2015). Sweden is also during the period of 2017-2018 a part of the UN Security Council to promote the Swedish view on for example human rights, development and democracy. Simon Anholt, the founder of “The Good Country” index talks about Sweden’s 1st place rank as “a good country is a country that successfully contributes to human interests, but never at the expense of other countries or their natural resources” (author’s own translation) (Stadling, 2017). Moreover, Sweden holds the world record of longest peace, as war within the country has not been present since 1814 (Radio Sweden, 2014). During the Second World War, unlike its neighbors, Sweden declared itself neutral to avoid suffering from negative consequences from the conflict (Säkerhetspolitik.se, 2018). Sweden has a long history of taking part in peacekeeping actions as well as being involved in several peacekeeping missions all around the world (Försvarsmakten, 2017). Sweden is also the very first country in the world to implement a democracy criterion, that took effect 1st of April 2018, making a certain level of democracy a condition for countries receiving arms from Sweden, and a possible hindrance for export of munitions to countries where the status is seen as inadequate (Regeringen, 2017b; LRR, 2017).

It might therefore come as a surprise to realize that Sweden is one of the world’s largest arms manufacturers and exporters (SIPRI database, 2017) and even exports weapons to several undemocratic countries. In fact, Sweden has exported weapons to the United States
of America, India, Pakistan, Thailand, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, whereof
the first two mentioned have engaged in war during the time of exportation, the following two
have a record of extensive violation of human rights and the last two are examples of
dictatorships that have been and still are buying munitions from Sweden (Svenska freds,
2010; Skr 2016/17:114). According to Radio Sweden (Sveriges Radio, 2017) the Swedish
arms industry was worth $1.21 bn in 2016. The Swedish Peace and Arbitration Society
(SPAS) argues that the Swedish arms trade is fueling wars and conflicts, contributing to
worsened human rights, strengthened dictatorships and contributing to poverty. Yet, the
weapon trade is continuously ongoing, seemingly not only to acceptable countries, as
statistics published in the Strategic Export Control report show that Sweden have exported
weapon to several countries with a very low degree of civil liberties and political rights.

However, Sweden’s arms exports have not remained unnotice. Several debates
regarding weapons exportation have concerned the unethical aspects Sweden has faced when
exporting to non-democratic countries. The recent debates have largely concerned the
democracy criterion suggested by the Council on Legislation at the end of June 2017,
following the propositions from the Parliamentary Committee on Swedish Arms Exports
(KEX). The Council on Legislation consists of a group of judges that provide judicial
previews before the government submits draft bills to the Parliament. The KEX-committee
has been dealing with the task of investigating how Sweden can improve the control of its
weapon exports. The purpose of implementing the criterion is to make democracy a central
condition in the decision-making process of granting export of munitions. In spite of this, it
does not compensate for a total hindrance, as the democratic status in the recipient country is
formulated as something that “should be taken into consideration”. Several actors have
commented on the democracy criterion and the opinions differ. The Swedish Peace and
Arbitration Society (SPAS) created in 1883, and often engaged in the public debate, applaud
the changes, seconded by Amnesty, while for example SAAB AB and the Swedish Security &
Defense Industry Association oppose them (LRR, p.37, 2017). Lastly the Swedish Defense
University argues that it would be limiting and the Inspectorate of Strategic Products (ISP)
points out flaws in the assessment and potential risks but say that they on the other hand have
nothing against a democracy criterion as such.

The debate about the democracy criterion and the presence of weapons exportation to
undemocratic countries present interesting contradictions about the perception of Sweden that
this study will look deeper into. The democracy criterion is the perfect example as it on the
one hand creates a desirable image of Sweden by sending signals about compliance with
democracy and responsibility to do right, both within the country and abroad. On the other hand, not everybody seems convinced about what effect the democracy criterion will really have (Perlo-Freeman, 2017). The criterion has gone from first being suggested with a stricter formulation, to more or less result in a “recommendation”.

It is a fact that many other countries around the world export weapons to other countries - democratic, as well as undemocratic. But Sweden is, because of its well-established democracy and good status an interesting case to investigate. Essentially this research seeks to create understanding for why a democratic country sells weapons intended for war to undemocratic states. A question that has not yet been answered in research, as the debate about the weapons trade seem to focus on e.g. finding rights and wrongs when authorities interpret guidelines and rules (Hellström et. al, 2018; Bolling, 2018; Åkerström, 2016). Examples on what previous research has focused on will illustrate the research gap. Ella Asplund (2015), examined how the debate about the arms trade from Sweden was affected by the revelation of the Saudi arms deal, leaving a gap concerning why Sweden would export to Saudi Arabia at the first place unsaid. Another study on the legal and political aspects of the weapons export, had a strong focus on how the regulations were formulated, when examining whether the established rules and human rights criterion were violated when exporting weapons from Sweden to Pakistan and Russia (Ericsson, 2008). The research gap also appears here, as no sufficient information is provided to explain why a democratic country like Sweden would go against its democratic norms and export weapons to non-free countries. The research gap is also established since Herrlund and Svensson (2010) conclude that their used theoretical framework realism fails to sufficiently explain justifications behind the weapons exportation from Sweden to countries in war, or to countries that violate human rights.

The topic is contemporary and of interest because it is believed that with a better knowledge considering the discourse we could better understand the reasons behind and perhaps also see potential actions that would be beneficial to take. As Gawronski & Strack (Psychology Today, 2012) argue, knowledge about dissonance between cognition (theory) and behavior (practice), also referred to as the hypocrisy paradigm, could motivate change to bring behavior in line with already subscribed beliefs (although not applicable to this specific study due to its focus on individual behavioral issues). On the one hand this study emphasizes increased understanding of the topic that in turn could lead to dissonance reduction and a more sustainable development worldwide. But mostly, by dissecting statements and justifications by the Swedish government representatives concerning weapons exportation to
democracy violators, this study is relevant because it will help to increase awareness of the hypocrisy that seem to appear in external policies regarding weapons exportation in Sweden as well as in many other countries. This case study of Sweden, can help to understand the behavior of other democratic states, and encourage further research on similar topics. It is believed that increased awareness could trigger further action by international organizations as well as civil societies worldwide.

The Swedish weapons exportation started as a result of the country’s neutrality politics (Åkerström 2016, p.13). The idea was simple; in order for Sweden to be able to declare itself as neutral in case of war, Sweden stayed out of joining alliances and the conclusion was a strong independent Swedish defense capability, relying on war material primarily manufactured in Sweden. But the other side of the coin remained a dilemma since it is exceptionally costly to independently produce munitions. The price tag would have exceeded the available means by far and the only solution was to be seen as a side effect of the Swedish neutrality and its politics - to export the excess from the industry. This way the exportation of munitions became central in a country striving for peace and protection of human rights (Åkerström 2016, p.13-15). According to Åkerström (2016, p.17) it can be understood as a paradox in the way Sweden’s aspiration to be impartial also meant it took part in providing weapons to countries or regions in conflict around the world.

In 1995, when Sweden joined the EU, its impartiality was affected, even though the alliance did not directly entail any military cooperation (Åkerström 2016, p.14). The security policies shifted in 1996 when the Swedish Parliament approved a proposition that in practice meant that Sweden not any longer strived to be impartial (Prop, 1995/96:12; Åkerström 2016, p.21).

On June 1st, 2012, a parliamentary committee on export control, often referred to as the “KEX-committee”, was assigned with the task of investigating how Sweden could improve its export control. The top priority within the committee, consisting of 12 members of the parliament, was to suggest implementation of stricter control of the weapons export in particular to countries with a low degree of democratic freedom. Originally the committee was supposed to present its conclusions by the end of 2014, but it got delayed and the result was finally presented in June 2015. Two years later, the 26 of June 2017, Sweden’s Minister for Foreign Affairs Margot Wallström received the proposed changes for the regulatory framework regarding weapon exportation from the KEX-investigation, that mainly suggested that the democratic status of the recipient country should be a central condition when
permissions to grant export of weapons are decided upon. Additionally, the proposition includes that the recipient’s country’s respect for human rights should play an important role in the decision-making process, as well as consideration on whether the export of weapons prevents positive change in the potential region receiving weapons (Regeringen, 2015; Prop, 2017/18:23).

1.2 Previous research

Even though the debate about the Swedish arms trade seems to concern many, the research on the topic is very limited, especially that in relation to why Sweden chooses to export weapons to countries with a low democratic freedom. Most previous research that has been found focuses more generally on the Swedish weapons exportation and its existence (Rosengren, 2011; Sirelius, 2012). In this section, relevant findings from previous studies concerning the weapons trade from Sweden will be presented to determine research gaps.

Primarily research shows that there are two strong sides in the debate. The Swedish Security & Defense Industry Association (SOFF) argues that the weapon exportation is of much importance for Sweden’s economy, labor market and security. The Swedish Peace and Arbitration Society (SPAS) on the other hand primarily focuses on disarmament using a moral viewpoint and a global perspective (Rosengren, 2011). Additionally, there are a number of different international institutes working with research in relation to munitions exports around the world. SIPRI (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute) is one institute based in Sweden that independently compiles data and provides analysis about e.g. disarmament, conflicts and arms control. It was founded in 1966 and is ranked as one of the top of its kind. It is possible to access databases on their website that has been developed to access e.g. all international transfers of major conventional arms (SIPRI Arms Transfers Database).

There are about 20 theses (written 2001-2018) available treating the Swedish weapon exportation in general. These include Ella Asplund’s (2015) study that emphasizes that Sweden has two conflicting roles that allows the weapons exportation from Sweden to Saudi Arabia to take place. The thesis that is written on a bachelor level at Uppsala University concerns the debate on weapons trade from Sweden, in particular to Saudi Arabia (a country with a very low degree of democratic freedom). Asplund (2015) concludes that when the Saudi arms deal was revealed it led to a change where export of weapons to countries violating human rights was viewed upon as less accepted in the debate concerning the issue.
The study does not go into the reasons behind why a democratic state exports weapons to dictatorships, whereas the main focus is to answer to whether the Saudi Arms deal affected the debate on weapons trade in Sweden, which indicates a potential research gap.

Lina Ericsson (2008) writes about how the Swedish regulatory framework is built up, to allow the exportation of weapons to countries violating human rights. Her conclusion shows that specific criteria on human rights seem to be disregarded in favor of the export. The study does not answer to why Sweden chooses to export to dictatorships, but focus rather lies on justifying that the exportation to non-free regimes are legitimate, legally speaking.

Lars Ingelstam (2012), who has conducted an extensive report concerning the debate on the Swedish weapons exportation, refers to a doctrine-chain when listing argumentations that has been used during a long period to justify the exportation of weapons. Although, he points out that it in practice is almost completely invalid as it includes listings that are not relevant any longer such as for example Sweden’s alliance freedom. This motivates a new study that can answer how argumentations are used today to justify the weapons exportation from Sweden.

A relatively new study conducted by Helena Larsson (2018), comprises very relevant and interesting results. The main idea of Larsson’s research was to test the hypothesis that said that the more democratic a country is, the less it will export weapons to regimes that are non-democratic, due to democratic values that especially a smaller state should be more concerned to uphold (Larsson, 2018). Surprisingly rather the opposite was proven, meaning that democratic norms in a country do not automatically equal a more responsible arms trade, but in fact, Larsson (2018) provided findings that pointed at a positive correlation between economically wealthy countries and their weapons export to non-democratic regimes.

Among previous research that has been conducted, Madeleine Svensson and Joakim Herrlund (2010) have contributed with a thesis with research questions that lack sufficient theoretical support when seeking answers to what justifies the Swedish weapons exportation to countries in war and countries violating human rights. The authors empathize in their conclusion that even though several statements subjected to analysis are characterized by a realistic view, the findings show that the contradiction between theory and practice in weapons exports politics are inadequately explained by the realistic perspective.

Kristina Neskovic (2011), on the other hand emphasizes that both the realistic, but mostly the liberalistic perspective have explanatory power. She concludes that in cases of uncertainty in the decision-making process, Sweden’s interest has the highest priority. What
remains the gap of knowledge are those cases of complicated character which does not seem to be directly connected to either realism nor liberalism (Neskovic, 2011).

None of the above-mentioned studies, that are closest to the topic of this research, have successfully explained why a democratic country chooses to export weapons to countries with a low degree of democratic freedom. The study by Madeleine Svensson and Joakim Herrlund (2010), and the study by Kristina Neskovic (2011) have at least partly been able to reach their objectives, but concludes that neither liberalism nor realism provide a sufficient explanation, which motivates the choice of this study.

1.3 Objective
The aim of this study is to analyze the arguments justifying the Swedish weapons exportation to non-democracies.

1.4 Research questions

• How does the system of the Swedish weapons exportation work?
• How do the Swedish Government representatives argue for weapons exportation?

1.5 Theoretical and methodological considerations
Framing Theory will be used as the theoretical framework in this study. Originally put forth by Gregory Bateson (1972) and developed by Ervin Goffman (1974), frame-analysis is a multi-disciplinary research method within the social sciences, that enables examination of how certain information is influenced by the use of communication or transfer of information.

Frames could be described as highlighters that are directing extra attention to certain elements that are part of a subject of communication. In written text, something can become more salient by the way it is placed or if certain words are repeated or associated with a familiar notion. The Framing Theory will first take place in the theory chapter where it will be explained and motivated. The Framing Theory will later be applied in the analysis, where the chosen frames will contribute to the understanding about the Swedish weapons export in particular to questionable countries.

This qualitative desk study will be conducted by analyzing the selected discourses of Swedish government representatives concerning the country’s weapons exports. The motive
is to examine how the argumentations about weapons export to dictatorships, are constructed, how they are framed.

When applying the method of argumentation analysis, we will be able to describe and evaluate the statements, while the framing theory is an ideal framework that complements the analysis when searching for an explanation to how arguments are formed.

1.6 Disposition

The second chapter will provide a section on theoretical frameworks in previous research, and how they have been used to explain weapons export, as well as a more in-depth description on the theoretical framework of this study.

The third chapter includes the methodological framework that has been chosen when conducting this research.

In the fourth chapter the findings of this study have been incorporated with the analysis. The Swedish weapons exportation system will be outlined and described, and statistics on the weapons exportation to countries with a low degree of democratic freedom will be presented. The statements of the Swedish Government representatives will also be presented and analyzed in this chapter.

The conclusion of this study, in the fifth and final chapter, will outline the results and answer the research questions. Also a short discussion on the study in relation to a larger context will be included, as well as suggestions on future research within the topic.
2 Analytical Framework

2.1 Theoretical frameworks used for explaining weapons exports in previous research

A number of different theories have been used to explain the weapon exportation from Sweden such as e.g. role theory, rational choice theory, realism and liberalism.

Role theory has been used in a study written by Ella Asplund (2015) treating the subject of weapon exportation to dictatorships from Sweden where she argues that Sweden has two conflicting roles – the humanitarian superpower (by referring to various development cooperation’s and aid-projects Sweden is involved in (Regeringen, 2018b) versus the weapons exporter. The research has its theoretical ground in role theory and treats the theory’s concepts role expectation, role performance and role conception. The theory was originally developed within psychology and sociology and has later been used to study states behaviour in international politics. Asplund’s research focuses on finding an answer to whether the Saudi arms deal affected the Swedish weapon exportation, using the method of process tracing and concluded that it had major effects on the debate. With help from role theory, Asplund (2015) could also show that Sweden’s role as a humanitarian superpower has met less critique compared to the opposed role as a weapons exporter. Despite this, she concluded that the two roles have remained stable (Asplund, 2015).

Lina Ericsson (2008) investigates how the regulatory framework of weapons exports from Sweden explains grant of weapon export to countries violating human rights, with help from using a deductive system of logical reasoning. The theoretical framework builds on 4 hypotheses derived from the regulatory framework and the findings show that decisions to grant to certain countries are clearly conflicting with the human rights criterion within the Swedish regulatory framework, but however not with the framework as a whole.

Both realism and liberalism have provided the theoretical ground for two separate studies conducted by Ian Sirelius (2012) and Kristina Neskovic (2011), while realism together with the security dilemma has been used in a study written by Joakim Herrlund and Madeleine Svensson. Neskovic (2011) writes about three categories within the two theories from where she operationalizes her analyses. Shortly, the world view from a realist’s perspective reflects an international system where sovereign states are seen to be calculating and rational. The foremost goal is to maximize the states’ power, security and wealth. Principal convictions are that the government legitimately represents its citizens and are
obligated to defend them. Moreover, the state view external actors with suspicion and as potential enemies. A causal conviction within realism is that security is growing stronger as the power of the state increases. Alliances and agreements are seen as tools to reach increased power and peace.

In liberalism, the political system starts with the individual. In the international system states are mutually dependent to one another. Individuals are viewed as rational, free and with inviolable rights. Principal convictions are that the state is morally responsible towards its citizens as well as to external actors and cross-border relations with other states are seen as important in order to reach world peace. Lastly, within liberalism its causal convictions are that through democracy, cooperation’s and international institutions, human rights, peace and security can be secured (Neskovic, 2011).

Neskovic (2011) has tried to find explanations of why Sweden exports weapons to countries that seemingly do not accord with the Swedish policies. With help from applying realism and liberalism she has concluded that both theories have strong explanation power. She argues that liberalism has a strong ground in the Swedish weapons exportations politics, but that liberalism alone, does not hold up, when less certain cases are analyzed. She concludes that in difficult cases, Sweden’s interests are prioritized when making decisions about grant of weapons export. Sirelius (2012) argues that politicians use arguments based on realism, when stating that we have to ensure our capability to defend ourselves. He also brings up the fact that Sweden have exported weapons to the US that were intended for use in war, and that this supports the idea from realism about states being the foremost actors and that the power play takes place between states rather than being regulated by global organs such as the UN. Sirelius (2012) concludes that the Swedish government today supports and works actively to increase the weapons export and that the regulations and rules are less decisive in comparison to other factors such as work opportunities and defense budget that have had effect on the weapons exportation debate.

The security dilemma, used together with realism in the thesis written by Madeleine Svensson and Joakim Herrlund (2010), is a concept within realism that could be explained as a consequence of continuous reinforcement and strengthening of military defense in one state. Other states subsequently get insecure about the objective (that could be of defensive or offensive purposes) and they often find it hard to trust the other states intentions. This insecurity results in a spiral of reinforcement of defense that in theory could be never-ending. (Baylis, Smith & Owens, 2014). Svensson and Herrlund’s study analyses argumentations about how weapons export is justified to countries in war and to countries violating human
rights. They apply realism to explain Sweden’s weapons trade, meaning that the trade exists because it is lucrative for Sweden. After applying the two theories realism and the security dilemma they concluded that realism can not provide full explanation for contradictions in the Swedish weapon exportation because some statements are incompatible with their hypothesis. They argue that realism, in spite of varied explanation power, is affecting Sweden’s weapons trade politics because rhetoric has few, yet existing parallels with realism. Svensson and Herrlund (2010) emphasize that more studies are needed in order to form a better and fuller understanding about the topic.

Jennifer Erickson’s “Dangerous Trade” (2015) suggests a theory explaining states’ commitment to arms export norms and regulations, and the varied compliance to these. The theory highlights social reputation and its importance as a factor explaining states’ commitment to arms export norms. It could be seen as a perplex reality where states to a large and growing extent can be seen to commit to international agreements often resulting in high implementation costs in absence of material gain. Erickson (2015) firstly suggests that states see their reputation as something important not only for material but also social reasons. States may therefore commit to agreements out of strategic reasons to support their standing in international politics or to build up a self-image that goes well with their concerns. Secondly, Erickson argues that the varied compliance has a strong connection to the concern for domestic reputation. Transparency plays a big role and compliance efforts will be more successful in democracies. Moreover, where civil society activity is higher, leaders are more vulnerable, making reputational damage matter. Lastly, Erickson suggests that social reputation as a theory of state behavior can provide explanations where gaps between commitment and compliance are identified. Although, she recognizes the gap she does not proceed with any complete explanation to why the compliance varies.

There is previous research to be found treating the subject of weapon exports from Sweden, other studies have focused on both similar and dissimilar issues such as understanding how the regulatory framework is formulated, how the Swedish weapon exportation has developed over time and how Swedish decision-makers justify export of weapons to countries that seem to not accord with the regulations. The reason of choosing another theory is motivated by the objective of the study that is to increase understanding for the state of the world, as Sweden is often viewed as a humanitarian superpower, and yet still exports weapons to questionable countries around the world. Previous studies have stressed the importance of conducting more studies, which also motivates the choice of writing about the chosen topic.
Eventually Erickson’s theory of state behavior mostly provides explanation for why countries choose to commit to agreements but includes weak support for why compliance varies or how social reputation is measured. Liberalism and realism are very broad theories that do not provide necessary tools to analyze how text can influence transfer of information in comparison to the framing theory. Realism has in previous studies shown to enable explanation, but only to limited extent. Role theory does indeed provide an interesting lens but focuses more on analyzing states behavior.

Framing Theory provides an interesting lens to look through considering the research question and the theory’s way of offering description of a communicating text (Entman, 1993, p. 51).

2.2 Framing Theory

This study therefore uses Framing theory. Foremost, the theory provides excellent tools to analyze the findings of this study together with the chosen methodology of argumentation analysis, that is one of the main motives for choosing this specific theory. As mentioned earlier, the previous research that has been found, are using other theories when interpreting findings with varying results. That also motivates why it is of interest to use another theory since the aim is to get a better understanding for the topic of this research. With help from Framing theory, it is believed that aspects that has not before been noticed, could form new explanation for the export of weapons. Framing Theory does in that matter provide a new sort of lens to look upon the issue. The research problem of this study consists of a lack of knowledge considering the reasons behind weapons exportation to non-democracies in particular, where Framing Theory will provide a different perspective as opposed to previous studies in order to tackle the issue. According to Goffman (1974), frame-analysis is essentially about giving the reader tools to easily comprehend what is being said about what, which also motivates the use of the Framing Theory in comparison to others.

The concept of framing highlights how human consciousness is influenced by the use of communication or transfer of information. Foremost, framing involve selection and salience, since framing essentially is about making certain aspects stand out from a perceived reality. Framing has become useful within multiple fields of research when analyzing how human understanding and consciousness are influenced by the way it is put forth. The framing affects e.g. the definition of a topic, the promotion of a specific problem, casual interpretation and moral evaluation. The concept of framing was originally put forth by Gregory Bateson in
1972. Two years later sociologist Ervin Goffman developed in his essay “Frame Analysis” that people understand the world through frameworks. With help from a frame that is taken for granted by the user, the individual is able to interpret data. Erving Goffman (1974) argues that natural and social frameworks are two distinctions within these sort of framework that automatically are applied when people are forming understanding for a certain issue.

Robert M. Entman (1993) explains that there are four framing functions; definition of problems, diagnose causes, the making of moral judgments and suggestion of remedies. It is further suggested that frames have (at least) four locations; the communicator, the receiver, the text and the culture. The *communicator* due to him/her that makes either conscious or unconscious framing choices/judgments. The *text* involves framing that can be seen in presence or absence of particular words, phrases, sources of information, stereotypes etc. The *receiver* that in turn may or may not have conclusions or thoughts formed from frames in the text. Lastly the *culture* - as frames that are common for most people in a social group in terms of both discourse and thinking. All the four locations and their framing include functions of selection and highlighting. Highlighted sections are used to build up opinions concerning problems, causation, evaluation, solutions etc.

Frames could be described as highlighters that are directing extra attention to certain elements that are part of a subject of communication. In written text, something can become more salient by the way it is placed or if certain words are repeated or associated with a familiar notion. Entman (1993) argues that framing is not always easily detectable for the receiver and factors such as existing thoughts and schemata affect how a text is understood. For an idea to become salient in a context, the interaction between the text and receiver is critical. How the audience receive information can be influenced by frames of different kinds, although there is no guarantee that it reflects the communicator’s intention.

Kahneman and Tversky (1984, p. 343) demonstrate an example of how framing can change and determine people’s way of looking upon a certain issue. In an experiment a number of people were asked whether they preferred option A or B, and in another if they preferred option C or D. A and C were in practice identical just as option B and D with the only difference being the formulation. The researchers proved how powerful framing might be when forming opinions due to the fact that the percentage were reversed depending on in what way it was written out. The frames do, like in this example, emphasize certain aspects that attracts attention and provide a perspective that definitely could have a strong impact on the receiver.
It is important to acknowledge that framing widely affects understanding of certain issues. In the political world the communicator can choose to focus on certain aspects while leaving others out in favor of an eligible outcome. Undoubtedly framing plays a critical role especially when it comes to exerting power politically and this highly motivates the use of framing theory in this study. This theory unlike others allows us to analyze how the transfer of information is used – what is emphasized and what is left out? And eventually helps to increase understanding of what the Swedish government wants us to see. For example, any news article demonstrates how the communicator has chosen to look upon the matter, and simultaneously registers the actor’s identity, as well as certain interests. Additionally, it has been shown that frames concerning news are prone to be self-reinforcing meaning a specific frame becomes so widely used that another frame is unlikely to have any bigger influence when it comes to policy changes. (Entman, 1993).

Edelman (1993, p. 232) argues that frames are powerful both because of selective description but not the least due to omitted explanation of a situation. If we can make sense of, not only how arguments are used but how they are framed, we can understand what the communicator wants the receiver to see, since the way an issue is framed to a great extent determines how it will be acted upon and understood.

The application of the Framing Theory will take place in the analysis, where the frames will be presented, motivated and explained. The Framing Theory will in the analysis help to categorize the different statements from the Swedish Government representatives.

Framing Theory will contribute more to the topic compared to previously mentioned theories because it is broad and applicable to the argumentations that will be analyzed. With help from framing theory, the benefits are that we can use any suitable frame to be able to explain how the text affects the debate. In the analysis of the arguments, after applying the framing theory we might be able to find – according to the four framing functions – definition of problems, diagnose of causes, detection of the making of moral judgments and suggestion of remedies. In other words, the framing theory will enable us to understand how statements from governments representatives are formed.
3 Methodological framework

This qualitative desk study will be conducted by analyzing the discourses of Swedish government representatives concerning the country’s weapons exports. The motive is to examine how the arguments of weapons export to dictatorships and other unacceptable countries, are constructed, how they are framed. Sweden was selected because it offers an interesting platform for analysis due to its high weapon export per capita and simultaneously high commitment to treaties and agreements restricting weapon exports. The findings of this study will be analyzed with help from applying the framing theory and by using an abductive approach, that essentially means to form a new understanding for something by observation and interpretation using a new conceptual framework (Danermark et al, 2005). Abduction could simply be described as a way to detect meanings and coherence in relation to a new theoretical idea or interpretation. Danermark et al. (2005) state that abduction fundamentally is about recontextualizing or reinterpreting something.

3.1.1 Argumentation analysis

Argumentation analysis provides a good methodological basis when conducting this study, and focuses on the validity of arguments, interpretation and relevance (Nationalencyklopedin, 2018). Argumentation analysis goes hand in hand with Framing theory because they both share the objective to critically examine and explain reasoning. To be able to proceed and find an answer to the question of this study, statements have been selected and form the discourses that will be analyzed. Since the research question of this study is to examine how the Swedish government argue, quotes from news papers and interpellations were relevant to include in the analysis. Not only does it provide the reader with exact citations, but with help from using argumentation analysis as a method we will be able to interpret and look more into the validity, interpretation and relevance. Additionally, the Framing theory in combination with the argumentation analysis complements each other, allowing the analysis to take into consideration different aspects, yet relevant to each other. Framing and argumentation analysis both look deeper into, and provide tools to analyze what has been said about what.

When applying argumentation analysis, we will be able to describe and evaluate the discourses, while framing theory is an ideal framework that complements the analysis when searching for an explanation to how arguments are formed and in what way they reflect the Swedish government’s standpoints.
In the analysis, the statements concerning the weapons exportation will be analyzed with the help of argumentation analysis. The chapter will examine one statement at the time that will include description, evaluation and explanation.

Argumentation analysis consists of two parts, one descriptive and one evaluative part. After choosing what will be analyzed, the first task is to describe and interpret the arguments used and how they are structured. After that the arguments detected will be evaluated to enable examination of validity and relevance – to confirm whether they support the main idea of the argumentation or not (Björnsson et al. 1994). The purpose of argumentation analysis is to assess what has been said and if the foundation of it holds up. Flaws in the argumentation can be found when using argumentation analysis and criticism can be brought up as a result. In short, argumentation analysis gives us tools to question what is said and also demonstrates the importance of critical thinking.

According to Björnsson et al. (1994), argumentation analysis consists of subjective elements within both the descriptive and the evaluative part. The result of the analysis is to a certain extent affected by the person conducting the study. Previous knowledge, experiences and opinions can influence the analyst’s evaluation because of different background and prerequisites. Although, the method of argumentation analysis helps us evaluate more objectively.

The descriptive part of argumentation analysis is conducted by detecting the different parts of the statement – the claim, statements, arguments. The aim is to find out if the arguments are supporting the main idea of the statement. Furthermore, to interpret the argumentation the context should also be considered. The goal is to find what statements the communicator intended to express with his or her discourse. The language style, intention of the communicator, intended receivers and place of publishing are also factors that are included in this part (Björnsson et al. 1994). Arguments that aim to strengthen the main statement or claim, are called first order arguments. Second order arguments are intended to increase the validity of the first order arguments. There are so called pro-arguments and con-arguments, where the first mentioned implies intent of strengthening of a statement and the con-argument implies a direct intent of decreasing the validity of a statement. The con-arguments can also be of different order as the pro-arguments. Lastly a premise in an argument should also be considered in the first descriptive part, that could be something implicitly understood that are said with the intention to increase the relevance of an argument.
The evaluative part includes critical examination of the argumentation to conclude if they prove to hold up in terms of validity. Björnsson et al. (1994) argues that this part is highly based on subjective factors. The result will inevitably differ depending on what previous knowledge we have, how we value and evaluate text and what our opinions are. In the evaluative part, this is not seen as a hindrance, but the insight is important. The method helps to reach a conclusion about the validity of the argumentation at least in relation to our own background and knowledge. Following is considered in the evaluative part of the argumentation analysis; conclusive power, factual and normative statements, validity and relevance. The conclusive power of an argument is measured by how well an argument is supporting the main idea of a statement. In order for the argument to be well established, it has to follow a certain intuitive logic. When we determine the conclusive power, it is important to base our thoughts on something to avoid assumptions. We might therefore need to double check information to control whether stated arguments have a foundation. The conclusive power also consists of both validity- and relevance- check in relation to what has been claimed, whereas an argument or statement can be both invalid and irrelevant in the specific context, yet be completely true and accepted in another circumstance.

In the evaluative part, the factual and normative statements also have to be considered. Factual statements are often regarded to be either true or false, while a normative statement is less likely to be static in terms of veracity. Factual statements are those that can be confirmed with help from scientific methods while a normative statement is for example: “We must buy a new car tomorrow”. The validity of an argument depends on how good reasons are behind accepting a statement or argument – how probable they are. Lastly in the evaluative part the relevance plays a role. The relevance is determined by how well the statement and argument are logically conformed. Even if the relevance is high, it does not automatically mean that the conclusive power is high (Björnsson et al., 1994).

3.1.2 The data, sources and their validity
In order to answer the research questions, quotes from government discourses have been found on the Swedish government’s website and in news articles online. The choice of sources is tangible as it illustrates how the current Swedish government justify the weapons exportation to dictatorships.

This study first strived to use official government documents when searching for answers to the research question but this was found to be difficult due to a lack of necessary retrievable material. Instead other sources have been used to be able to answer the research
questions. Since the objective is to increase understanding of why Sweden exports weapon to dictatorships, it became interesting to look at reasoning’s of ministers in the Swedish government to increase understanding for their arguments. A number of statements from concerned ministers have been collected and found in news articles and on the Swedish government’s website. Although, only ten statements have been possible to find. Many statements were used several times in different articles whereof the amount of statements first seemed to be larger, and some statements seen in what first appeared to be relevant articles, came from an irrelevant context and had to be removed. The somewhat limited amount of selected statements is nevertheless providing a platform for analysis, due to that they were expressed by a person in the Swedish government (that is ultimately responsible) in their professional role.

Other information such as background information on the Swedish weapon exportation and data about statistics, laws and what Sweden has signed in form of agreements and treaties has been retrieved from relevant websites and databases of i.a SIPRI and the Swedish government. Reports and documents have been retrieved from first or second-hand sources. Interpellations where the ministers themselves have written their response is an example of a first-hand source, while an article written by a journalist citing a concerned minister, is a second-hand source.

Quotes and data have been retrieved from sources that are viewed as highly reliable such as the Swedish government’s website and other databases with high confidence i.a Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). The quotes that are taken directly from an interpellation found on the Swedish governments website could be argued to have very high validity due to the fact that it is the minister’s own formulations and first-source information. Quotes retrieved from articles are only retrieved from well-known newspapers. The form of statements is usually very critical and has to be quoted verbally. In cases where information has been retrieved from secondary sources online, triangulation has been attempted, meaning cross-checking data from different sources (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 245).

To some extent information from the Swedish Peace and Arbitration Society (SPAS) has been used and in this case the impartiality could be argued to be a bit lower since SPAS is an organization working for disarmament. Linda Åkerström’s book about the Swedish weapon exportation has also been used in this study. Åkerström might be a biased source, but the information she provides the reader with, accord with for example the Swedish Government’s website and the information ISP provides.
3.1.3 Limitations and Delimitations

The discourses of the Swedish government representatives on weapon exportation that will be presented in the following chapter are found in newspapers as well as on the government’s website. Due to secrecy, the decision-making process takes place behind closed doors and the access to what the decision has been based on is limited. The study is also limited since there could be quotes and data of interest for this research that are not written down or not possible to access because it is considered classified information. The main reason for this delimitation is that the Swedish government is ultimately responsible and therefore interesting to examine closer. It was also necessary to delimit the search in terms of time and therefore only sources from latest October 2014 have been used. The reason for this delimitation is that this study should reflect current government positions and justifications, so the time frame starts from October 3\textsuperscript{rd} 2014, which was when the current government was formed. Weapons exports took place well before, but due to the time and word limitation for this study, it was necessary to delimit and the foundation for analysis is still believed to be sufficient. The quotes are cited in either first or secondary sources of information and are collected from well known newspapers or from the government’s website. This was also a factor delimiting the search to make the study more trustworthy. To find statements to analyze, the search focused on one minister at the time, and relevant statements were selected from quite limited search results where often the same statement could be found several times in different articles. The number of discourses that will be analyzed is delimited also because of the time frame of this study, but the discourses are believed to provide an adequate foundation in spite of the delimitation. Lastly, the collected discourses have been translated from Swedish to English by the author.
4 Findings and Analysis

4.1 The Swedish Weapons Exportation

In this part of the findings, the decision-making process and system of the legal framework regarding the Swedish weapons exportation will be presented. What will be stated is considered important for the reader to know since the statements of the Swedish Government representatives that will be analyzed eventually are formed with knowledge based on the regulatory framework and its function.

The Swedish government is ultimately responsible and controlling the regulation of the exportation of munitions. In theory all export of weapons is prohibited, but exceptions can be made and permission can be granted according to the Military Equipment Act (1992:1300). The military act says that permissions can be granted only if there are security- or defense-political reasons for it, and if it accords with the Swedish foreign policy. The Inspectorate of Strategic Products (ISP) is the authority that, independently yet under the Swedish Government, decides and assesses grant of weapon exports from Sweden. ISP has support from the Export Control Council.

As of paragraph one of the Military Equipment Act (1992:1300), permission for weapon exports can only be granted if there are security and defensive purposes according to policy and furthermore the export should be in line with Sweden’s official foreign policy. Premises and principles for the assessment can according to the Swedish government be found in the Swedish guidelines for weapons export that the Swedish government and parliament have approved. The guidelines are established through the governments proposition (1991/91:174) as a support to interpret the law.

The Swedish guidelines say that weapons exports should only be approved if the export
1. is considered desirable for security policy reasons, and necessary in order to match the need of material of the Swedish Armed Forces and
2. does not violate the principles and goals of Sweden’s foreign policy.

**Figure 2. Regulations overview**

ISP supervises and independently decides which countries are granted permission to receive weapons from Sweden. The administrative authority has to consider several agreements, laws and rules when making an overall assessment for each individual case. Out of the Swedish Military Equipment Act (1992:1300) and the guidelines (1991/91:174), ISP has to consider i.a. the EU act (2008/944/Gusp) and the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) of the UN (ISP, 2018).

**Figure 3. Regulations Overview**

The United Nations Arms Trade Treaty formally took effect December 24th 2014 (ISP, 2018). It regulates weapons exports with conventional weapons, meaning weapons that work primarily though bullets, pressures and splitter (Nationalencyklopedin, 2018b). The criteria that ISP has to consider within ATT when assessing whether to grant export of weapons mainly relates to international humanitarian laws and gender-based use of violence. Export of weapons cannot be permitted if it violates a decision of the UN Security Council. The
Security Council has decided on weapon embargoes against the following countries: Afghanistan, Central African Republic, North Korea, Democratic Republic of Congo, Eritrea, Iraq, Iran, Yemen, Lebanon, Libya, Somalia and Sudan (ISP, 2017).

Apart from the abovementioned, ISP has to act in accordance with the EU and its eight common criteria about weapon exports (2008/944/Gusp) (EU, 2015). Following criteria has to be taken into consideration when ISP is deciding about grant of export of weapons from Sweden; international agreements, treaties and embargos, human rights, the internal situation in the country, regional peace, security and stability, national security for allies and member states, the recipient country’s compliance with international law, risk of diversion and sustainable development (ISP, 2018).

According to the Swedish government, the EU is also working closely with five export control regimes: Nuclear Suppliers Group, The Australia Group, Wassenaar arrangement, the Zangger committee and Missile Technology Control Regime. The EU applies all of the weapon embargos that the UN has decided upon and are therefore applied to Sweden as well (ISP, 2017).

The EU has also, independently from the UN, introduced weapon embargos against the following countries (legally binding): Burma/Myanmar, Iran, Libya, Russia, Sudan, South Sudan, Venezuela, Belarus, Zimbabwe, and following embargos that are politically binding; Egypt (council conclusions), China (council declaration) and Syria (council declaration) (ISP, 2017). The legally binding embargoes imply that there is a risk of suffering from legal consequences if the decision of a weapon embargo is violated, while a politically binding embargo lacks outspoken consequences, yet expects compliance due to e.g special agreements or decisions.

Within the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), that Sweden is a part of, there is a weapons embargo against Nagorno-Karabakh that affects both Azerbaijan and Armenia (ISP, 2017). The OSCE is the world’s largest intergovernmental security-oriented organisation with 57 participating states (OSCE, 2018).

The Export Control Council’s meetings are only for members, and therefore very few people have insight in what exactly is discussed at those occasions. Just like the employees at ISP, the people working in the Export Control Council are subjected to secrecy and risk prosecution if they reveal any information that has been discussed at the meetings. According to Linda Åkerström, the Swedish weapons export distinguishes from other countries in three different ways. First, it is not the government, but an authority that decides about the grant of
weapon exports. Second, the process of decision-making is informal. Lastly the Export Control Council have, because of their supportive role, the possibility to affect the outcome of decisions. In other countries it is more common that this sort of council examines the decisions afterwards rather than take part in the actual process. How far it impacts the Swedish weapons exports is almost impossible to answer because of the secrecy concerning the decision-making process. What remains clear is that there are very few people who have insight in how the weapons export politics work in practice (Åkerström, 2016). Åkerström (2016) argues that the investigation by the KEX-committee during 2012-2015 is a perfect example of that after they received major criticism for not having understood the basic conditions for the decision-making process by the ISP, even though experienced secretaries and members of the parliament formed the group.

4.1.1 The Export of Weapons

Every year, the Swedish Government publishes a report “Strategic Export Control” that can be retrieved on the Swedish Governments website. The report includes information to support and describe the Swedish governments politics regarding weapons exports, and also includes which countries that have been granted with permission to receive weapons from Sweden and what has been exported. The report is released in March for the previous year and the latest version for 2017 has not yet been published at the point when this was written.

In the “Strategic Export Control” we can see that Sweden during 2014, 2015 and 2016 exported or granted at least one permission of weapons export to the following countries; Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Croatia, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, New Caledonia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, The United Kingdom, The Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Austria, Andorra, Iceland, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey, Canada, The United States of America, Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Japan, South Korea, Kazakhstan, Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, United Arab Emirates, Jordan, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Algeria, Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, Zambia, Australia, New Zealand, Cyprus, Malta, Liechtenstein, Trinidad & Tobago, Peru, Uruguay, Bahrain, Kuwait, Tunisia and Montenegro (Strategic Export Control 2014; Strategic Export Control 2015; Strategic Export Control 2016).

Freedom House is an independent organization that each year publishes reports of how free countries around the world are. The score that the countries are given represents its freedom status, where 0= least free and 100= most free. With help from Freedom House’s
(2018) search tool, the list of countries that Sweden have exported weapons to has showed that the following countries are classified as “not free” 2018: Turkey, Kazakhstan, Brunei, Thailand, United Arab Emirates, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Algeria, Bahrain, and following “partly free”: Mexico, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Jordan, Zambia, Kuwait, Montenegro. When a country has the freedom status “not free” and “partly free” the civil liberties and political rights are lower compared to a country with the freedom status “free” (Freedom House, 2018).

Since this study is focusing on export of weapon to non-democratic countries and how government representatives justify the export of weapons to these, the countries classified as “not free” will be examined closer. Provided below are three charts put together by the author, of the countries that have been classified as “not free” during the period of 2014-2018 that Sweden has exported or granted permission for export of weapons to during 2016, 2015 and 2014. The worth is in million Swedish Krona. There are different categories for different types of weapons. A granted permission is a first step towards receiving arms from Sweden, while the actual export might have been permitted another year.

**Chart of export of weapons and grant of permission for weapons export 2014, 2015 and 2016:**

**Figure 4 - 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Granted permissions</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Worth granted permissions</th>
<th>Category exported</th>
<th>Worth exp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,11,17,21,22</td>
<td>217,9</td>
<td>8,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan,</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,22</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand**</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,4,5,9,11,21,22</td>
<td>886,4</td>
<td>2,4,5,10,11,21,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,4,5,10,11,15,16,17,21,22</td>
<td>10 638,6</td>
<td>1,2,3,5,15,17,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14,17</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>14,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21,22</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>5,10,21,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 5 – 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Indicator 1</th>
<th>Indicator 2</th>
<th>Indicator 3</th>
<th>Indicator 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,8,13,17,21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5,8,13,21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand**</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,3,4,9,13,22</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2,3,4,5,9,10,21,22</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,3,15,22</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>5,10,21,22</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,5,18,21,22</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>5,21</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6 – 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Indicator 1</th>
<th>Indicator 2</th>
<th>Indicator 3</th>
<th>Indicator 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,13,17</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>8,17</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2,3,22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand**</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,3,21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2,3,5,10,14,21,22</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5,6,10,13,15,21,22</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>5,6,13,15,21,22</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,21,22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,5,10,11,21,22</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,9,22</td>
<td>15,5</td>
<td>5,17,21,22</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Graphs (Figure 1, 2 and 3) put together by author with data from the Strategic Export Control 2014, Strategic Export Control 2015 and Strategic Export Control 2016.*

*Turkey shifted freedom status from “partly free” to “not free” 2018, as a result of worsened civil liberties and political rights.

**Thailand shifted from “partly free” to “not free” 2015.

***Jordan shifted from “not free” to “partly free” 2017.
The charts above show that the weapons are categorized and what exactly countries are importing is different from case to case. In the Strategic Export Control report from 2016 very brief descriptions of each category that varies from “technic” to bombs and missiles is available, but what all categories have in common is that they are classified as “war material” and can be used either directly or indirectly to kill (Strategic Export Control, 2016).

The total export of weapons from Sweden was 2016 almost worth 11 billion Swedish kronor. 2015 the export of weapons was worth close to 7.5 billion Swedish kronor and year 2014 it amounted to nearly 7.8 billion Swedish kronor. The value of the weapons export to countries during 2016 that got classified as “not free” from Freedom House was about 708.8 million (6% of the total export) the same number for 2015 is about 434.2 million (6% of the total export) and 1,12 billion for 2014 (15% of the total export) (Calculated by author with data from Freedom House, 2018; Strategic Export Control 2016; Strategic Export Control 2015; Strategic Export Control 2014).

4.2 Swedish government discourses justifying weapons exports
In this section the findings will be presented and analyzed, in particular the statements by the Swedish government representatives together with application of the argumentation analysis and categorization by using the Framing theory. A frame matrix has been implemented to introduce an overview of the different frames and the four functions of the Framing theory. The frames were formed after analyzing the statements, to be able to design concrete support for the categorizations. That also explains why some frames include more statements. The statements will be analyzed and include description, evaluation and explanation using the method of argumentation analysis. All the statements have been translated from Swedish to English by the author, and do not always express a direct justification for weapons exportation to dictatorships, but they might contain clues for why the export of weapons to non-democracies is present.
**Figure 7 – Frame Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Definition of Problem</th>
<th>Diagnose Causes</th>
<th>Make Moral Judgments</th>
<th>Suggest Remedies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security</strong></td>
<td>Security concerns are used as a factor to justify export of weapons from Sweden.</td>
<td>Major attention has been directed to instability in the world, that triggers concerns.</td>
<td>Signals a necessity of weapons export from Sweden to other countries, in order to achieve safety.</td>
<td>Both receivers and communicators should be critical to information and try to create understanding for how long-run consequences could have an impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credibility</strong></td>
<td>Communicators tend to emphasize the importance of credibility by being law-abiding to rules or politics in favour of the weapons export.</td>
<td>Concerned ministers are directing attention to rules that could be seen to support actions taken.</td>
<td>Builds up a biased support when referring only to rules that fit, while overlooking others.</td>
<td>Communicators could take bigger responsibility and present that other options to solution exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td>International exchange and trade is used to justify the export of weapons, and are indicated to outweigh negative consequences.</td>
<td>Trade with a country might enable communication and possibility to have a positive impact.</td>
<td>Makes the export of weapons look like a way of keeping doors open for positive business exchange.</td>
<td>Inform about that a stop of export of weapons to non-democracies does not have to lead to Sweden having less to say, but rather a strong condition to display as an option for a real positive change in terms of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td>Alliance freedom in Sweden is used as justification for the defence industry, while it does not exist in practice anymore.</td>
<td>Historically seen, Sweden strived to be alliance free in order to be reliably neutral.</td>
<td>False statements could lead to people accepting the argumentation on the wrong premises.</td>
<td>Here lies a big responsibility at the communicator to instead justify in a valid manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig.4. Frame matrix put together by the author, based on the four framing functions and analysed statements (Entman, 1993).*
4.2.1 Security-frame
The security frame comprises statements referring to security concerns by justifying the need of Swedish weapons exportation to be able to achieve safety, in Sweden and/or abroad. With this framing, Sweden seem to take on the role as a responsible country and justifies the export of weapons to non-democratic countries by pointing at instability and conflicts around the world, to explain why it is needed. The statements that fall into this category frames the arguments by making the reasons behind look legitimate and positive for security.

”A politically and economically important actor with a key-role for the development and security in the region.” Stefan Löfvén, 2016

The statement above about Saudi Arabia was expressed by Stefan Löfvén, the Prime Minister of Sweden. We can see that Löfvén frames the discourse by focusing on the development and security, while leaving other factors out, directly in Saudi Arabia, but also indirectly in Sweden, since Löfvén mentions that the country is a politically and economically important actor (Holst, 2016). This statement has been found in an article on the Swedish Government’s website where press secretary Jonatan Holst is informing about Löfvén’s upcoming visit to Saudi Arabia. The intention of the article is not directly to form an argumentation about weapons exportation, but it contains information about why Sweden sees Saudi Arabia as a valuable partner, which explains why Sweden still export weapons despite massive critique. Another interesting fact related to the context of this case is that Marcus Wallenberg, the Chairman of SAAB (one of the biggest weapons manufacturer in Sweden), followed the Prime Minister on the trip to Saudi Arabia 2016.

The main argument concerns that Saudi Arabia is seen as a critical actor in the region for the development, and Löfvén signals that security issues are another reason to the Swedish relation with Saudi Arabia.

The language style of the article published on the Swedish government’s website is formal and correct, and due to its place of publishing it intend to be accessible for everybody who might be interested. The overall intention of the published article is to inform, and justify the trip. Press secretary Holst writes that one reason for the trip is that Sweden will take place in the UN Security Council 2017, where Syria is a highly prioritized subject. Löfvén also says that the situation in Syria will be discussed during the meetings in Saudi Arabia. This also shows that they want to present the information focusing and framing the purpose of the trip.
for the public to perceive it as Sweden being the responsible country, while it in fact can be the other way around.

The validity of the arguments can be considered high since Saudi Arabia indeed is a big and very powerful country, mainly due to its oil and the exportation of oil to other countries that is seen as a necessity and has made the country interdependent (BBC, 2018). The conclusive power of Löfvén's argumentation is therefore high, due to Saudi Arabia having a special position and power in the region. For Sweden, keeping a good relationship with Saudi Arabia might be beneficial in terms of economic and political agreements, and some may argue that Sweden, by sustaining a stable relationship with Saudi Arabia, have the possibility to affect the country. Others argue that when we support a country that we know have a questionable leadership and weak human rights, we also support their constitution as it is formed today rather than pushing for a change. The statement is normative; it is not written in stone that Saudi Arabia has a special position that they will possess forever.

The relevance of the argument in terms of weapons exportation from Sweden to Saudi Arabia could be considered both high and low because it is unclear what effects a potential ban of weapons exportation could have. For Sweden and Saudi Arabia, the development and security could have worse effects in a short time period, and maybe in a longer time frame it could result in a positive change both economically and for the development if Sweden (and possibly other countries too) took a stand and stopped exporting weapons to a country with very low civil liberties and political rights. In a best case scenario, it could result in a change and Saudi Arabia could develop to become more democratic. But there are also risks since Saudi Arabia is a powerful country and not depending on Sweden in specific, of Sweden being excluded from other beneficial trade that could have negative effects on the economy and political climate of Sweden.

"It is part of the industry, but it is important in particular for the Swedish defense capability and our security policy. That we have our own production, knowledge and capacity is an important part of Swedish defense policy, not the least because what has happened in our world in recent years may increase the need for our own capacity to produce equipment.”

Mikael Damberg, 2015.

The statement by Mikael Damberg, the Minster of Enterprise and Innovation of Sweden, has been retrieved from Svenska Dagbladet, and was published 2015. The article is about the Swedish weapons exportation to the region around Saudi Arabia, and includes information
about that certain years the exportation is decreasing and other years it is increasing depending on the orders that have been placed. The article that has a quite unclear intention and the title “Swedish Weapons Exportation is decreasing” is considered a bit misleading. The argumentation about the weapons exportation is framed by focusing on the safety and security of Sweden. Damberg is in his statement emphasizing how well the export is established in the weapons industry today, and how important it is for Sweden of security reasons. He also points out that due to happenings in the world during recent years, the need of our capacity to produce equipment might increase. Damberg uses the argument where he links the weapons exports to to need for Swedish weapons productions. The security-frame is chosen for this statement as he refers to “what has happened in our world, in recent years”, a somewhat weak argument as he do not provide any further information.

In this article, even if the language is correct and the information it gives its intended readers is right, it also shows that wrong conclusions can be drawn if there is not enough background knowledge and accessible information for the writer.

When evaluating the statement by Mikael Damberg, the validity is considered high. The weapons exportation from Sweden is part of the industry today, and is considered important for the Swedish security policy. The argumentation is relevant when explaining why there is a weapons exportation but less relevant in relation to weapons exports to non-democracies.

“With reference to the UN Charter, I can add that all countries have the right to defend themselves and therefore have the right to their own defense.” Ann Linde, 2016

The communication between Ann Linde, Minister of EU Affairs and Trade, and Hans Linde (Swedish Left Party), raised questions about the government’s promotion of weapons exports to the Philippines (Riksdagen, 2016). It is characterized by Hans Linde questioning and seeking answers to why the Swedish government have chosen to promote weapons exports to an authoritarian regime like the Philippines, and provides facts about that Swedish SAAB has a strong wish to sell JAS Gripen fighter aircraft to the Philippines. He further provides information about that SAAB opened an office in Manila the same week as the Swedish Embassy reopened in Manila, the capital of Philippines in November 2016.

Ann Linde frames her arguments with focus on credibility as she argues that all countries have the right to defend themselves according to the UN Charter, and means that the UN charter is important to compile to for Sweden to be credible. Linde’s first argument is of
high validity since it is true that the UN charter says that all countries have the right to their own defense. But the conclusive power in this context is low. The argument rather appears to be a poor excuse where she diverts attention from the main issue namely that Sweden is providing weapons. Instead she argues that the Philippines should have the right to acquire weapons, referring to the UN Charter. The argument is not relevant in relation to the question about weapons exportation from Sweden to the Philippines. The argument has been placed within the credibility-frame because from the Swedish government perspective the arguments seem to focus on how important it is to follow the UN charter.

4.2.2 Credibility-frame
The credibility frame tends to be used where the Swedish government representatives have focused their argumentation on reasons emphasizing the importance of Sweden’s credibility. As the most common argumentations in this study, the focus is directed to justifications that are grounded in Sweden’s well established and strict control that is argued to be complied with. The main idea with that sort of argumentation is to signal that “it is good the way it is” By framing arguments with reasons that solely aims to prove a credible role, the communicator wants to ensure the critics that everything is under control.

"But the government and Sweden have chosen to have a weapons export and not to put it down, but instead have a strict control. Now we are tightening it further. ” Margot Wallström, 2017

The statement was found in an article published in Sydsvenskan. (TT, 2017c). Margot Wallström, the Foreign Minister of Sweden put forth her argumentation for weapons exportation framing it with a focus on credibility. Wallström focuses on credibility in the way she lifts that Sweden has chosen its weapons export and that it now has to live up to what they have chosen. She emphasizes that Sweden has a strict control and that it will be tightened further. In this discourse, there are not really any arguments, but rather statements and justification about the current weapons export control. The article is as previously mentioned published in Sydsvenskan - a Swedish newspaper intended for South of Sweden and with possibility to access the news paper online for a fee, with certain articles that are accessible for free. The language is formal and informative, with the intention to inform readers about a foreign political debate where the government representatives discussed the weapons exportation. The article also discloses that Wallström has a strong personal opinion about the
weapons exportation as she says that she thinks it always is a hindrance for discussion about human rights. Both the relevance and validity of her argument is strong, as the government indeed has decided to keep the weapons exportation, but she also makes it look like the rules will become stricter – a less likely consequence according to how the democracy criterion has been formed.

“In an ideal world, I would probably belong to those who argue that we should not have it at all. But I accept that this is the way it is, since long way back. It is part of our politics and we must live with and handle it the best way.” Margot Wallström, 2017

The second statement by Margot Wallström, Foreign Minister of Sweden, has been found in an article in Expressen - one of the biggest evening tabloid in Sweden publishing both in paper format and online. The article and interview conducted and written by Hanna Jakobson 2017, therefore has the potential to reach many people. The language is simple, yet correct and includes many of the Foreign Minister’s personal opinions.

It can be analyzed with a credibility-frame since Wallström argues that the weapons exportation is “part of our politics” and means that therefore it is something that needs to be complied with in order for Sweden to appear credible. She also expresses that the world we live in is not ideal, and says that she accepts the weapons exportation because it is part of the politics and means that there is no other choice than handling it the best way possible.

In one way it could be seen as if the arguments are supporting what Wallström wants to communicate, but just because it is part of the politics today, it does not automatically mean that it will be part of the politics tomorrow and therefore the conclusive power is lower. The validity and relevance is high – the weapons exportation is indeed part of the politics, and her statement is relevant since it is logically conformed with the statement and what she wants to express.

"If a deal is conducted with a country that some say is not democratic, then it would mean giving that country a public stamp, that we believe the country is democratic even though there may be objections. If we on the other hand would say no, we could have serious foreign policy concerns." Morgan Johansson, 2017

The above-mentioned statement by Morgan Johansson, Minister of Home Affairs of Sweden, was found in an article retrieved from Helsingborgs Dagblad, (2017a) and the intended
receivers are their readers. The intention of the statement is to provide description about what Johansson believes are the risks with stricter export rules regarding weapons from Sweden. It is framed emphasizing the credibility because of Johansson’s argumentation about what potential consequences it could lead to when making decisions about other countries democratic status.

The arguments are considered well established and relevant, and support Johansson’s claim about that it could lead to a problematic balance if Sweden openly decided about other countries democratic status. The minister of Home Affairs, in other words means that it is so difficult to openly say no to export to a dictatorship, because of potential foreign policy concerns. In the article, it is brought up that Johansson does not want to speculate about what could make Sweden export weapons to a dictatorship.

The validity of the arguments is considered weaker, as it gives the impression of Johansson trying to rationalize and defend Sweden’s decision of still wanting to keep the doors open for grant of weapons export to dictatorships. It also sends signals about that the reason for Sweden to export weapons to dictatorships, is characterized by representatives not being able to stand up for objections and other foreign policy concerns.

"ISP follows the strict guidelines that the government has decided upon and are approved by the Riksdag. It would be a directly wrong for me to try to influence ISP's decision. Politically speaking, attempting to influence an authority's decision in individual cases would be a breach of the Swedish Constitution. The ISP takes its decisions independently based on an overall assessment, where HR- conditions form an important part of the decision-making basis." Ann Linde, 2016

Another statement retrieved from the communication found on the Swedish government’s website between the Minister of EU Affairs and Trade, Ann Linde, and Hans Linde instead focuses on the established guidelines, where Ann Linde argues they are strict and approved by the Swedish Parliament, and says that each decision is based on an assessment where human rights form one criteria for the decision-making basis. She bases her argumentation on that the Swedish rules are strict and good enough which results in both a low conclusive power and a low relevance (Riksdagen, 2016). Linde argues that it is important to stay committed to the regulatory framework and frames the statements with a focus on credibility. What Linde really does is to divert the responsibility to ISP, since they are authority.
The language is formal and correct, but seemingly Ann Linde fails to give a valid and relevant answers to Hans Linde’s questions about weapons exportation. The intention of the communication between the two, is to create a debate and raise a question about Hans Linde’s concerns. The intention of Ann Linde’s argumentation is to defend the governments decision and actions that Hans Linde is questioning. The intended receiver is mainly Ann Linde but since it is also accessible on the government’s website it might be intended to open up for a discussion elsewhere as well.

4.2.3 Development-frame
Some of the analyzed statements contain arguments about the development, either in Sweden or abroad as a justification of the weapons exportation. The ministers that have used this frame in their argumentations, refer to political- and business related factors to determine positive development. They tend to make the export of weapons sound like a way to keep doors open to be able to direct that specific country in the right direction. The earlier analyzed statement by Stefan Löfvén could also be argued to fit within the development-frame.

"The government is convinced that international exchange and trade contribute to a positive development in the world. Swedish exports are a cornerstone of our economy that creates growth and employment and ensures our welfare.” Ann Linde, 2016

From the same interpellation as abovementioned between Ann Linde and Hans Linde, Ann Linde emphasizes in statement that trade and international exchange are important factors for development both worldwide and in Sweden particularly (Riksdagen, 2016). That she frames her argument with a development-frame in this case is questionable. She might not mean that the weapons exportation to the Philippines in specific will contribute to a better development but in the context of the interpellation and what she has been asked to answer, it results in a low-relevance argumentation. The validity in this context considering her argument is also low due to weapons trade rather contributing to worse conditions in the recipient country than what Linde is trying to present.

4.2.4 Reliability-frame
The reliability-frame, is mainly used in argumentations concerning Sweden’s alliance freedom due to previous ambition to be neutral in case of war. The statements are made up by using a frame that focuses on the importance of Sweden’s own weapon industry, in order to
be regarded as reliable, which immediately gives a weak impression for the person with at least fair knowledge regarding politics, who knows that the Sweden no longer strives to be alliance free. Although, this sort of framing is surprisingly well established in the debate about weapons exportation.

"We need our own defense industry for our alliance freedom and depend on exports, although we should also have ethics in this.” Peter Hultqvist, 2017

Peter Hultqvist, the Minister of Defense of Sweden, does in this argumentation defend the democracy criterion by arguing for the need of a Swedish defense industry for alliance freedom and its existence being dependent on exports. Hultqvist uses a reliability frame in his way of arguing, since he highlights Sweden’s need of a defense industry that depend on exports for an alliance freedom. He means that in order for Sweden to be reliably neutral and not tied to any alliances, the export is subsequently necessary. The whole discourse is characterized by doubtful rhetoric since Sweden no longer is alliance free and neutral in case of war. Additionally, it is unclear what Hultqvist means by saying “although we should also have ethics in this” since he does not provide any more information. In one way it could be seen as him acknowledging that Sweden is not doing right today. The statement was found on the Swedish Television’s (SVT) website (TT, 2017b). Since SVT is part of Public Service in Sweden, anybody who takes part of the news are intended receivers. The article brings up the formulation of the democracy criterion that will take effect 1st of April 2018. The first proposition for renewed stricter guidelines regarding the weapons exportation to dictatorships met both positive and negative critique but when the democracy criterion eventually was presented, it was less strict than previously promised and not seen as any bigger hindrance for weapons export to dictatorships.

The arguments are not supporting the claim since Sweden is not alliance free, but arguably the weapons industry in Sweden depend on exports to other countries around the world. The language style of the article is formal and Hultqvist’s way of arguing tries to communicate solidarity and authority, since he says “We” and talks about the issue in a way to convince the intended receivers that he knows what he is talking about.

The conclusive power of this argumentation is low - the relevance might be high, but the validity of the argumentation does not hold. It is also surprising that the Minister of Defense of Sweden mentions alliance freedom as something established while Sweden since 1996 changed its security policies to not any longer strive to be alliance free (Prop
Additionally, it is a normative statement that Sweden’s defense industry depends on exports, as there might be other solutions.

To sum up Peter Hultqvist’s argumentation about weapons exportation, and how he defends the democracy criterions reduced impact, it does not at all explain why Sweden would export weapons to dictatorships. He seems to support a less strict regulatory framework, that still allows Sweden to export to less free countries, and argues in a non-valid way making it look like the export to those countries is crucial.

"We need our own defense industry, for our own defense interests and for our alliance freedom." Morgan Johansson, 2017.

This second statement of Morgan Johansson, Minister of Home Affairs of Sweden, is characterized by a belief about that the weapons exportation from Sweden is necessary for the country’s alliance freedom and safety. The argumentation strongly reminds us about Peter Hultqvist’s way of arguing and contains the same elements as they both refer to Sweden being in need of the defense industry due to its alliance freedom. Johansson also argues that the defense industry is necessary for the defense interests. Hence the frames that Johansson uses in his argumentation are reliability and security.

The statement has been found in an article retrieved from Dagens Nyheter, that was published 2017. The article is about introducing stricter rules for weapons exportation to dictatorships. The intention of Morgan Johansson’s discourse is to give reasons for why it is important for Sweden to not stop exporting to non-democratic countries. In another part of the article he stresses that the most part of the Swedish weapons exportation goes to democratic countries close to Sweden, such as Norway and the EU. By saying that, one may wonder if it really is necessary for the Swedish defense industry to keep exporting to dictatorships, if the most part goes to democratic countries anyway?

The argumentation is as previously mentioned framed with a focus on reliability as the alliance freedom seem to be an important factor for Johansson and the security frame - due to his argument about the defense interests of Sweden. The arguments are relevant since they could be argued to logically be conformed with the claim but part of the validity is not high due to Johansson’s false claim about that Sweden needs the defense industry to keep its alliance freedom. Although, to have a defense industry to secure defense interests and the safety of Sweden could be considered having higher validity.
4.2.5 Summary
The statements of the Swedish government representatives, can be categorized within four different frames; security, credibility, development and reliability. Sometimes more than one frame is suitable. The way of arguing and justifying the export of weapons from Sweden show that concerned ministers uses a certain type of focus when expressing their argumentations. They are framing the issue in a certain way, to highlight some aspects while making other aspects less visible. The arguments that the Swedish Government representatives mostly uses, tends to justify the export by referring to Sweden’s credibility, by indicating that the politics of weapons exportation is already so deeply rooted that it could be harmful to make any changes. Other arguments that has been used, are focusing on that the rules are strict and well established, the way they are formed today. There are also arguments that are emphasizing the security, by reasoning that the export of weapons contributes to safety either by keeping good trade relations with the recipient country or by Sweden ensuring its defense capability. Moreover, some argumentations are framed with a development-focus, by arguing that trade, whether it is about weapons or otherwise, contributes to positive development and growth. Lastly, there are arguments justifying the weapons export by referring to Sweden’s alleged alliance freedom. These statements have been categorized under a reliability-frame because the ministers have argued that the weapons production and exports are needed to prove Sweden’s reliability and trustworthiness.
5 Conclusions

With no sufficient explanation to why democracies choose to go against their democratic values and export weapons intended for war to dictatorships, this study aimed at seeking for justifications to be able to fill that research gap and provide increased knowledge in the research debate. By applying Framing theory, and using the method of argumentation analysis, several statements from concerned Swedish government representatives have been analyzed. The most commonly used arguments to justify weapons exports to non-democracies include following; (1) There is a need of a defense industry for Swedish security reasons, (2) It is positive for international exchange and trade and (3) The rules for weapons exports are strict enough and well established in politics. The different ways of justifying the weapons export shows that the concerned Swedish government representatives frame their arguments in a way that supports their political opinion and the current government. Framing theory provided theoretical support to clarify that most justifications were highlighting certain things. Foremost, the Swedish government argued for concerns such as the security, development, credibility and reliability; whereof these were the frames selected to categorize the statements. Overall the justifications for weapons exportation are characterized by arguments that put Sweden’s interests first.

It is a fundamental issue that countries tend to prioritize military expenses and rearmament instead of fighting poverty. When Sweden exports weapons to undemocratic regimes it automatically supports those countries and suppresses a sustainable development. Therefore, this study is of much importance in terms of creating awareness, not the least for other countries, since this case study have concerned how democratic states support undemocratic states. The analyzed statements clearly show that some arguments used by the government representatives do not provide valid justifications for the weapons exportation to non-democratic countries, which contribute to encourage policy changes.

Future research within the topic is highly encouraged. For example, it would be of interest to replicate this study, analyzing statements from other countries (both major and minor weapons exporters), to be able to compare and identify differences or similarities. Another suggestion for future research, is to go deeper into what consequences the weapons export have in the recipient countries classified as non-democracies.
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