



Legitimizing intervention

- **A critical reading of a contemporary Swedish discourse of peace operations**

Emet Brulin

Bachelor thesis in Political Science, Security Studies

January 2012

Swedish National Defence College

Department of Security and Strategic Studies

Supervisor: Maria Hellman, PhD

Examinator: Eric Stern, Professor

Abstract

This thesis takes its onset in a growing debate about globalization and its possible consequences for the Weberian-state monopoly on the use of force. It concerns the discursive legitimizing and construction of Swedish military peace operations. It studies how the official, Governmental discourse is structured, which arguments are used and how these in turn motivate and legitimize operations. Theoretically it is situated within a poststructuralist understanding but drawing on wider international relations theories to relate the empirical findings to existing research. Methodologically it uses a discourse analytical framework developed by Lene Hansen, supplemented with analytical concepts stemming from the work of Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe. Empirically the thesis analyses Governmental Bills, a Governmental Communication and one op-ed written by the minister of Defence in regards of peace operations. The empirical analysis show that the official Swedish discourse of peace operations is structured by three basic discourses; *internationalism*, *stateism* and *humanitarianism*. These are analysed and interpreted in the light of different IR theoretical understandings. The thesis argues that the basic discourses are involved in a reciprocal process in which the state legitimizes peace operations and reproduces the idea of states and foremost the notion of an international state system. The humanitarian factor is less elaborated on in the material, which can be interpreted in different ways, one being that the humanitarian situation is not so important in the eyes of states, another that it is regarded as so self-evident that the situation of flesh and blood individuals is the legitimating reason for Swedish engagement in peace operations that it does not need to be said. The thesis ends with a critical discussion where its findings are related both to the globalization debate and critical peace operations literature.

Key words: peace operations, legitimizing, discourse, poststructuralism, Government of Sweden,

Table of contents

Section I: Introduction.....	4
Aim and research questions.....	5
Disposition.....	5
Section II: Points of departure.....	6
Historical context.....	6
Poststructuralism.....	7
Theoretical preliminaries.....	9
Section III: Research design, delimitations and methodology.....	10
Research design.....	10
Methodology.....	12
Section IV: Analysis	14
Towards an empirical analysis.....	14
Basic discourse of internationalism.....	16
Basic discourse of stateism.....	20
Basic discourse of humanitarianism.....	24
Historical perspective	26
Section V: Conclusions and critical discussion	27
Conclusions.....	27
Critical discussion.....	29
Abbreviations	31
References.....	32
Official foreign policy discourse.....	35

Section I: Introduction

A constantly repeated notion in current debates in international relations is globalization and its possible effects on the Weberian-state monopoly of violence. The international realm might be breaking up from the Westphalian state system, which means that the legitimacy of the use of force could be shifting from the state to other entities such as the international community or humanity. (Lederer & Müller 2005; Neumann 2002; Leander 2005). By studying how Sweden – after 200 years of peace – legitimises sending Swedes to international hot spots trying to save foreigners the purpose of this thesis is to show how a state actor draws on different discourses and constructs subjects as legitimate reasons for intervention. Sweden is interesting here since it has a long tradition of conducting peace operations with a broad and strong political and public support; during the Cold War it formed a part of the Nordic model of peace operations. (Anthonsen 2003; Jakobsen 2006). Supporting United Nations and participating in peace operations are by many seen as natural in Sweden. It is now a stated purpose of the Swedish armed forces to be internationally active and potentially being a ‘force for good’ in the world. (Bergman 2004; Bergman-Rosamond 2011). But what are the main legitimating reasons for this cosmopolitical ambition? How does the government advocate peace operations, making them a credible course of action? In relation to the globalization debate, what entities or ideas do the state reproduce as important with the practice of peace operations?

To study how interventions are constructed as legitimate this thesis uses a poststructuralist understanding and analyses the official Swedish discourse through a critical reading of Governmental Bills initiating Swedish troop deployment to UN authorized peace operations over the last twelve years. The poststructuralist understanding makes it possible to critically combine different theories from the discipline of international relations and show how close the relation is between a specific, real world, course of action and language and production of reality. The discourse analysis draws on a methodological framework by Lene Hansen and analytical concepts from Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffes discourse theory. In light of interventions’ contradictory and multifaceted character – for how or what are we risking the life of soldiers? Do we have a moral responsibility for foreigners? What weights heaviest, sovereignty or human life? Are states only intervening when it suits their pre given interests? Interventions constitute a fascinating lens through which it is possible to analyse significant representations and gaze through different levels of social relations. (Compare Finnemore 2003; Medvedev & van Ham 2002).

Aim and research questions

The aim of this thesis is to show how Sweden legitimizes¹ its engagement in peace operations². Studying legitimation of interventions also provides us with insights about the notion of the state and the state system, as discussed above. This study will be conducted through applying a poststructuralist perspective and discourse analytical method in analyzing the empirical material. The poststructural understanding will also influence the use and discussion of existing international relations theories in relation to the empirical findings. To fulfil the aim I pose the following research questions to the material:

- How is the official Swedish discourse of peace operations structured, and what are the main lines of argument in legitimizing intervention?
- Which concepts or discourses are drawn upon in this process, and how?
- What entities or subjects, in a poststructuralist sense, are constructed in the legitimating process?

Disposition

After this short introduction the thesis goes on with some important theoretical as well as empirical points of departure. The third section is devoted to research design, selection of empirical material and methodological questions; here the concept of discourse will be outlined in more detail together with further analytical concepts and methods. In the fourth section the empirical analysis, in the light of IR theories, will be conducted. In the fifth section the empirical findings are summarized and theoretical conclusions are presented together with a critical discussion. At the end of the thesis used abbreviations and the material representing the official discourse is listed.

¹ Legitimizing is understood as a process where the Government puts forward arguments as to why it is proposing engagement in peace operations. If the operation in the end didn't happen is not relevant, nor is the opinion of the receiver of the legitimation arguments, it is what is perceived as legitimating reasons by the Government that is of interest to this thesis. I will return to this question at different points below. For an interesting discussion of the strength of the notion of legitimacy, regarding interventions see *Saving Strangers* (Wheeler 2000: 4-11).

² By *peace operations* is denoted all forms of internationally – mostly UN – authorized military interventions to build, keep, enforce, prevent or in other ways further peace or aiming at inducing better humanitarian situations. This is my way of bridging the terminological confusion around these operations, but simultaneously stressing that no neutral term is possible. (Compare Jakobsen 2006: 54f).

Section II: Points of departure

In this section I will first shortly place the practice of peace operation in a Swedish historical context. Secondly, I will elaborate on the poststructuralist perspective guiding this thesis, or to put it differently: a few words about the importance of words. And last in this section, some preliminaries of the IR theories that will be used in the analysis are presented.

Historical context

Sweden's first military contingent in an international peace operation was deployed in 1956 to Egypt; this was also the first time that a peacekeeping operation was initiated under the auspices of UN. During the Cold War Sweden was one of the major troop contributors, and together with the other Nordic states formed a special "Nordic model" of peace operations (Eknes 1995: 65). After the end of the Cold War deadlock of the UN Security Council in 1987 peace operations moved from the fringes of the international community's security policy to the centre, the numbers of operations increased and the nature of them are often argued to have become more complex and demanding. (Jakobsen 2006: 1-5, 11-3, 46-7). This change can be, and often is, illustrated and related to the report *An Agenda for Peace: Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peacekeeping* written by the UN Secretary General in 1992. (Moore & Pubantz 2006: 184, 203f).

The classical Cold War peacekeeping was guided by a "holy trinity of consent, impartiality and the minimum use of force" (Higate & Henry 2009: 9) and was mostly undertaken under the chapter VI of the UN charter – or chapter VI½ as it informally is called (Moore & Pubantz 2006: 81). The peace operations of the early 1990s are often said to have been characterized by optimism and hope for a new more humane world. The increased ambition, size and numbers of operations have lead researchers to talk of different generations of peace operations: first generation during the Cold War, subsequent second, third and sometimes fourth generations since then. Jakobsen criticizes the notion of generations, not because important changes have not occurred but since likenesses are hidden using the metaphor of 'generations'. (2006: 6, 46ff). In this thesis the notion of generations is relevant when demarcating the contemporary discourse and relating it to previous legitimizing practices in the research design and analysis below.

The post-Cold War operations have often had a robust mandate under the chapter VII of the UN charter. Another trend is that increasingly western countries prefer to engage in peace operations through other international organizations or multilateral arrangements. (Ångström 2010: 173, 175). The optimistic era of the early 1990s is often said to have come to an end with the devastating events of 18 American soldiers killed in Somalia, the genocide of Rwanda and the prolonged and costly engagement of troops on the Balkans. (Jakobsen 2006: 48; Bellamy &

Wheeler 2008: 528). As a response to the changing character and failures of peace operations the so called *Brabimi Report* presented a thorough review of UN peace operations in 2000, putting the problems on the agenda and proposing some potential solutions. (Jakobsen 2006: 57). Related to this is the notion of *Responsibility to Protect* that was agreed on during the World Summit in 2005. It outlines a norm of an international responsibility to protect citizens in a state that fails to do so or is terrorizing them itself. (Bellamy & Wheeler 2008: 535f). Another UN and peace operations related document is the *Security Council resolution 1325* where a gender sensitive approach to conflict resolution is outlined and stressed. These documents are important since they represent normative stances and are also mentioned in the material, used as legitimating discourses.

Sweden has a long and strong tradition of peacekeeping and relation to the UN and these practices have both a strong political and public support. Politically international operations are now a stated main task of the Swedish armed forces and the engagement benefits from broad public support. The question of engagement is seldom politicised or questioned. (Anthonsen 2003: 171, 186f; Jervas 1994; Ekengren 2007: 152; Bergman-Rosamond 2011). Sweden's tradition of working with UN and peace operations, the non-politicized debate and the broad public support of it might lead one to think that legitimizing peace operations are a rather superfluous practice, but the Government gives reasons and creates motives to why Sweden engages in peace operations. Even though these are perhaps not the *true* reasons – and I would argue that there is not such a thing as true or *real* reasons.

Poststructuralism

In reaction to traditional IR theories a theoretical field sometimes termed 'reflectivist' or social constructivist has emerged within IR, inspired by broader social sciences and especially sociology³. The 'social constructivist paradigm' of IR contains within itself immensely different ontological and epistemological assumptions so it is rather hard to grasp how they often, haphazardly, are put together under the same term. (Hansen 2006: 2f; Ruggie 1998). However, accepting this terminology, this thesis is situated within the broad field of IR reflectivists and critical understandings or to follow Ruggie; within a 'postmodernist constructivism' (1998: 881). Putting aside this nomenclatorial quarrel, the thesis draws on a poststructural understanding of how the world is composed, how the research questions are posed and in pursuing the purpose⁴.

³ A groundbreaking work in sociological social constructivism is Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmanns *The social construction of reality* (1998 [1966]). For a philosophical introduction and critique see Ian Hackings *The social construction of what? (1999)*.

⁴ Poststructuralism draws most extensively on thinkers such as Foucault, Lacan, Derrida, Butler, Kristeva, de Saussure and Nietzsche. (Hansen 2006: xviii; Winther Jørgensen & Philips 2000: 15ff). For examples of poststructural IR works see *Security as practise* (Hansen 2006).

Poststructuralisms ontological kernel is language and the production of reality through social relations. Language is as such both political and social, it is through a relational language or discourse that things – subjects, objects, states, nations, experiences, social and material structures – procure meaning and are given identity and existence. Rather than being a medium for transformation of information from a *real*, independent reality, poststructuralism claims that social relations through discourse create reality, and reality is only accessible through words. Language is in this understanding thought of as a web where words – or signs – are juxtaposed, giving meaning through difference from something constructed as other, not in relation to the essence of things. (Hansen 2006: 18-9; Winther Jørgensen & Philips 2000: 15-8). E.g. a man is a man since he is not a woman, Sweden is Sweden since it's not Norway. These juxtapositions create strings, which connote positive or negative meaning when they are combined; e.g. Sweden is suited to conduct peace operations since it is more equal and peaceful than perhaps any other country. It is of paramount importance to note that these systems of signs are not fixed but that there is a struggle about how they should be understood and with what meaning they are filled, since there is always a potential different meaning.

Studying this contingency and its consequences is the scope of discourse analysis. (Hansen 2006: 20-1; Winther Jørgensen & Philips 2000: 21-2; For IR perspective see Huysmans 2006). This struggle is a field for political agency and power, not power *over* someone or something but power as relations between subjects, and objects. A relational concept of power is not necessarily repressive but rather productive, it is through relations and power that things become possible – or impossible. (Foucault 2002: 102-7).

Epistemologically, poststructuralism puts the construction of identity in the centre of the analysis. This focus springs out of a critique of the rational, by modernity constructed, idea of a uniform identity. The poststructuralist view of identity is one where a process of interpellation forms identity. Discourses interpolate an entity in to a position by relating to other entities, and so a *subject's position* is constructed. (Winther Jørgensen & Philips 2000: 48f). However, in this thesis identity is not the main focus of analysis but rather how discursive articulations enable and contextualize interventions. Identity and policy are though, in a poststructuralist understanding, inseparable – it is only as someone that action is possible and vice-versa and we will return to this in the conclusion. (Hansen 2006: 23-25, 27). Due to the inseparability of entities – such as the dependent and independent variables – and the absence of an extra-discursive reality discourse analytical perspectives often refute the notion of a rigid causality. It is not possible to conclusively say *why* Sweden engages in peace operations but through analysis we can say how both the entities acting and the actions are made possible and meaningful. (Hansen 2006: 25-8).

A poststructuralist perspective provides a powerful theoretical tool for analysing how the world is constituted and the process of constructing it. However, it is often criticized for its abstract understanding of language and that it thereby misses the practical, real world, side of reality. Marie Demker (2007: 63) asserts that a discourse analytical perspective can contribute greatly to the study of foreign policy since much within this field is conducted through language, and as such foreign policy is blurring the dichotomy between language and practice. At the same time it is important to note that interventions are surely very real and material to the people conducting or being affected by them. The material or practical side of peace operations are not the primary scope of this thesis, rather legitimating interventions is. Putting the shaping of discourse by an actor in the centre of analysis and not primarily focusing on identity construction are ways to both answering critique towards the poststructuralist perspective stating that it is too focused on structure constituting actors and also to contribute to developing the use of poststructuralism within IR. (Compare Kinnvall 2009: 137-138).

A theoretical problem with poststructuralism is how to handle the results of studies; if reality is constructed by language and utterances, what role, impact and relevance have scientific products – such as this thesis? This problem can perhaps not be solved theoretically. This thesis, as every other attempt of knowledge production, is a political representation of a ‘reality’. (Compare Winther Jørgensen & Philips 2000: 28-30, 57)

Theoretical preliminaries

The poststructural perspective forms the general understanding guiding this thesis, but more traditionally and empirically applicable IR theories will be used to analyse the empirical findings. In the poststructuralist perspective relations between knowledge, power and reality construction are pivotal. Different theoretical understandings or perspectives construct different, sometimes competing, realities or narratives of reality. The discourse of the international system of sovereign states has, for example, had paramount consequence on all social relations from the singular individual to groups or larger social aggregates. Interventions – distinct from war – challenged the boundaries of the state since perforating the hard shell and intervening in its, perceived, internal affairs seems to go against the very idea of sovereignty.

In the analytical section three different IR perspectives will be presented and discussed to show how it is possible to understand the practice of intervention. For example will Martha Finnemore (1996, 2003) be used to understand norm change in the international system, Erik Ringmar (1996) and Jan Ångström (2010) to analyse identity and strategic culture and Nicholas J. Wheeler (2000) to illustrate the tension between the individual and the state.

Section III: Research design, delimitations and methodology

In this section I will show how a discourse analysis will be used to answer the research questions and fulfil the aim. To design this study, delimitate and motivate the empirical material, I will make use of a framework developed by Lene Hansen in *Security as practice* (2006). This will form the base of the research design, but it will be supplemented by certain concepts from Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffes theory of discourse⁵.

Research design

Lene Hansen (2006) provides a general theoretical understanding of discourse analysis based on poststructuralist work in which she focuses on identity construction as a kernel in the study of foreign policy. More importantly to this thesis Hansen puts forward a very practicable methodological framework and proposes ways of constructing a specific research design, which will work as a springboard for this study. The framework is based upon four different aspects of design or ways to delimit and clarify the scope of the analysis, intertextual model, analytical selves, number of events and temporal perspective. (2006: 73ff). Below I draw on this to define what this thesis will focus on, why and how.

Hansen uses the concept of intertextual model to denote that no texts exist in a vacuum, they all relate and build upon other texts implicitly or explicitly, and it's through this web of texts that they procure meaning. Hansen brings in genre as a distinction between texts; they exist in different contexts and as such they both tend to abide to different styles but more importantly they articulate knowledge and authority differently. (Hansen 2006: 56-9, 65-7). She elaborates on three different intertextual models: official discourse, wider foreign policy debate and cultural or marginal discourses. It should be noted that a sharp distinction between the intertextual models hardly exists in practice since the point with intertextuality is that it makes the texts dependent on each other; the difference is rather an analytical abstraction or choice of focus. (Hansen 2006: 60-4).

This thesis is interested in one *self*, the official state of Sweden – constructed in a contingent process of differentiation and linking in relation with other entities – and here

⁵ Within a poststructural perspective a Grounded Theory or a Critical Discourse Analytical methodology would have been possible to use. However, Laclau and Mouffes theory is in my view more uniform and suits this study well since it stresses the discursive construction of reality and denies a distinction between discourse and materiality as is the case with critical discourse analysis. (Hansen 2006: 25 [endnote 6]; Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2000: 25f). The methodology of grounded theory has to some extent inspired my way of conducting the empirical analysis, as we will see below, even though a I strongly object to the notion of 'coming empty' to the field of study. It is perhaps also a more suitable for ethnographical work. Using this perspective more directly would probably not have changed the result of the thesis radically but the discourse analytical methodology and theory of Laclau and Mouffe is a central work within poststructuralism and is as such well integrated even though it is perhaps a bit abstract.

represented by the government of Sweden (Regeringen). (Hansen 2006: 24, 37ff). The government is the main foreign policy body and the propositions it puts forward in the aspect of peace operations often gets a broad support in the parliament (Riksdagen), due to previous consultations with other parties and a tradition of consensus in Swedish foreign policy. (Bjereld & Demker 1995: 121f. Möller 2007: 156f. Brommeson & Ekengren 2007: 20-21. Bäck & Larsson 2006: 86-87)

To analyze the discourse of the Swedish self the official foreign policy discourse model is the most applicable. The material analysed to capture this discourse mainly consists of Governmental Bills (*regeringens proposition* or short *prop.*). Governmental Bills propose a certain policy stance of the government to the parliament. They are referred to a parliamentary committee for party considerations before a decision is taken in the parliament. Governmental Bills don't necessarily reflect the final formulation of the parliamentary decision nor do they reflect competing arguments from political parties. (Bäck & Larsson 2006: 85-7) They are however commonly used as a source for analysis of Swedish foreign policy since the government is the main agent regarding foreign policy. (Bjereld & Demker 1995: 121-28). The number of events (instances of legitimating) is regulated by the temporal demarcation (see below), and as such it is regarded as one consistent body of material legitimizing peace operations. One more general instance of legitimating is included; the Governmental Communication (*regeringens skrivelse* or short *skr.*) outlining a "National strategy for Swedish participation in international peace-support and security-building operations" (skr. 2007/08:51). A Communication has more of an accounting character and doesn't propose a decision to the parliament; it is a message from the government discussing a specific matter⁶.

These texts are part of a special, official, genre with a special style and way of expressing. They are also only one type of material that could be used to capture the official foreign policy discourse, but the focus on what *the state* constructs as legitimizing discourses benefits from this narrow empirical material⁷. However, in the analysis below an op-ed by the minister of defence will be used as it provides complementary and useful insights to the Governmental Bills.

The *temporal* concern of this thesis is what is identified as the current discourse on peace operations: 1999–2011. Any sequestering is to some extent arbitrary, here the line is drawn prior to the Kosovo operation in 1999 so as to mostly exclude the operations of the 1990s but not only

⁶ On the relevance of this communication see the parliamentary controlled National Audit Office report *Svenska bidrag till internationella insatser [Swedish contributions to international missions]* (Riksrevisionen 2011). During the time period of interest, this was the only Communication dealing explicitly with the issue of peace operations.

⁷ A broader reading of official historical material, more Governmental Bills/Communications, press releases and op-eds and press/news material have been read during the research process. But due to delimitation reasons presented here and for reviewability and transparency of the results in the end only the listed and discussed material was considered in the analysis.

focusing on operations post the 9/11-attacks. By drawing the line so as to include Kosovo, an intervention within Europe is also included⁸. Even though Swedish foreign policy traditionally is considered as a policy field of consensus it is still important to isolate for regime change and this is another reason to extend the temporal period to 1999. There was a social democratic minority Government until 2006 and thereafter a centre-right majority, and from 2010 a centre-right minority coalition Government. These changes will however not be considered in this thesis, it is the more general official, state, discourse that is of interest here.

To contrast, complement and thereby strengthen the analysis Governmental Bills from two former temporal periods will also be used as points of reference. These periods are the classical cold war peacekeeping and the optimistic era of the early 1990s so called second-generation peacekeeping. (See historical context discussion above). The two previous temporal periods included to illustrate and contrast the analysis can then be seen as two instances' of legitimating peace operations. It is important to note that they do not form a representative material and are no ground for any substantive conclusions of change over time.

We have now seen what the focus of the analysis will be and what material that will be used. The focus of this study is the current official discourse of peace operations, to analyse this Governmental Bills legitimizing and arguing for the initiation of ten major interventions will be included. If the operation actually took place is not taken into account since it is the legitimization process that is of interest. Ranging from Kosovo in 1999 until Libya in 2011 the Bills propose initiation of interventions in Afghanistan, Kongo, Liberia, Sudan, Tchad/Central African Republic and of the coast of Somalia. Bills proposing the continuation of an ongoing operation are excluded due to the amount of them; one every third to twelfth month for missions that have continued in some cases for ten years, and the consequential decreasing reviewability of material. As touched upon, one relevant Governmental Communication is included in the empirical material. To complement and strengthen the analysis one op-ed and two historical Bills are also included.

Methodology

The next step is to move on to operationalize the concept of discourse and how it will guide the text analysis so as to answer the research questions.

Hansens's use of discourse analysis is mostly aimed at analysing identity – through the process of linking and differentiating – whereas I am more interested in how peace operations are

⁸ For a further discussion on the importance and novelty of the Kosovo operation see *Mapping European Security after Kosovo*. (Ham & Medvedev (ed.) 2002).

framed, understood and legitimized. Hansen uses the notion of *basic discourses* when discussing what structures more general discourses:

Analytically, basic discourses point to the main points of contestation within a debate and facilitate a structured account of the relationship between discourses, their points of convergence and confrontations; how discourses develop over time in response to events, facts and criticism; and how discursive variations evolve. [...]

The analytical value of basic discourses is [...] that they provide a lens through which a multitude of different representations and policies can be seen as systematically connected and that they identify the key points of structuring disagreement within a debate. (Hansen 2006: 52)

This concept and the discourses analysed through it will be central for the empirical analysis below but to be able to get closer to the material and what is expressed there the analysis will also draw on post-Marxists and poststructuralists Laclau and Mouffe. For them *all* social practices are contingent, discursive constructions, never fixed or closed but always subject to struggle and potential change. In the analysis, Hansens basic discourses will be complemented by Laclau and Mouffe's concept of *nodal points*. A nodal point is a structuring point around which meaning is established – through an *articulatory praxis* – in the fluid social field. (Laclau & Mouffe 2008: 169). Such practise is a central concept that in a dual process both pertains and gives meaning to *elements* or *moments* in the *discursive field*. *Element* denotes that which exists and has meaning, constantly contested, in a discourse, whereas *moments* are those elements that have been partly fixed in relation to other moments or nodal points. *Discursive field* contains all those possibilities of meanings that a particular discourse excludes, the process of fixing meaning to elements and making them into moments around nodal points is the *articulatory practice*. (Howarth 2000:102-4) That fixation of meaning is partial and subject to struggle between different discourses is one of the foundational points of Laclau and Mouffe's theory of society. The articulatory practice and how that process affects elements of a discourse can be analysed through the tracing of *chains of equivalence*, how a discourse connects elements and makes them into moments and through this process tries to stabilize meaning. A chain of equivalence is, simply put, a process where the similarity of entities make them connect so to create identities or entities. (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2000: 50-52, 57-58. Howarth 2000: 106-107. Laclau & Mouffe 2008: 188).

The Governmental Bills are considered as part of an articulatory practice, trying to create meaning through a chain of equivalence, constructing a legitimate peace operation. The notions of moments, elements and nodal points will make visible how entities and assumed understandings are produced and talked about, and thereby help answer the research questions. How this will be implemented is elaborated on in the first part of the next section.

Section IV: Analysis

This section combines empirical and theoretical presentations as well as analysis. The empirical material is presented more generally and the step from raw texts and methodological concepts to analysis is illustrated. While doing this, I also show how the legitimation of peace operations is structured by three basic discourses found in the material. This perhaps early answer to the first research question is motivated by the need of a logical and comprehensive structure to the analysis. With the help of this structure the analysis goes on to illustrate and relate the empirical findings to theoretical understandings, both showing the close connection between them and answering the remaining two research questions.

Towards an empirical analysis

As discussed in the research design section above the material consists of ten Governmental Bills initiating peace operations between 1999 and 2011. The Governmental Bills included start with a short introduction of the case in question and how it has been prepared; usually the situation in the country is described, how other international actors are handling it, what have been done before, if and how the Swedish armed forces are preparing for deployment and formal or informal negotiations about the form and size of the Swedish contribution with the international counterpart organizing the operation. The next section of the Bills often lay out the historical and current political, military and humanitarian situation in more detail. In this section Swedish engagement in or relation to the country or issue as well as former international engagements are also elaborated on. If the engagement is motivated by references to the politics of UN or EU it is also included in this section. The Bills include a section on the legality of the operation and which rules the Swedish force is regulated by, and financial questions are also discussed. The last section is usually “the governments considerations” where there is an explicit discussion about reasons for and risks with troop deployment.

In addition to the Governmental Bills one Governmental Communication outlining a national strategy for contributing to international peace and security operations is, as discussed above, included in this study. It consists of three parts: first, political aims and guidelines, where the government among other things spells out that Sweden should be a active international actor, increase its capacity to contribute to peace operations and do so in a comprehensive way. The second section of the communication touches upon the relation to EU, IGOs and regional collaboration, the Nordic states. The last section discusses means and methods in relation to peace, security, and development in both armed and civilian aspects.

Throughout the texts there are concrete arguments presented as to *why* engagement is deemed necessary and also representations building up and supporting these arguments. I'm looking for these concrete arguments as to why it is necessary to engage in a peace operation in the case at hand. To illustrate how this is done and how the analysis will go from individual, raw, texts to systematically extracted discursive moments and in turn how these construct legitimate peace operations an excerpt consisting of a part of "the Governments considerations" from *Governmental Bill 1998/99:112. Swedish participation in a peaceforce in Kosovo* is quoted and used:

Reasons for the Government's proposal: An international peace force in Kosovo is essential for the return of refugees and for creating peace and enabling a democratic development. Sweden can make a very important input by contributing to such a mission. Refugee return also requires secure and stable conditions for the sizeable reconstruction efforts that will be necessary.

Swedish participation in a peacekeeping force in Kosovo would be in line with Sweden's already very sizeable commitment in the Balkans. The operation would be of great importance to security and stability in the region as a whole, as well as to European security cooperation. (prop. 1998/99:112: 9) (My translation, bold in original).

This peace operation, as the other in the material, is legitimized by three different logics. First, *internationalism*: there is a need for an international peaceforce in Kosovo, stabilizing the region as well as contributing to the European security community. Second, *stateism*: (The state of) Sweden can make an important contribution promoting peace and democracy, it would also be in line with the states policy. And third, *humanitarianism*: the aim of the operation seems to be to oversee the safe return of refugees. These logics are present in this excerpt, in the whole material, as well as in other texts related to the matter, and have been identified inductively through in-depth and repeated readings of the texts.

I argue that they function as what Hansen terms *basic discourses*: They are main structural positions, articulate key representations and "draw upon available conceptual histories" (2006: 52-54). To analyze these and the process of legitimating in some more detail the basis discourses can be considered as *nodal points* that are structuring parts of *chains of equivalence* that link together concepts or discursive *moments* to stabilize the general discourse, in this case, the processes of legitimation of the operations. Returning to the excerpt above we can see how it is not just any force that is needed in Kosovo, it is an 'international' 'peace' force to which 'states' – Sweden – contribute, aiming at protecting 'refugees'. There are several things that are unsaid or taken for granted and other that are elaborated on: the international form is emphasised, that states are the only possible entity contributing is not mentioned, what peace, democracy and development

means the reader supposedly already knows. Refugees or the humans that are represented by this concept are put forward as a main reason legitimizing the intervention.

Since these concepts aren't argued about in the text, but are instead seen as stable and self-evident. I see them as moments, linked together in a chain of equivalence structured by nodal points. For example: the nodal point 'international' is linked together with 'peace', 'stability', region, the nodal point 'state' (Sweden) is self-evident and linked together with 'development', 'democracy', 'security' and then the last nodal point of 'humanity' is not elaborated on, but represented by 'refugees'.

Now that we have seen how the step from raw texts to analytically derived basic discourses/nodal points, moments and chains of equivalences is taken, the next step is to present empirical findings, extracted from the texts and analyse them using relevant theories. This will be structured along the same lines that structure the discourse: around the three basic discourses, internationalism, stateism and humanitarianism.

Basic discourse of internationalism

In table 1 frequently used arguments found in the material, legitimizing peace operations in relation to internationalism, are summarized. These findings were extracted with the procedure illustrated above, then categorised and clustered together and considered as discursive moments and make up an answer to the question of what concepts or discourses are drawn upon in legitimizing intervention. In the following I will discuss them according to these clusters.

Theoretically, interventions are here seen in a state systemic perspective. This is the traditional realm of IR where the classical theories of realism and liberalism and foremost their neo-versions have long been the main understandings. The focus is traditionally on power, security and anarchy but within the liberal institutionalism and IR constructivism one can see how this has changed, now focusing on how the international system shapes what states want and how they act. (Compare Ruggie 1998).

Asserting that a conflict has a regional dynamic or is contagious to the regional or international peace is often put forward as important in the material. (e.g. prop. 1998/99:112: 6. prop. 2007/08:14: 11. prop. 2002/03:143: 9). This is perhaps also the case, but relevant to this study is that it is stressed as a factor motivating intervention. If conflicts have by definition regional implications then using it

Table 1: Internationalism

Regional conflict
Broad int. mandate
UN mandate
EU mandate
Broad int. mission
Int. balance (NATO/USA)
Support for int. peace
Support UN/sub-organisations
Support aid NGOs
International peace
International law
EU engagement
EU crisis management
EU-UN cooperation
Norm influence: West
Norm influence: int. system
Norm influence: 1325
Norm influence: R2P/Brahimi
Influence troop recruitment

as a argument for intervention seems unnecessary, but on the other hand it might be very important for a state to certify that it is not intervening in *one* state's affairs, so for that reason the international or regional aspect is put forward and emphasised.

The second cluster regards the formal or informal mandate or condemnations that IGO - international community broadly or specific states - have made regarding the potential operation at hand. These discursive moments draw on the notion that broad international support constitutes a legitimizing factor for engaging in peace operations. Perhaps especially important is the support of Great Power countries. (e.g. prop. 1998/99:112: 8. prop. 2008/09:108: 10).

The third cluster of discursive elements is closely related to the second cluster and we can see that strengthening existing international institutions or norm systems, such as UN, EU or international law and human rights is part of the discursive process of making interventions legitimate. It can be hard to judge if this is for instrumental reasons securing interests of an a priori state or if it is seen as an intrinsic value legitimizing in its own right. (Compare discussion below). Both understandings are supported in the material: Sweden wants to further EU crisis management capacity and develop EU-UN cooperation (e.g. prop. 2008/09:108: 11,14), "The contribution would show our will to further strengthen EU's crisis management capacity." (prop. 2002/03:143: 14). I interpret this as a way to strengthen these entities in their own right whereas for example the Governmental Communication asserts that Sweden would gain materially and directly in increased security by engaging. (skr. 2007/08:51: 6, 17).

This can be seen to represent and reflect a rational understanding and a focus on security gains and perennial a priori interests as understood – and constructed – by the traditional IR theories, which is problematized by constructivists as Martha Finnemore. In her study *National interest in international society*, she shows, "[...] how states are socialized to accept new norms, values and perceptions of interest by international organizations" (1996: 5). Finnemore's constructivism focuses on how norms in an international society of actors can change what states want by changing their interests, states are rational actors but they do not a priori know what they want. Much of her argument is centred on the fascinating theoretical question of agent-structure; is it the agents that form the structure or the other way around? In Finnemore's analysis it is a dual relationship where the agent-constructed structure in turn changes the agent in ways not intended or foreseen by the agent. (1996: 30). In this way Finnemore blurs the division between a priori interests and socially constructed interests, which is interesting since the same tendency seems to be present in the governments' arguments.

The fourth cluster in table 1 regards a normative factor, seemingly important in the chain of equivalence that is the legitimizing process. Government bills often argue for Swedish

engagement by stating, or asserting, that through troop contribution to peacekeeping Sweden may influence other EU states to the same behaviour and in that way change the tendency of mostly developing countries contributing. To illustrate, an excerpt from the Governments considerations section of a Bill proposing contribution to the UN force in Liberia, is quoted:

According to the trend of recent years, developing countries have been the main contributors to UN peacekeeping missions, and the EU and other Western countries have been criticized for not participating in UN activities on the ground. Last year, Sweden broke the trend by being the first EU or Western country to participate with military troops in the UN mission to the Democratic Republic of Congo. The mission attracted much attention and may have contributed to an increased interest among other EU countries for peacekeeping efforts in Africa. Through an intervention in Liberia Sweden shows its continuing strong commitment to conflict prevention and management of African conflicts, in accordance with Swedish Africa policy. The operation is also a way to concretely demonstrate the strong Swedish support for the UN peacekeeping operations. Finally, it is of Swedish interest to participate with the proposed contribution, which is reported to the UN force register UNSAS to show Sweden's willingness to participate with, in the registry notified units, and to learn from the experience that the Armed Forces gain in connection with these international peace operations. (prop. 2003/04:61: 11-12) (My translation).

Here we can again see the tension between potential national gains for Sweden and the intrinsic will to strengthen and develop the international system. Both the stateism and internationalism basic discourses are present, and humanitarianism arguments are put forward in the paragraph above the excerpt. (prop. 2003/04:61: 11).

To understand more about this tension it is interesting to relate to Annika Björkdahls (2007) studies of 'norm entrepreneurship', denoting the active work done by Sweden in trying to promote norms within the UN system. Björkdahl argues that this norm entrepreneurship is a way for states with small hard power capabilities to punch above their weight. (2007: 538, 549). Even though Björkdahl focuses on the General Assembly and Security Council the findings here can indicate that the norm-promoting factor of peace operations can be seen as a practical side of this normative power mechanism. Here, Björkdahls arguments are seen as a part of the international system dynamics and not as an individual state policy, but it can also be interpreted in that way.

A general point of the internationalism discourse is that Sweden doesn't only intervene or contribute to peace operations to stop war or promote national interests but because operations are perceived as an active way to influence the international system and construct the international system Sweden prefers. The norm-affecting component is an intrinsic value and legitimizing component in its own right. The Government Communication explicitly mentions the UN summit of 2005 where the international community asserted its responsibility to protect (R2P) and that this is an important step in changing the international system. (skr. 2007/08:51: 9).

The basic discourse of internationalism can be considered to have a top to bottom perspective where the nation-state is a part of the structure – international system. It is the norms of the structure that governs the parts, the system *demand*s action, the reciprocal change of the system and the parts – or agents. In *The purpose of intervention – changing beliefs about the use of force* Finnemore studies the changing reasons about when, how and why states intervene. Finnemore's first case study is the aftermath of the Hague Conference in 1907 when debt collection by force was made unlawful between states. Previously states intervened to collect debts owed to their nationals by foreign states, but after 1907 this was no longer a practice in the international society (Finnemore 2003: 49-51). The second case study investigates the changing norms of humanitarian intervention, how western states have intervened in protection of mostly European Christians in the nineteenth century but now “this focus has been expanded and universalized such that by late twentieth century all human beings were treated as equally deserving in the international normative discourse” (2003: 83). Humanitarian intervention is now multilateral and conducted under the auspices of an international body which is related to Finnemore's third case study; looking at how interventions promoting or protecting a certain international order have changed since the beginning of the Westphalian system to the current international system. (2003: 83, 85-140). Finnemore stresses the ‘of course’ nature of these norm changes; it is now impossible to think that a state would intervene militarily for banking reasons. Relating it back to this thesis it can be understood as confirming the three basic discourses found in the material, it is also interesting to note the changing reasons for intervention, over time, but that it still seems to be along these three discourses that intervention is performed.

To sum up what we have learnt about legitimizing peace operations and its internationalist discourse: the importance of an international – or regional – character of the conflict rather than being an internal state matter was stressed. The Government leans on international support and mandates but peace operations can also be used as a normative tool to change the world. These arguments or moments were summarized and presented in table 1, and are seen as parts of a chain of equivalence that link them together, being articulated through the Bills and Communication and in the end creating legitimized peace operations. We also learned that there was a convergence and relation between the IR theorists’ understanding and creation of the international realm and the states. This was also used to understand how norms could affect the will of a state.

Basic discourse of stateism

Moving from the international systemic perspective, the next step is to consider peace operations from an individual state perspective; this is much elaborated on in the material and legitimation process. As showed and discussed I consider legitimizing of peace operations using state-related arguments and notions as a basic discourse but when the empirical analysis is conducted I draw on the notion of nodal point to see how it is related in more detailed to other discourses or what is understood as discursive moments (presented in table 2). This abstract terminology is related to the research questions: the basic discourses/nodal points structure the discourse and simultaneously being subjects that are reproduced by the state. The discourses/moments/arguments used to do that are summarized and presented in clusters in tables.

The first cluster in table 2, stateism, can be said to relate more to the idea of an a priori actor needing to have full control of *Swedish* troops, having predefined national interest and being in pursuit of material gains. (e.g. prop. 1998/99:112. prop. 2005/06:203). Interventions are in this way a part of Swedish policy to promote its own security and also strengthen the voice and position of Sweden vis-à-vis other states. “Swedish participation in peace operations is ultimately also about promoting our own national security and Swedish interests” (skr. 2007/08:51: 3). Eli Stamnes argues that there exists a certain “troops-for-influence” (2008:5) strategy and that this is related to self-images and reputation and can explain much of why Sweden engages in peace operations. (For a similar argument also see Jakobsen, 2006: 22f, 35).

Table 2: Stateism

State, Swed. control of force Good quality of troops National interest Strengthen Swedish role/voice Part of Swedish policy UN as Swedish policy Strengthen EU voice Economic/trade Political – state – process Bad governance Weak state Ethnic conflict Foreign troops/sovereignty Host nation mandate Illegal activities Foreign aid Long term/broad engagement Tradition/History Earlier Swed. military mission Swedish missionaries/NGOs /state/political presence Limited operation
--

The second cluster is related to the first; it could be seen as a process where one state prefers other equal units in the system, thus trying to strengthen weaker states. The other states are constructed as needy of assistance: political processes, bad governance or that the state is a ‘weak state’ is emphasised as legitimating support in form of an intervention. (e.g. prop. 2002/03:143: 4f. prop. 2007/08:14 4f). In discourse analytical terms this can be seen as a form of differentiating between oneself and something other, thus creating oneself as superior. Or it can be understood in the other way, were articulating the other as a potential equal motivates intervention.

Theoretically, these arguments or discursive moments can be related to two different understandings; first, a rationalistic or strategic school closely related to traditional IR theories, and second, a cultural or radical constructivist understanding focusing on identity not as variable but rather as a holistic concept – bridging these schools are understandings using identity as a potential independent variable. The first school focuses on material interests and state security by deploying the idea of an *a priori* rational actor, the state. When applied to the use of force, as an intervention, it puts potential material gains – e.g. power, security, stability, recognition, or promotion of beneficial norms – as the explaining factors emanating from traditional definition of security policy. (Ångström 2010: 176-179). The focus of this approach is to secure the own state through assuring that its *interests* are secured or met. At a basic level this could be that the state's integrity – sovereignty – isn't violated, but in a globalized world with an international system this can consist of assuring that the system develops in a way that is beneficial for the Swedish state. Other things that can be perceived as threats such as organized crime, drug trafficking or large-scale migration due to war can also be used as instrumental arguments (Ångström 2010: 80-81). Even a Swedish tradition, self image and legacy of neutrality and impartiality are factors that can be considered as interests that could be protected or threatened through involvement in interventions. Strengthening UN or responding to expectations due to the Swedish EU membership are other instrumental gains that can legitimize peace operations from an instrumental perspective. (Ångström 2010: 82-83).

The underlying rationality within this perspective is, once again, to secure the state and fulfil this with perceived rational and egocentric gains as the guiding star. Good outcomes might be produced for other actors as well, but this is not the purpose. This perspective has inherent problems: first, aims and purposes are difficult to define and the idea of an *a priori* state with predefined interests is problematic. Erik Ringmar criticises what he calls “the modern orthodoxy”, which includes the notions of interests, selves and actions, as they are understood by a “scholarly consensus” (Ringmar 1996: 45). By applying a genealogical method he shows how problematic these concepts are. After tracing the notion of interest back to Hobbes via the realist school, Ringmar concludes that no such thing as a perennial national interest exists. The notion is only an expression of *preferences* for a particular self in a particular time. A second problem is that being engaged in for example Afghanistan makes you a potential target for terror, or a decrease in credibility in relation to neutrality or as an important actor, which obviously is not a way of maximizing gains as this model is thought to do. (Ångström 2010: 80-81. Jarvas 1994: 124). The research conducted within this scientific paradigm – in a Kuhnian way of understanding – has been very powerful and influential and as Ringmar shows it is inherent in the enlightenment and

modernity projects. Looking at it from a poststructuralist understanding it creates a specific understanding or narrative of reality and thereby legitimizing discourses, as will be seen in the empirical analysis⁹.

In the material, references to a Swedish tradition or an explicit relation to the country or region relevant to the operation frequently occur and are stressed. These forms of representations make up the third cluster. A general Swedish engagement in the form of aid, civil disaster relief, missionaries, NGOs or political policy is constructed as reasons for deployment. Governmental Bills authorizing and motivating operations usually have a chapter declaring former and contemporary Swedish commitments. (e.g. 2001/02:60: 6). Asserting that Sweden has a long history of contributing to UN peace operations and because of this has a responsibility to continue this makes similar arguments. (e.g. prop. 1998/99:112: 6. prop 2002/03:58: 7). In relation to this argument and its legitimating of operations, another component is present: military operations don't exist in a vacuum but are followed by and exist parallel to a comprehensive approach of educational efforts, police contributions and security sector reform, humanitarian aid and so on. This inclusive approach is also used to emphasize the distinctiveness of Sweden's identity, and as a legitimating discourse (skr. 2007/08:51: 8). To illustrate these points a part of the Governmental Communication outlining a national strategy for peace promotion is quoted.

Swedish involvement in international peace-support operations is ultimately intended to contribute to maintaining international peace and security and consequently to facilitate fair and sustainable global development. Swedish participation in peace-support operations is also concerned, in the longer term, with promoting national security and Swedish interests.

Underlying the strategy is defence of a number of universal norms and values, such as democracy, human rights, gender equality, human dignity and development. In addition, Swedish participation in international operations contributes to safeguarding and promoting general interests such as a world order, founded in international law, to attain peace, freedom and reconciliation.

Swedish policy for global development, with the aim of contributing to fair and sustainable development, is a key basis for Swedish operations in developing countries. The military, civil and reconstruction operations undertaken in a specific region should be viewed as mutually complementary and collaborating parts of Sweden's combined support of security and development in that region or country.

Sweden's involvement is an act of solidarity with the people and countries threatened by conflict. (skr. 2007/08:51: 3-4) (The Governments translation).

⁹ Critique against 'conventional' IR theories and positivism are today widespread but not a topic in its own rank for this thesis. All constructivist, critical or poststructuralist work cited here includes some form of critique of this paradigm. For a defence and radically different view see: *The renaissance of security studies* (Walt 1991).

Again we can see the tension between different purposes of peace operations, as have been discussed throughout this analysis. We can also see some of those concrete arguments as well as the entities reproduced and drawn upon through the legitimation process. Underlying the rationale for engagement in this excerpt are also, interestingly, ideas of Sweden as a defender of certain values.

Analyzing the discursive moments or arguments concerning the state can also be done through a second, theoretical school: focusing on cultural, radical constructivist or discursive understandings and seeing a more floating self in search or need of a recognised identity. Actions such as peace operations are made possible, and can be analysed, through self-perceptions. Using a study of Swedish strategic culture Ångström shows how there are dichotomies at work between national defence and international use of force where the national has a superior position. The national defence is egocentric whereas the international is based on humanism and solidarity and as such goes well with a Swedish self-perception, even though this is perhaps at odds with the idea of a peaceful nation. The dilemma is solved, Ångström argues, by sending small or even symbolic forces so that Sweden appears to be a good international partner, sympathizing with suffering peoples, but simultaneously able to argue that war is not a good method for conflict solution. (Ångström 2010: 186-96; See also Bergman-Rosamond 2011 for a similar argument). A perhaps somewhat more powerful interpretation of identity as an explaining variable is put forward by Erik Ringmar. He uses a narrative theory of action, identity and recognition when he argues that “[i]t is only *as some-one* that we can want *some-thing*” (1996: 13, 189). In his understanding the narrative of identities connects generations of people within a state is connected to the state and the state in turn act to receive recognition of this narrative of identity. (Ringmar 1996; Compare Demker 2007: 59-62). These two different theoretical understandings or narratives of identities produce different interpretations of what action is and why it is taken. Not only do they exist in the literature but the different rationales are also present in the material analyzed here.

Summarizing how the Swedish Government legitimizes peace operation through a stateism discourse we have seen how discourses or moments, drawn upon were related to a rational self promoting its own interests and enhanced security, how equal units in the system is preferred and that self perception and identity is much elaborated on when advocating intervention, which is a way of getting confirmation of the state’s self. This was related to both traditional IR understandings and more cultural or sociological interpretations.

Basic discourse of humanitarianism

Humanitarianism is the third basic discourse or nodal point structuring the discourse of peace operations, it is however somewhat different than the other two since it is far less explicitly elaborated on in the material. We will return to this difference and how this basic discourse can be understood theoretically after reviewing what the material does include in regard to the humanitarian situation legitimizing peace operations and in the conclusions below.

The material is rather homogenous in constructing reasons with regard to humanitarianism; the difference between the clusters of Table 3 is mostly about how abstract the moments are. All Governmental Bills included in the analysis outline the background to the proposed operation with a description of the humanitarian situation, often in a rather limited way, just mentioning that abuses have been committed and stating that the situation is more or less grave. The government bill proposing a deployment to Liberia (prop. 2003/04:61) stresses the humanitarian situation more than usually. Moments supporting this nodal point are often refugees’ situations, that the security situation renders humanitarian aid impossible, and mentioning in rather abstract terms the suffering of humans. In some cases women and children are specifically constructed as victims (e.g. prop. 2005/06:203) and the protection of civilians is also put forward. (e.g. prop. 2010/11:111). The subject positions constructed as reasons for intervention – e.g. civilians, women and children – are not humans of flesh and blood, but rather abstract notions representing the idea of suffering. Another example of a peace operation that is more explicitly legitimized on humanitarian discourses is the maritime operation off the coast of Somalia:

In light of the difficult humanitarian situation in Somalia and the increased prevalence of piracy, the Government concludes that there is a great need for an international naval presence in order to contribute to repelling, preventing and combating of piracy and armed robbery off the Somalian coast. (prop: 2008/09:108: 14) (My translation).

As mentioned above, the nodal point of humanitarianism differs from the other nodal points, in being less elaborated on and more implicit. To illustrate this difference, one op-ed written by a governmental representative will be used, see the discussion of intertextual model in the research design section above. Minister for Defence Sten Tolgfors’ op-ed “This is why Swedish soldiers are fighting in Afghanistan” (2009. My translation) includes moments from all the three basic discourses but elaborates more explicitly on the Afghans’ situation. Tolgfors argues that the

Table 3: Humanitarianism

Severe humanitarian situation
Human suffering
Long-term humanitarian work
Refugees
Human security
Poor security that affects aid
Women/children security
Human rights violation
DDRR

intervention makes a difference for the people and takes as an example the situation for girls: “Recently a group of school girls were sprayed with acid” (Tolgfors 2009. My translation). He asserts that the civilian population are those hardest struck by the war and lists different forms of concrete mistreatments and atrocities. When compared to a text aimed directly at the Swedish public, it is even more evident how the humanitarianism discourse is present but not stressed in the Bills.

How are we to understand the role that humans have in legitimating peace operations? There has been much discussion about the alleged CNN effect, where states are hypothesised to be forced to intervene due to horrifying images being broadcasted of people suffering in armed conflicts. However, both Anthonsen (2003) and Jakobsen (2000) argue that the causal link between media coverage of violent conflicts and military interventions are weak. The impact of images and text about suffering humans seems to be more indirect and having a long term effect even though they both assert the covering as being focused on humans. (Anthonsen 2003: 222, 233-234, 299ff; Jakobsen 2000: 138f). I will discuss this further in the conclusion section below.

Writing within the tradition of the English School of international relations, Nicholas J. Wheeler has developed “[a] solidarist theory of legitimate humanitarian intervention” (2000: 33). Wheelers’ point of departure is the inherent dilemma in the UN Charter, as it is aimed at protecting human rights and thereby putting domestic conditions under scrutiny of other states, and simultaneously assuring state sovereignty and non-intervention. (2000:1, 41-42). Wheeler divides the English School into two different understandings: *pluralists*, focusing on the rules and order of international society and *solidarists* focusing on the justice of international society, recognizing that individuals have rights and duties but that these can only be enforced by states. Solidarists claim that “states that massively violate human rights should forfeit their right to be treated as legitimate sovereigns, thereby morally entitling other states to use force to stop the oppression” (2000: 11-13). The pluralist, and realist, defence of non-intervention is based on rule consequentialism; the good of individuals is best protected by states, which will in turn protect the individuals. (Wheeler 2000: 29). The solidarists assumption of the individual as the primary referent object rests on the seventeenth-century Hugo Grotius writings. Instead of focusing on states’ rights it is the individual’s rights that legitimize or demand protection. Wheeler also draws on just war theorist Michel Walzer and his notion of “supreme emergency” and the hardship that faces state-leaders when they are to judge between the life of soldiers or of the victims that are rescued, to them surely humanitarian intervention is legitimate. (Wheeler 2000: 38, 45, 49-52)¹⁰.

¹⁰ For another interesting discussion of just war theory and underlying assumptions see *Gender and the war on terrorism: the justification of war in a post-9/11 perspective*. By Anna T. Höglund (2010: 127-54)

The notion of responsibility to protect (R2P) that was shortly mentioned in the historical outlook above can be seen as attempt to codify the tension between state sovereignty and direct protection of individuals.

Summing up my findings in regard to the well-being of humans as a reason for intervention we noted that it is not as elaborated as the other discourses. The moments in the chain of equivalence legitimizing peace operations that is related to humanitarianism are abstract and perhaps far from the media picture of why intervention is motivated. Drawing on the English School theorist Nicholas Wheeler we also noted the tension between *saving strangers* and fulfilling a states internal obligation and that the individuals safety might be best protected through a strong and inviolable state.

Historical perspective

To illustrate and indicate a difference between the current discourse of peace operations material from two legitimating events – in a way representing previous temporal periods – is analysed, as was discussed in the research design section above. Governmental Bills proposing Swedish troop contribution to UN peace forces in Cyprus (1964) and former Yugoslavia (1993) representing the Cold War period and the optimistic peace operations era of the early 1990s. The Bill initiating the operation in Cyprus is much shorter and not at all as elaborated as is the one initiating the operation in Yugoslavia, which is rather similar to the current Bills in its form and elaborations.

In this historical material the focus is almost entirely on international legitimizing and supporting or promoting UN in its work. State related factors are also apparent but the people living, and suffering from war, on Cyprus or the Balkan are almost completely absent. (prop. 1964:113. prop. 1992/93:254) Rather than pressing on the need to stop the havoc of war the logic underpinning the UN-force or the reason for the UN Security Council resolutions seems to be the international security and stability. Returning to the humanitarianism discussion of Wheeler above it is evident that it is the international society and not the rights of humans that are seen as legitimizing peace operations in this historical perspective. That forces are recruited voluntarily is also discussed and emphasised as well as Swedish particularity as neutral country with a tradition of contributing to UN peace operations is also moments included in the chain of equivalence legitimizing engagement. (prop. 1964:113: 2-3. prop. 1992/93:254: 5).

Section V: Conclusions and critical discussion

In this last section the empirical findings are summed up and interpretations elaborated on. Then I return to the introduction's discussion of globalization and relate my findings and conclusions to this debate. The question of legitimacy and purpose of peace operations is also related to a critical discussion of this practice.

Conclusions

We now return to the aim of the thesis; how are Swedish peace operations created as legitimate in the official foreign policy discourse? This was operationalised by posing three research questions: how is the discourse structured and what are the main lines of arguments, which and how are concepts or discourses drawn upon to legitimize interventions and what entities or subjects are constructed in this process. It is now time to answer these questions and discuss to what extent the thesis reaches its aim.

Firstly, in the beginning of the analytical section I showed, and argued, that the legitimization of Swedish peace operations is structured around three discourses: internationalism, stateism and humanitarianism. These discourses emerged through reading of the material and are as such a finding of the analysis. But they do not only exist here, they are rather both present and of paramount importance in understandings of the organization of the world. The close relationship between scientific knowledge of them and the Government's discourse was illustrated by the theoretical readings and informed by the poststructural understanding of knowledge and language as important in reality construction. This finding was presented early in the analysis to provide structure to the analysis, and perhaps it could also, in future research, constitute an analytical tool to gauge dimensions of legitimation and purpose of peace operations just as they did in this thesis. The empirical analysis showed how these discourses or nodal points were parts of chains of equivalence as well as discursive moments, producing meaning and power, or more concretely constructing legitimate peace operations.

Secondly, concepts or discourses drawn upon were presented – in line with Laclau and Mouffe's theory of discourse – as moments and presented in the tables in relation to the nodal points structuring them. These discourses were extracted from the material through in-depth and repeated readings, then categorised and clustered. What can be concluded from these discourses was that to legitimize peace operations, the Government of Sweden draws on a broad international mandate and support. The Government gives support to international organizations and the system, promoting certain norms, but they also try to change these by influencing norm change in a, one assumes, positive and strengthening way. Other discourses drawn upon were

that peace operations are practices supporting states, emanating from states: it is an *interstate* practice. The tradition or legacy and perhaps exceptionality of Sweden plays a significant role for legitimizing operations. The humanitarian situation, the presence and conditions of and for refugees, poor human security and human rights violations were also discourses drawn upon to legitimize these operations. These were, however, both rather abstract and not emphasised as much as the other discourses.

Thirdly, entities or subjects constructed or reproduced when interventions are legitimized are primary an international society of states, in its own right. What happens within and to this system is emphasised as an important reason for engagement, something that is much elaborated on in the material. Another strong idea or subject's position that is constructed is the idea of the state. Sometimes as an a priori rational actor, sometimes as a more floating entity searching for or trying to get recognition for its identity; but most importantly the official discourse of peace operation emphasizes that the existence of states is important. The third basic discourse, humanitarianism, was described in abstract terms, far from humans of flesh and blood, but more importantly not nearly as frequently used and emphasised as the other two. This dissonance is interesting and might look different if this official discourse was compared to a press related discourse. Systematic comparison of this sort was not a part of the analysis, but the op-ed by minister of defence Tolgfors indicated this dissonance. This could also indicate that the Swedish public, or at least media consumers, connect the idea of peace operations to the (suffering) people in the operation area or host nation, rather than reproduction of the state or systemic change. I propose four different ways to interpret this dissonance: (I) It is a matter of intertextuality and genre. Remembering Hansens (2006) models and theoretical understandings outlined above it is possible that the lack of elaborated humanitarian discourses is due to the genre of Governmental Bills. These are formal texts and do not include people of flesh and blood *per se* or, (II) it is assumed by the government that the humanitarian dimension is covered in a broader media discourse and therefore does not need to be elaborated on. (III) Following Laclau and Mouffe it is also possible to use the element/moment distinction, now seeing humanitarianism as a moment/element rather than a nodal point. If humanitarian discourses are considered as moments – something that is partly closed and not struggled about – the internationalism/stateism discourses can be considered as elements – that which is more open and subject to articulatory struggle. (Compare discussion above and Howarth 2000: 103). Then we can analyse the dissonance as a need for the state to elaborate on state matters in the Bills, since these, as elements, are not obvious or seen as truly legitimizing in relation to the Swedish public/voters. The image of Sweden as a self-sacrificing nation that puts the need of

humanity/people first needs not to be elaborated on, since this, as a moment, is not contested but rather taken as self evident. (IV) The dissonance can also be interpreted as states' talking to states in a state-language; the international system consists of states and it is to these entities that the Governmental Bills are addressed. When a state representative, as a human, talks to – e.g. in op-eds – other humans, the public, he or she uses the language of humans and humanitarianism.

In the current discourse of interventions – and in contrast to the previous temporal periods – there is a focus on other entities than the state. But states or state related practices, for example the international system seems to form the primary legitimizing arguments.

Critical discussion

Returning to the introduction, I started by arguing that the globalization process has had a potentially important impact on the states' monopoly of violence, and how it is possibly shifting away to other entities such as the international community or humanity. If this is so, it is interesting to see how a state argues for and legitimizes such a potent practice as an intervention, which also was the purpose of this study. As argued in the conclusion above, the legitimizing factor of humanitarianism is not used much when the Swedish Government is advocating peace operations, something that corresponds to Iver B. Neumanns argument that “‘humanity’ may exist as a political notion, and increasingly as a legal concept, but is not (yet?) strong enough to carry the burden placed upon it by NATO countries legitimizing the waging of war in Kosovo”. (2002: 80).

On the other hand, the discourse of internationalism and what happens on the international arena seems to be the strongest argument for intervention, not in a self-centred way but rather that the system is more important than the parts. The poststructuralist perspective guiding this thesis uses identity production through differentiating and linking as well as reality construction through juxtapositions to analyse and criticise entities and practices that are commonly taken for granted. By applying this understanding and analysing official text I have shown how the state assists in the construction and reproduction of the idea of the state and international state system. It is also through a poststructural lens that I consider the IR theories used to analyse and make sense of the empirical findings, which are a part in a reality construction process. Social science does not exist in a vacuum but is rather a highly political practice with potentially important impact, which obviously applies to this thesis as well. The representations or narratives that are constructed by the different theories do not represent final answers to objective questions. Instead, as the poststructural perspective helps us understand, it is through creating knowledge that a meaningful world is created.

Related to this, there is a growing literature that considers peace operations as a part of a global governance practice aimed at disciplining both failing states and the system as a whole in line with the neoliberal paradigm. (For an overview see Higate & Henry 2009: 9ff) This critical literature is often based on postmodern theoretical assumptions and uses notions such as biopolitics, deconstruction or normalization. Peace operations are here seen as a form of neo-imperialism “[...] intended to protect and spread liberal democratic governance, and in so doing sustain the extant status quo” (Higate & Henry 2009: 10). This reading of peace operations can be seen as supported by my findings here; the state of Sweden emphasises the state and state system and is using the practice of peace operations as a tool for forming the system in a way that is most of all beneficial for states.

Even if peace operations are mostly about reproducing states, state system and perhaps a neoliberal paradigm one has to ask what the alternative to this would be. Even if peace operations is a bad way of fixing the symptom of a broken system or unjust world order should we do as Edward Luttwak proposes and “Give War a Chance?”. (1999). Perhaps we should not ask about the legitimacy of peace operations in the acting community but rather in the receiving, as does Nicholas J. Wheeler (2000: 10-11) when he asserts that if the victims of mass murders and people suffering from brutal tyrannies would be asked, the answer to the question of legitimacy would surely be different than when asking a state.

Abbreviations

Brahimi Report: Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations

DDRR: Disarmament Demobilization Rehabilitation and Reintegration

EU: European Union

IGO: Inter-Governmental Organization

IR: International Relation (Academic discipline)

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization

Prop: Regeringens Proposition (Governmental Bill)

R2P: Responsibility to Protect

Skr: Regeringens Skrivelse (Governmental Communication)

UD: Utrikesdepartementet (Foreign Office)

UN: United Nations

UNSCR 1325: UN Security Council Resolution 1325 (Concerning women in armed conflicts)

References

- Anthonsen, Mette (2003). *Decisions on participation in UN operations: do media matter? Danish and Swedish response to intra state conflicts in the 1990s*. PhD diss., University of Gothenburg.
- Bellamy, Alex J. & Wheeler, Nicholas J. (2008). Humanitarian intervention in world politics. In: *The globalization of world politics: an introduction to international relations*. Baylis, John, Smith, Steve & Owens, Patricia (ed.) 4. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Berger, Peter L. & Luckmann, Thomas (1998 [1966]). *Kunskapssociologi: hur individen uppfattar och formar sin sociala verklighet*. 2.ed. Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand
- Bergman, Annika (2004) The Nordic militaries: forces for good? In: *Forces for good: cosmopolitan militaries in the twenty-first century*. Elliott, Lorraine M. & Cheeseman, Graeme (ed.), pp: 168-186. Manchester: Manchester University Press
- Bergman-Rosamond, Annika (2011). The cosmopolitan-communitarian divide and the Swedish military. In: *War, ethics and justice: new perspectives on a post-9/11 world*. Bergman-Rosamond, Annika & Phythian, Mark (ed.), pp: 55-75. London: Routledge
- Bjereld, Ulf & Demker, Marie (1995). *Utrikespolitiken som slagfält: de svenska partierna och utrikesfrågorna*. Stockholm: Nerenius & Santérus
- Björkdahl, Annika (2007). Swedish Norm Entrepreneurship in the UN. *International Peacekeeping*. Vol. 14, No. 4, pp: 538-552
- Brommeson, Douglas & Ekengren, Ann-Marie (2007). Utrikespolitiskt beslutsfattande. In: *Sverige i världen*. Brommesson, Douglas & Ekengren, Ann-Marie (ed.), pp: 18-33. Malmö: Gleerups
- Bäck, Henry & Larsson, Torbjörn (2006). *Den svenska politiken: struktur, processer och resultat*. Malmö: Liber
- Demker, Marie (2007). Idéer, normer, identiteter och diskurser i utrikespolitiken. In: *Sverige i världen*. Brommesson, Douglas & Ekengren, Ann-Marie (ed.), pp: 51-65. Malmö: Gleerups
- Ekengren, Ann-Marie (2007). Sverige och FN. In: *Sverige i världen*. Brommesson, Douglas & Ekengren, Ann-Marie (ed.), pp: 146-162. Malmö: Gleerups
- Eknes, Åge (1995). The Nordic countries and UN peacekeeping operations. In: *The Nordic countries in the United Nations: status and future perspectives*. Eknes, Åge (ed.), pp: 65-83. Stockholm: The Nordic Council
- Finnemore, Martha (1996). *National interests in international society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press
- Finnemore, Martha (2003). *The purpose of intervention changing beliefs about the use of force*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press
- Foucault, Michel (2002) *Sexualitetens Historia. Band I: Viljan att veta* Göteborg: Daidalos
- Hacking, Ian (1999). *The social construction of what?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press

- Ham, Peter van & Medvedev, Sergei (ed.) (2002). *Mapping European security after Kosovo*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press
- Hansen, Lene (2006). *Security as practice: discourse analysis and the Bosnian war*. London: Routledge
- Higate, Paul & Henry, Marsha (2009). *Insecure spaces: peacekeeping In Haiti, Kosovo and Liberia*. London: Zed Books
- Howarth, David (2000). *Discourse*. Buckingham: Open University Press
- Huysmans, Jef. (2006). Agency and The Politics of Protection: Implications for Security Studies. In: *The politics of protection: sites of insecurity and political agency*. Huysmans, Jef, Dobson, Andrew & Prokhovnik, Raia. (ed.) London. Routledge.
- Höglund, Anna T. (2010). *Gender and the war on terrorism: the justification of war in a post-9/11 perspective*. Uppsala: Centrum för Genusvetenskap, Uppsala Universitet
- Jakobsen, Peter Viggo (2000). Focus on the CNN effect misses the point: The real media impact on conflict management is invisible and indirect. In: *Journal of Peace Research*. Vol. 37, No. 2, pp: 131-143
- Jakobsen, Peter Viggo (2006). *Nordic approaches to peace operations: a new model in the making*. London: Routledge
- Jarvas, Gunnar. (1994). Övergripande reflektioner och rekommendationer. In: *Skall Sverige tvinga fram fred?*. Jarvas, Gunnar & Lindahl, Rutger (ed.), pp. 121-125. Stockholm: Utrikespolitiska Institutet
- Kinnvall, Catarina (2009). Postmodernism. In: *Internationella relationer*. Gustavsson, Jakob & Tallberg, Jonas (ed.) 2. ed. pp: 123-140. Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Laclau, Ernesto & Mouffe, Chantal (2008[1985]). *Hegemonin och den socialistiska strategin*. Göteborg: Glänta
- Leander, Anna (2005). Shifting political identities and global governance of the justified use of force. In: *Criticizing global governance*. Lederer, Markus & Philipp Muller (ed.), pp: 125-143. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Lederer, Markus & Philipp Muller (2005). Introduction: Challenging global governance In: *Criticizing global governance*. Lederer, Markus & Philipp Muller (ed.), pp: 1-19. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Luttwak, Edward N. (1999). Give War a Chance. *Foreign Affairs*. July/august. Vol. 78. No. 4. pp: 36-44.
- Medvedev, Sergei & van Ham, Peter (2002). Preface: Kosovo and the outlines of Europe's new order. In: *Mapping European security after Kosovo*. Van Ham, Peter & Medvedev, Sergei (ed.), pp: 1-14 Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press

Moore, John Allphin & Pubantz, Jerry (2006). *The new United Nations: international organization in the twenty-first century*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education

Möller, Tommy (2007). *Svensk politisk historia: strid och samverkan under tvåhundra år*. Lund: Studentlitteratur

Neumann, Iver B. (2002). Kosovo and the end of the legitimate warring state. In: *Mapping European security after Kosovo*. Van Ham, Peter & Medvedev, Sergei (ed), pp: 66-81 Manchester: Manchester University Press

Riksrevisionen (2011) *Svenska bidrag till internationella insatser*. [RiR 2011:14] Stockholm: Riksrevisionen

Ringmar, Erik (1996). *Identity, interest and action: a cultural explanation of Sweden's intervention in the Thirty Years War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Ruggie, John Gerard (1998). What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge . *International Organization*. Vol. 52, No. 4, pp 855-885

Stamnes, Eli (2008). Introduction. In: *Peace support operations: Nordic perspectives*. Stamnes, Eli (ed.), pp: 1-9. London: Routledge

Walt, Stephen M. (1991). The renaissance of security studies. *International studies quarterly*. Vol. 35, No. 2, pp: 211-239

Wheeler, Nicholas J. (2000). *Saving strangers: humanitarian intervention in international society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Winther Jørgensen, Marianne & Phillips, Louise (2000). *Diskursanalys som teori och metod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur

Ångström, J. (2010). Försvarsmaktens internationella insatser: i den svenska säkerhetens eller identitetens tjänst? In: *Svensk säkerhetspolitik i Europa och världen*. Engelbrekt, Kjell, & Ångström, Jan. (2010). Stockholm: Norstedts juridik.

Official foreign policy discourse

Proposition 1964/113 *Kungl. Maj:ts proposition till riksdagen angående svensk medverkan vid upprättande av en av F.N.:s fredsstyrka på Cypern.*

Proposition 1992/93: 254 *Sveriges deltagande i av FN:s säkerhetsråd beslutade insatser för säkerställande av fred i f.d. Jugoslavien*

Proposition 1998/99:112 *Svenskt deltagande i fredsstyrka i Kosovo*

Proposition 2001/02:60 *Svenskt deltagande i en multinationell säkerhetsstyrka i Afghanistan*

Proposition 2002/03:58 *Svenskt deltagande i Förenta nationernas fredsoperation i Demokratiska republiken Kongo*

Proposition 2002/03:143 *Svensk deltagande i en EU-ledd styrka i Demokratiska republiken Kongo*

Proposition 2003/04:61 *Svenskt deltagande i Förenta nationernas mission i Liberia*

Proposition 2005/06:203 *Svenskt deltagande i en EU-ledd militär förstärkningsstyrka till stöd för FN-insatsen i Demokratiska republiken Kongo*

Proposition 2007/08:7 *Svenskt deltagande i Förenta nationernas och Afrikanska unionens gemensamma fredsfrämjande insats i Darfur*

Proposition 2007/08:14 *Svenskt deltagande i Europeiska unionens militära insats i Tchad och Centralafrikanska republiken*

Proposition 2008/09:108 *Svenskt deltagande i Europeiska unionens marina insats utanför Somalias kust*

Proposition 2010/11:111 *Svenskt deltagande i den internationella militära insatsen i Libyen*

Skrivelse 2007/08:51 *Nationell strategi för svenskt deltagande i internationell freds- och säkerhetsfrämjande verksamhet*

Tolgfors, Sten (2009). Därför strider svenska soldater i Afghanistan. In *Dagens Nyheter* 2009-07-29. P 6