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Abstract

This study takes its origin in the discussion regarding the linkage between security and development, referred to as the security and development nexus. The main research problem that this study is concerned with is related to the research gaps that exist regarding the security and development nexus and nation-state policy. Furthermore, previous researchers have brought forward some critical arguments and reflections related to the security and development nexus which this study takes note on and are put in relation to the chosen case. Methodologically this study builds on a content analysis of policy documents from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and The Ministry of defence. The limitations that this study faces are that it is a study of policy documents from the Swedish actors mentioned above. This study concludes that the security and development nexus paradigm has trickled down into Swedish policy. This study identifies that the nexus is expressed in three different ways in which the clarity of the nexus is expressed in different ways. This result also confirms the notion that there are not a nexus, but many different nexuses, which derives from different security and development narratives. The analysis also confirms the analytical bearing that Stern and Öjendals six security and development narratives have. The result is lastly problematized and put in relation to some of the critiques that have been directed towards the security and development nexus.
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1.0 Introduction and research problem:

1.1 The security and development nexus:

My subject of interest for this thesis is the discussion about the linkage between security and development referred to as the security and development nexus. In the literature regarding the security and development nexus, advocates of the paradigm argue that there are a number of mutually reinforcing linkages between security and development. Prior to the security and development nexus paradigm entered the research field, security and development were much more approached as two different sectors with different ideas and aims (Chandler 2007: 365). There are two reasons behind this change of paradigm. Firstly, according to Chandler this shift is rooted in the belief that by merging security and development closer will create the most coherent and well managed policies with regards to the work in post-conflict countries, failed stead and weak state (Chandler 2007: 362). Secondly, and as stated above, there is a belief that long-term development requires and hinges upon security and that lasting security depends upon development (International peace academy 2004: 1). Thus, the security and development nexus both concerns a general idea of how societal security and development best is achieved and maintained and how the civil and the military in international operations should approach crisis, conflicts and other concerns in post-conflict countries, failed stead and weak state, that is cooperative.

The security and development nexus paradigm has gained increased attention since the end of the cold war and especially since the last ten years and references to the nexus can be seen in scholarly papers, in government’s and international organization’s policy writings (Duffield 2010:54). One example of this, at organizational level comes from the former United Nations general secretary Kofi Annan, who stated the following in the General Assembly: “Humanity will not enjoy development without security and will not enjoy security without development and will not enjoy either without respect for human rights” (Kofi Annan cited in UN general assembly 2005:7). The same type of writings can also be seen in European Union’s security strategy 2009 where they write the following: “As the ESS and the 2005 Consensus on Development have acknowledged, there cannot be sustainable development without peace and
security, and without development and poverty eradication there will be no sustainable peace” (Council of the European Union 2009: 20).

As one can see in the quotation above, security and developments are linked together in a mutually reinforcing relationship and when one of these factors is not met the mutuality are weakened and as a result neither security or development can be attained. The linkage seems rather clear in the quotation above. In the academic literature on the other hand, there is another story being presented about the security and development nexus where the clarity and obvious linkage seen in the quotation above is contested. In Stern and Öjendals text Mapping the security - development nexus: conflict, complexity, cacophony, convergence (2010) (will be presented further down below) the authors maintain that there is not a nexus but many different nexuses. The conclusion of Stern and Öjendals argument is that the security and development nexus cannot be linked with any given meaning. This does not mean that the nexus is an empty concept per se, it means that the nexus is given its meaning and content when it is defined by the actors implementing the nexus in their policy (Stern and Öjendal 2011: 24). From a national perspective, one result of linking security and development together is that it stresses the importance of cooperation between the military and the civil such as the development community. What is not given however is that two actors from two different fields have a shared understanding of what security and development are or should be and since the meaning of the nexus is defined by the understanding of security and development a discrepancy in the understanding of security and development will thereafter be transmitted to the nexus.

According to Tschirgi (and others) one reason to why the linkage is hard to pinpoint and define is due to the broadness in the two main concepts (Tschirgi 2005: 43). Development can mean everything from human rights to environmental sustainability, from economic growth to governance. This is also the case with security which today can contain more than the traditional state centric understanding. This is not unproblematic and critics have raised this issue. The core of the argument is that by merging two elusive concepts together can create policy confusion and incoherence. This critic is often brought forward against the nexus manageability (Boonstra and Shapovalova 2012:7; Tschirgi 2005: 39; international peace academy 2006:8).
Chandler on the other hand seems critical towards both the nexus itself and to the focus on coherence that comes with the nexus. He argues that the call for coherence is a “bureaucratic substitute for politically coherent policy-making, where the clarity of goals enabled instrumental policy making” (Chandler 2007: 370). Rather than critiquing their own incapacity to formulate strategic frameworks in relation to the state or region concerned the critic is put on the failure to coordinate the involved actors and by doing so a responsibility vacuum erupts where the burden sharing that comes with the nexus diffuses the possibility hold single actors responsible (Chandler 2007: 370). The critic against the focus on coordination and coherence can be related to the second argument to why merging security and development together is desirable since the core of the pro-argument is based on the same idea that Chandler is critical of.

The research problem that this study will addresses relates to the research gap that exists regarding studies that evaluates the security and development nexus paradigm’s impact on nation-state policy. Due to this gap there exists no sufficient knowledge of, if the academic discussion regarding security and development nexus has trickled down into national policy. Consequently, we do not know how the security and development nexus is perceived at this level or how the security and development nexus is expressed. There are studies done about the security and development nexus at an organizational level with multilateral organizations such as the United Nations and European Union as cases, this is on the other hand not enough to get a full picture of how the nexus paradigm has come to play a role internationally.

The research problem is also founded in the problematics that earlier research already have pointed out exist with the security and development nexus. With the help of earlier research (presented above) this study identifies three problems or problematics and for the thesis interesting points that are related to the security and development nexus that this study will take note of. These three areas are: That security and development nexus is given its meaning by the actor making claims on the nexus as argued for by Stern and Öjendal (see above). Secondly, that the implementation of the security and development nexus in policies can create policy incoherence/confusion, as a result of actors having different understandings of the two elusive and concatenated concepts security and development. Thirdly, Chandler’s critic on motivating the nexus based on the coherence argument (see above).
In response to the research gap that exist regarding the security and development nexus and policy documents at nation-state level it will be the focus of this study. Methodologically, this study will be guided by a content analysis that will help to extract my findings. The findings will thereafter be analyzed with the help of my analytical framework that builds on Stern and Öjendals (2010) six security and development nexus narratives.

1.2 Purpose and research questions:

In essence the purpose of this thesis is to study and clarify which discourses exists in the documents regarding security and development and if the security and development nexus paradigm have trickled down into Swedish policy. If so, it will also clarify how the security and development nexus paradigm are perceived and expressed in the documents and on what grounds the actors motivate why the nexus is the way forward. Lastly, with the help of my analytical framework the purpose of this study is to study the meaning/meanings that the actors give to the possible nexus/nexuses. Since I study two actors, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Defence I will be able to contrast the result from the two actors with each other to see if there are a shared understanding of these matters. The main research questions that will guide this thesis are:

What discourses of security and development can be found in the documents from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and The Ministry of Defence? How do they conceptualise these two concepts?

How do the actors link security and development together in the documents? How is the nexus between security and development argued for?

In the light of the analytical framework, out of which narratives do the nexus/nexuses identified in the documents derive from and are comparable with?
1.3 Relevance of the study:

This topic is worth researching from the chosen perspective for several reasons which is both academic and practical. From an academic perspective, this topic is of relevance because it will analyse if academic discussions have a trickled-down effect at national policy level even in subjects that are highly conceptual and diffuse. It is also relevant due to the knowledge gap that exists regarding how the nexus is perceived and expressed at this level, which also can answer the question which discourses governments are susceptible to within this paradigm. This study is also relevant from an academic point of view since Stern and Öjendal’s six narratives never have been tested on empirical cases which can answer the questions if their six narratives have bearing or not.

This study is also relevant for Swedish policymakers because as made clear above the nexus comes with certain risks and it is therefore a necessity to evaluate if the nexus can be found in Swedish policy. It is also relevant for Swedish policymakers because as mentioned above the nexus cannot be linked with any given meaning and with my analytical framework I will in a systematic way be able to systematize and give meaning to writings. This will possibly show how the nexus can be given different meanings depending on which actor that define the nexus. If this research can find a discrepancy between the actors, this will be valuable knowledge for Swedish policymakers. This is especially so since within the security and development nexus paradigm, there is a belief that security and development in conflict management, conflict prevention and post conflict reconstruction cannot be attained without joint up operations and if there is no consensus of what security and development are or how they perceive and express the nexus it can have negative effects on the ground as mentioned above. A study that focuses on how development, security and the nexus is perceived and defined is also important and can contribute with important knowledge for Swedish policymakers because a Stern and Öjendal argue “the power of definition over ‘development’ and ‘security’ also implies power to define not only the relevant field of interest, but also the material content of practices, the distribution of resources, and subsequent policy responses”(Stern and Öjendal 2010: 7). Lastly, since Sweden is taking part in thirteen international operations aiming at preventing conflicts, strengthening secuirty and development in post-conflict countries, weak and failed states the nexus do matter (Swedish Armed Forces).
1.4 Disposition:

The rest of this study will be structured in the following way: In chapter two I will discuss the analytical framework that this study builds on. A special focus will be devoted to discussing Stern and Öjendals text *Mapping the security – development nexus: conflict, complexity, cacophony, convergence* (2010) and their six security and development nexus narratives which derives from this text. In chapter three the methodology will be discussed. In this chapter I will explain and discuss the content analysis that will be used in this study, the material, the selection of actors and lastly reliability and validity. In chapter four, the findings will be presented. Question one will be answered in this section. The base for question two will also be presented here. However, question two will be elaborated further within the fourth chapter, which is the analysis chapter where it will be put in relation the analytical framework and earlier research. I will also answer question three in the analysis chapter. Lastly, I will present a conclusion of the thesis main points and in a reduced form present the answers to the questions.

2.0 Analytical framework

In this section I will firstly try to make a conceptualization of the concepts security and development. After that I will go deeper into the discussion about the security and development nexus and outline some other thoughts and views than to what was presented in the introduction. After that a brief discussion of Stern and Öjendals text where I will explain the thoughts, ideas and the methodology behind these narratives will be presented. Thereafter, I will explain why I have chosen to incorporate their work as my analytical framework and what purpose it serves in this study. Lastly, I will bring forward some of the critics that their text and mapping have received.

2.1 Defining security and development:

Just as any other academic concept, security and development are two widely contested concepts. In order to not fall into a too long discussion of different theoretical perspective within the security and development field, I will limit this conceptualization to the most necessary and relevant for the thesis.
Security:

The concept of security has undergone a radical change since the end of the cold war. During most of the Cold War, security studies focused on issues revolving around the control, threat or use of force. The prevailing view at that time was that since states are both the main users of force and the main targets of force, security should therefore be state centric and military centric (Bernard 1998:3). As a result of this understanding, security came to be understood as mainly related to the state and/or the military (Bernard 1998:4; Baylis 2001: 255). Thus, the concept of security has mostly been associated with national security and external military threats to the nation state (Bernard 1998:8). According to Anderson threats have traditionally been thought to comprise some combination of the capability and intent to do harm, both being required to constitute a threat (Anderson: 2012:8). The focus on the state, the military and external threats was later criticized for being too narrow and not functional with the realities of today. As stated above, threats have traditionally been thought to comprise some combination of the capability and intent to do harm, both being required to constitute a threat (Anderson: 2012:34). According to Anderson new paradigms of security studies have tended to eliminate this important element of intent or agency, and have securitized a wide range of threats that lack this qualification (Anderson: 2012:34). The process that was referred to above as securitizing have come to frame i.e. environmental decline, natural disasters, poverty, deadly diseases and resource scarcity as threats not only to the state itself, but to international security (Anderson: 2012:34). Relatively new concepts such as human security (coined by the United Nations Human Development Report (1994) takes note of this multidimensional view of security and includes seven elements of security: economic security, health security, food security, environmental security, personal security, community security, and political security (Anderson 2012: 8). The emphasis that was put on the military in the first dimension is in the second dimension given less importance (Anderson 2012: 25). The focus on national security seen before have not lost importance, but made equally important to international and global security due to the recognition that the world today is interdependent politically, socially and economically (Baldwin 1995, 131). Emphasis has also been put on regions and institutions as new security actors (Bernard 1998:7).
Development:

Defining the concept development is as problematic as defining security, if not more problematic. Just as with the concept security there are different schools within the field of development studies and related fields that not necessarily agree with another about what development should be or understood as. The meanings of development have changed from mostly being linked with economy and industrialization in the 1940’s, to meaning economic growth, social and political modernization advocated by the modernization theory, in the1980’s the meaning of the concept development shifted into concerning economic growth and structural adjustment change (Sumner and Tribe 2008: 11f). There is however one general agreement that they all seem to share and that is that development encompasses change or transformation (Sumner and Tribe 2008: 11). In recent years, concepts such as human development and sustainable development have emerged in the debate and been embraced by the United Nations in their work against poverty and development. Development according to the Sustainable Development concept is “development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (Drexhage and Murphy 2010:2). Both human development and sustainable development includes various factors that all together effects development. Sustainable development most often includes four dimensions which are: the ecological dimension, the social dimension, the economic dimension and (not always) the political dimension. All of these factors will be important to have in mind as guiding points of departure when I am reading the documents.

2.2 Outlining the security and development nexus discussion:

As mentioned above, the divide between security and development that was seen before is according to many authors less visible today. As a result, security and development are approached as a nexus instead of as two separate sectors (Duffield 2010:54). A good question to start with, what constitutes a nexus? The Oxford dictionary defines nexus as such “A connection or series of connections linking two or more things” (Oxford dictionaries). In other words, the nexus is the connection that is being made when two or more variables are linked together which in this case is when security and development is linked together. In the section down below, I will discuss the ongoing debate about the security and development
nexus. Some of the arguments and researchers have already been introduced and described above so I will not repeat those here.

One critic against the security and development nexus is the lack of empirical evidences. One evidence of the interdependence between security and development that is often brought forward is the fact that most of the 20 poorest countries have experienced violent conflicts in the past decade (Neethling 2005:35). Some researcher such as Chandler dismiss that the nexus has empirical bearing and argues that since there are no clear relationship between security and development and that the nexus relies more on rhetorical claims than on thought trough policy-making. This means that the policies are more symbolic than rooted in practice. As a result the security and development nexus leaves a gap between policy and practice (Chandler 2007: 363). In relation to the lack of evidence, many studies regarding the security and development nexus most often conclude that the nexus needs further research and that it is still wage how these concepts are linked (Chandler 2007:366). One example of this is the International Peace Academy that launched a two year research program called the security – development nexus program and in their paper research findings and policy implications they argue that there exist problem with the security and development nexus which calls for further research at a conceptual level, in policy integration, at implementation level, at institutional level and at political level (international peace academy 2005: 2 ff)

Another aspect of the security and development nexus that is widely discussed is the question about policy coherence. Besides Chandler, whose arguments related to the call for coherence already has been clarified above is Sending who has studied United Nations and how they have tackled the nexus at an institutional level. According to him there are two alternatives to tackle the nexus at this level. The first alternative is to establish new bodies where an integrated perspective on security and development are the founding idea. The second alternative is to coordinate different bodies and by that addressing the security and development nexus by joined up operations. According to Sending’s analysis, coordination has been the way forward in United Nations. Mostly because of the political issues that emerges when old structures becomes challenged. Establishing new bodies have according to him been problematic due to the power structures that exist within the United Nations between member states that makes states guard their position, leverage and influence over United Nations (Sending 2004:14).
In the debate about security and development nexus there is also a question of whose security? This question is often raised in the academic debate. According to Chandler, critical security theorist are already claiming that development and poverty reduction have been deprioritized to western security concerns and that we are moving towards a securitization of development (Chandler 2007: 363). This is very relatable to Duffield’s line of thinking that clearly seems sceptical to the whole idea of security and development. Clearly in his thinking there is a power struggle between the insured people living in the global north and the uninsured people living in the global south and according to Duffield development and security is just another bio political containment strategy being done in the name of security and development with western countries interest in the forefront (Duffield 2007:16; Kienscherf 2011: 518). In the discussion of the security and development nexus there is a related discussions about securitization of development aid. Oxfam America has raised their critic where they argue that securitization of aid will be self-defeating, since it can turn long term investments and operations into short term national security operations. According to Oxfam this will then prevent aid from fulfilling the long term purpose, which is a precondition for a safer world (Oxfam 2011: 22). Boonstra and Shapovalova argue in a rather ambivalent way when they are discussing the securitization of development. They express this in the following way:

“Linking security and development can result in the securitisation of development rather than the ‘developmentalisation’ of security. For development actors, securitisation of a development issue may raise their prominence on the political agenda, which can lead to immediate action, political prioritisation and mobilisation of funds. But many in the development sector remain concerned about the subordination of development to the West’s domestically inspired security priorities”. (Boonstra and Shapovalova 2012:7).

One empirical example that could indicate that there is a real risk of development aid becoming securitized is US aid. Brand who has studied US allocation of aid in a post 9/11 context comes to the conclusion that US spending on security related development have increased substantially (Brand 2010: 75).

In the section below I will present what will be my analytical framework which is based on Stern and Öjendals six security and development nexus narratives.
2.3 Explaining Stern and Öjendals Mapping the security – development nexus: conflict, complexity, cacophony, convergence:

As mentioned above, in this part a discussion about Stern and Öjendals text *Mapping the security – development nexus: conflict, complexity, cacophony, convergence* (2010) will follow. I will also raise the critic that the text has received. First off, it is in place to explain how their work fits into the broader discussion about security and development nexus. Stern and Öjendals text *Mapping the security – development nexus: conflict, complexity, cacophony, convergence* (2010) is a result of the notion that there is not a universal definition of security, nor is there a universal definition of development. Thus a one dimensional meaning of the security and development nexus is impossible. Consequently, there are not a nexus but many different nexuses with different meanings and logics. This is a point in the debate that according to Stern and Öjendal has been underexplored "it remains nonetheless underexplored how the nexus is differently experienced, imbued with meaning and ultimately employed" (Stern and Öjendal 2010:7). It is also in this context that Stern and Öjendal comes into the discussion as they take on the task to develop an analytical framework that allows for this type of inquiries (Stern and Öjendal 2010: 8). Their work has resulted in their six security and development nexus narratives which I will make use of in this study. The methodological approach that Stern and Öjendal have used to construct these six narratives is based on a mapping exercise where the authors are mapping different demarked accounts of security and development which afterwards are turned into six different security and development nexus narratives. In their text they leave us with six different security and development nexus narratives which are: development/security as modern (theological) narrative, broadening, deepening and humanizing development/security, development/security as impasse/impossible, post-development/security, development/security as a technique of governementality and development/security as globalized. Each narrative has its own perspective on what development and security are, who it concerns and what actors are concerned. In the section below I will describe and discuss these six narratives, but before we go into that I would like to describe why and how Stern and Öjendals security and development nexus narratives fits into my study as my analytical framework.

Just as in any other study the analytical framework will be used as a grid that my findings will be studied through. I have chosen Stern and Öjendals six security and development nexus
narratives as my analytical framework because their work leaves us with a more hands on model that can be used for analysis compared to many other authors writing in this matter. Their text therefore provides with an analytical framework with theoretical depth that advantageously can be used as an analytical framework. Their narratives are also good as an analytical tool since their narratives are diversified which helps to capture the full variations of your specific case.

2.4 The six security and development nexus narratives:

The security –development nexus as modern (teleological) narrative:

This narrative speaks from a modernist perspective where the state is seen as the main actor. Dimensionally, security and development are often located in a bounded geographical space, often to the state. Promises of security and development depends on a successful strive towards progress and modernity. Security and development are in this nexus seen as mutually reinforcing each other. The mutuality ceases to exist when development and security is not met. Economic growth and democratization (examples of development) is examples of conditions for development which can only occur if the state manages to exert a certain amount of control, strong defense high legitimacy (these are also examples of security) (Stern and Öjendal 2010:17).

Security development nexus: deepened, broadened, humanized:

This nexus represents the counterpoint or alternative development standpoint. It stands in stark contrast to the narrative above. This narrative joins different challenging views of what a good, safe and just society might be. The narrative challenges the mainstream idea of what one is supposed to strive for, it is not deterministic. This nexus might rely on a more cyclical temporality as it looks back in time to find the most desirable state of security for humans, cultures or the environment. This nexus might also be influenced localized experience of vulnerable people. Human security and human development fits into this narrative. In general this narrative is characterized by combinations of complex idealistic and normative ideas of security and development (Stern and Öjendal 2010:18).
Security-development nexus as impasse/impossible:

According to this narrative security and development is seen as a dead end and impossible and something that is not desirable. The view that security is impossible and that development is a dead end is joined together in belief that the concepts and practices are both mutually constitutive and misapprehended. For several reasons security and development is out of reach and each effort at achieving development creates underdevelopment and the same goes for security leading to more insecurity, threat and violence. According to this narrative the nexus is empty, impossible, harmful and undesirable (Stern and Öjendal 2010:18 f).

Post security –development:

This narrative is similar to the one above, but places more emphasis on the nexus as linked discursive practices that produces specific realities and are thus tools of power. Practices and discourses reproduce defined relations of inequality, injustice, harmful mechanism of inclusion and exclusion, violence, insecurity and danger. Security and development are here seen as possible, however inherently self-contradictory in themselves and in relation to each other as a nexus. According to the authors the discourse becomes self-perpetuating and impossible promises. The nexus should be refused, critiqued and avoided according to this narrative (Stern and Öjendal 2010:19 f).

Security –development as a technique of govermentality:

Security and development are here seen as techniques of biopower. Security and development therefore governs life through interrelated efforts aimed at improving life, management of continence and controlling the potentially dangerous. The biopolitical understanding of the nexus can include politics of aid, humanitarian assistance and the good governance agenda as well as local and global techniques and practices that encourage the global war on terror. (Stern and Öjendal 2010:20)

Globalized security-development:

This narrative is similar to the security development nexus: deepened, broadened, humanized. This narrative is embedded in globalization and therefore does not see borders or territories as
limitations. Globalization has blurred what ones were distinct entities and territories. The representations of the world as distinct and separate entities must be challenged to better represent the reality of today. According to this narrative problems are not limited to a specific geographical area and cannot be solved in that manner. The focus is moved from the local to the global. Seen in this way, the nexus represents a way of addressing the interrelated and mutual human global issues such as global warming (Stern and Öjendal 2010:20f)

2.5 What critique has been raised against Mapping the security – development nexus: conflict, complexity, cacophony, convergence?

What should be lifted in this section is that Stern and Öjendals text and mapping have received critique. According to Reid-Henry, Stern and Öjendal are in their mapping exercise missing the important aspect of power that comes to into play in their mapping (Reid-Henry 2011: 97). Reid-Henry also argue that their mapping only shows the inconstancies that exist within the nexus (Reid-Henry 2011: 98). Reid-Henry points out that their approach can reinforce the way that the nexus serves the interest of power. In this matter Reid-Henry is especially referring to the development/security as modern (theological) narrative (Reid-Henry 2011: 98). The main message of his criticism concern the function of nexus, that security and development are mutually reinforcing and when one of two factors are not meet the mutuality crumbles. In many developing countries this is a reality, thus leaving a dysfunctional nexus. Due to this dysfunction Reid-Henry argues that the consequents of this will result in a de-politization that Stern and Öjendals fails to address. This de-politicizing and dysfunction can in turn lead to more securitization (Reid-Henry 2011: 98). According to Henry, when the nexus fails and becomes depoliticized it “achieves the ‘real aims’ of power” (Reid-Henry 2011: 98). Lastly, Reid-Henry also points out that there are few empirical evidence of many of the arguments that stern and Öjendal brings forward (Reid-Henry 2011: 102). This is not a surprise since their framework have not been tested on any data (Stern and Öjendal 2011: 106).
3.0 Methodology

In this section I will clarify the methodological selections that have guided this study. After that I will discuss the material, reliability, limitation and delimitation.

3.1 Content analysis:

In general a content analysis is applied when the researcher wants to systematically describe the content of a material (Bergström and Boréus 2000: 50). A content analysis can be of both a quantitative and/or qualitative character (Werle and Andersson 2012: 15). Research using qualitative content analysis focuses on the characteristics of language as communication with attention to the content or contextual meaning of the text whilst a quantitative content analysis focuses more on the frequency of words in a document (Shannon and Hsieh 2005: 1278).

This thesis is of a qualitative character and the focus is put on studying the content in the documents by reading and asking questions to the text. One further distinction should be made. Within the content analysis the researcher can study either or both the latent and manifest content. In this thesis, I will focus on the manifest content that is the explicit (Potter and Donnerstein 2009: 259). In Chelimsky’s text about content analysis she presents a six step map on how to conduct a content analysis, all six steps will not be dealt with here and it should also be mentioned that the step Developing content sensitive headlines is not a part of Chemlimsky’s six steps, it has been added to create a more interesting headlines that corresponds with the material (Chelimsky 1989: 8ff).

Select units of analysis: This step is about choosing sampling units, context units and recording/units. The sampling unit is related to what material that will be used which will be dealt with under the heading material. To simplify these concepts the context unit can be said to be the biggest unit of analysis whilst the recording unit is the smallest (Petros 2007: 13). The smallest unit of analysis will be words and sentences as the biggest unit of analysis.

Develop coding categories: The third point is according to Chelimsky the most crucial in a content analysis. This is because categories provide the structure for the findings (Chelimsky 1989: 11). The research questions will be used as my main coding categories and sort my
findings in accordance with those categorises. Each actor will be dealt with in the same way: findings development, findings security and security and development as a nexus.

*Code the material:* the coding will be done with the help of my research question. When reading the material I will use my research question as a tool to extract my findings and to organize the material. This is similar to one of Dahlgren’s six approaches of a content analysis where he argues that you can ask your material questions to understand what information is being produced (Dahlgren 2000:75). The coding will be done in conjunction with the reading of the documents by marking relevant text that is usable to answer my research questions. The coded material will then be divided into the different categories (explained above). Since that the findings at this stage will be rather fragmented, the findings will therefore be read again and then rewritten into a more intelligible text. The result of this process can be read under the heading findings.

*Developing content sensitive headlines:* this is a step that I have added to create sub headlines under the three main categories which is very broad and hollow in relation to the findings. These headlines are more aligned with the discussion and the discourse.

*Analyse and interpret the results:* lastly, when I have extracted my findings from the material and coded the findings and placed the findings in the categories and rewritten them I will then apply my analytical framework on the material.

3.2 Actors selection and material

3.3 Actors:

This study will be based on documents from two actors which are the Swedish Ministry of defence and the Ministry of foreign affairs. It should be mentioned that the documents in the *Policy for Global Development* series and the document *Policy Platform for Development Aid* is called government communication and is written to clarify the government’s position on the specific matter, however at the publication database it stands clear that the senders is not the government but the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, due to that I have chosen to go by the actor
that are expressed as the sender (Swedish parliament). On the other hand, one can consider the documents as a representation of the government’s opinions in these matters since that the documents are called government communication and are also signed by the prime minister but I have chosen to connect the document with its sender to simplify the number of actors. Furthermore, the documents that I choose to connect with the Ministry of Defence have also been developed in cooperation with the Defence Commission but just as in the case with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the senders of the documents are the Ministry of Defence and I will therefore stay with the Ministry of Defence when I am discussing the documents.

The reason to why I have chosen the actors that I have is because I have tried to cover all the actors that might have an impact on Swedish security and development policy. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs was chosen because they are the actor that are responsible for Swedish foreign policy and deals with subjects such as Swedish international development aid and humanitarian assistance (mostly through Sida), and international involvement and in many cases the Ministry of Foreign Affairs should also be seen as security actors since they write policies that concerns international military operations. The Ministry of Defence was chosen to represent the military/security sector of the nexus since they are the actor responsible for Swedish defence, security and crisis management. I believe that the actors that have been chosen are the most relevant actors with my purpose and questions in mind. After all, there are no more relevant actors if you want to study security and development at a policy level then the ministry of foreign affairs and the ministry of defence.

In total, I have read fifteen documents but chosen to base the study on eleven of the fifteen documents. The documents from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs makes up eight of the eleven documents whilst the documents from the Ministry of Defence makes up three of the 11 documents. One issue with the material is that there is an imbalance in the material in the sense that I only have three documents representing the military side of the nexus. The reason to this imbalance is that I found very few documents that were relevant with the purpose and aim of this study in mind. This, despite the fact that I went through all the material from the Ministry of Defence and the Defence Commission that are accessible at the Swedish Government’s and the Parliament’s homepage. The material to be representing the security side might be considered to be small but it is not a matter of quantity, adding three or four irrelevant documents in order to even out the imbalance would indeed even out the imbalance.
quantitatively but it would not change the result since the material would not have been usable.

3.4 Material:

The material that will be used in this study consist of four different types of material, all are first hand sources. Firstly, I will use communications which is a clarification of the government’s point of view and towards what goals they and their concerned institutions will work (Swedish Parliament). When these documents will be discussed I will refer to them as belonging and as drafted by the sender.

I will also use two sets of data called Swedish government official report (SOU) (in Swedish Statens offentliga utredninga) and Ministry publication series (Ds) (in Swedish Departementsserien). These documents have different character compared to communications mentioned above (Swedish government a 2013). These documents are written at the request of the government by the concerned departments when the government wants their opinion about a specific subject. The documents are in other word considerations and evaluations (Swedish government a 2013. For example, if the government is to take a decision about how the national defense should be reorganized due to a new security threat they can ask the Defense Commission and the Ministry of Defence or some other department who have knowledge of and/or are concerned by the Swedish security and defense Policy for their opinion which in turn can guide the government in their decisions (Swedish government a 2013). The conclusion ends up in documents called Swedish government official report (SOU(in Swedish Statens offentliga utredningar) and Ministry publications series (Ds)(in Swedish Departementsserien) (Swedish government a 2013. The opinions that are expressed in these documents are the concerned departments (Swedish government a 2013). All of the document from the Ministry of Defence is of this character, and one of the documents from the Ministry of Forging Affairs.

The last form of data is Information material. There is only one document in this study that is of this character. This is the document Peace and security for development. In general,
information material as a source is written and given out with the same aim as communication, which is to clarify (Swedish Government b 2011).

It should also be mentioned that the time frame for the documents spans over two governmental installations. In 2006 there was a shift in the government seat from a government led by the Social Democratic Party to a government lead by the Moderate Party. This means that all documents prior to 2006 were developed under a government led by the Social Democratic Party whilst all documents past 2006 have been developed under a Moderate Party led government.

The processes of finding these documents have been rather uncomplicated. I have used the database that can be found on the Swedish government’s webpage and the database that can be found on the Swedish Parliaments webpage. With the help of their database I have gone through all the published documents for the Swedish government, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Defense from 1994-2014. I have done the same when I have searched the database on the Swedish Parliament’s webpage where you can search for documents published by specific commission. The choice of what have been a relevant document to study have been mine, which means that the selection have been strategic rather than random and my role in it have been very active. In order to maximize the possibilities to get as much usable material as possible from each document I have chosen to use a strategic selection rather than a random selection.

3.5 Reliability and validity:

The basic meaning of reliability in qualitative research is if the research is reliable and possible to repeat with the same result (Eliasson 2006:14). Validity on the other hand lifts the question if the study measures what it claims to measure (Eliasson 2006:14). Both concepts are relevant, although the focus is most often put on reliability when it comes to qualitative research (Eliasson 2006:17). One way to achieve reliability is to keep the research process as transparent as possible (Eliasson 2006:15). Against what has been written above it is fair to argue that the research process and the basis for my choices have been explained thoroughly for the reader and by that made it easier for the reader to understand the approach that this study is based on. When research is based on content analysis, the reliability becomes closely
connected to the coding of the material. As mentioned above, the material is coded into three categories view on security, view on development and security and development nexus expression of development. The point of the argument is that reliability in the content analysis is reached when an outsider is able to code the material in the same way as the researcher or when a researcher is able to get the same result over and over again (Stemler 2001). The conceptualization of security and development found in the theory chapter will also help to guide me in the choice of what material should be classified as a finding and what material is irrelevant.

There are also reasons to pay some attention to the material in this section. The material that has been selected is according to my point of view the most relevant to answer my questions. All of the documents are first hand official sources which speaks for that the material is reliable.

4.0 Findings

In this section, I will present my findings. I will present my findings in the following order development, security and security and development as a nexus.

4.1 Findings – Development

Findings - the Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Underlying perspective:

When development is discussed in the documents one can deduce a number of underlying perspectives that are repeated in many of the documents. First off, when development is discussed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs uses the term *equitable and sustainable development*. In the document *Policy for Global Development 2005/06* they argue for example that the ambition is to contribute to an equitable and sustainable development (Swedish government c 2005/06:4). Two other perspectives that influence the discussion about global development are the *rights perspective* and the *perspectives of poor people on development*. The rights perspective is explained as follows “The rights perspective is based
on non-discrimination and implies that human rights should form the basis for measures aimed at promoting equitable and sustainable development” (Swedish government e 2004/05:5). The perspectives of poor people on development is explained as follows “the perspectives of poor people on development means that poor individual’s experiences, interests, needs and conditions shall guide the poverty reduction” (Swedish government e 2004/05:6). These four perspectives permeate and lies as a base in all the policies in the Policy for Global Development series and the Policy Platform for Development Aid. It should be noted however that in the Policy Platform for Development Aid that is apart of this study the perspectives of poor people on development is named poor and repressed peoples’ perspective.

The focus on the individual as mentioned is another perspective that can be seen in several places in the document. It is especially expressed in the documents Policy for Global Development series (Swedish Government d 2007/08: 9; Swedish Government c 2005/06: 9 et alt). One example of this is found in the Policy for Global Development 2005/06 where the Ministry of Foreign Affairs writes as follow: “Without a focus on the individual, her rights and her views on development, the goals of promoting equitable and sustainable development will not be achieved” (Swedish Government c 2005/06: 9). One can also discern that the individual’s ability to alleviate out of poverty is not generalizable into one explanatory factor. In this sense poverty and development is seen from an intersectional perspective. For an instance in the document Policy for Global Development 2005/06 poverty is discussed intersectionally where the individual ability to alleviate out poverty is related to gender, age, ethnicity and other individual conditions (Swedish Government c 2005/06: 4).

In the documents Policy for Global Development and Policy Platform for Development Aid the authors also express that they have a holistic and multidimensional view on poverty related to development and in peace building (Swedish government f 2013/14:14; Swedish government e 2004/05:7 et alt). Why and how their view of poverty is multidimensional is expressed in many ways. In the chapter called basic values in the Policy Platform for Development Aid they argue that there is a multidimensional view on poverty because “It is based on how people living in poverty and oppression, self-describe their situation, based on their own reality and their own experiences, needs, priorities and opportunities to change the living conditions” (Swedish government f 2013/14:10).
Development perspectives in international commitments aiming at promoting peace and security:

When it comes to Swedish contribution in international peace promoting operations there are according to the documents that are a part of this study a developmental perspective. In the document *National Strategy for Swedish Participation in International Peace and Security operations (2007/08)* the Ministry of Foreign Affairs writes that international peace promoting operations is done with two purposes. The first purpose is that Swedish participation aims at contributing to the maintenance of international peace and security through facilitating conditions for an equitable and sustainable development (Swedish government h 2007/08: 3), similar goal declarations can also be found in the document *To Prevent armed Conflicts (2000/01)* which also contains a clear development dimension, especially in relation to the long terms commitment towards conflict prevention and the integrated approach that is advocated for here (Swedish government i 2000/01; Swedish government i 2000/01:9; (Swedish government i 2000/01: 12).) The second purpose found in *National Strategy for Swedish Participation in International Peace and Security operations (2007/08)*, is the defence of what is called “universal norms and values such as democracy, human rights, equality, human dignity and development” (Swedish government h 2007/08: 3). Regarding long term and short term commitments, it seems as Swedish policy is not biased towards any of them. In the document *Peace and Security for Development 2010/14* the ministry of foreign affairs express that Swedish commitment to peace and security should be short term and long term (Swedish Government b 2010: 10). They also state that the development cooperation shall be based national ownership (Swedish Government b 2010: 11).

The document series *Policy for Global Development* seen above is also at the centre of Swedish participation in international operation aiming at promoting peace and security. In *Think about the World Ds(2004)* there is no clear discussion about development. The sender do on the other hand refer to the document *Policy for Global Development* (see above)(Swedish Government g 2004:25). This is also the case with the document *Peace and Security for Development ( 2010)* in which the stated goal is to contribute to an equitable and sustainable development (Swedish Government b 2010: 9). This document also takes its point of departure in the goals for development and aid cooperation’s which are to help to create opportunities and conditions for poor people to improve their lives (Swedish Government b
2010: 10). The same linkage between the document series *Policy for Global Development* and the documents mentioned above can also be found with *National Strategy for Swedish Participation in International Peace and Security operations* (2007/08) and to a great extent also the document *To Prevent Armed Conflicts* (2000/01) (Swedish Government h 2007/08: 3). Direct references is not made between the document *To Prevent Armed Conflicts* (2000/01) and *Policy for Global Development* they do however share the same call for equitable and sustainable development.

Findings – the Ministry of Defence

View on development:

What is clear when reading the documents from the Ministry of National Defence is that the development dimension makes up a small to almost not existing space in these documents. When the writers do discuss development this is mostly done in relation to conflicts and security. This is characteristic for both documents that are presented here. For example, in the document *A Strategy for Swedish Security DS* (2006) it is argued that the risk of conflicts can be reduced by attacking the essence of crisis and that this is being done within the frame of the policy document equitable and sustainable development (Swedish government j 2006: 18). In the document *Swedish Security Policy in a New World Light Ds* (1998:9) the sender not only connect security and conflicts with development they also connect it with Swedish security they write as follow “Sweden's security is closely connected with the global development” (Swedish Government k 1998: 69). The ministry of national defence also put emphasis on securing long-term basic living conditions and that this is of great importance to human security in the broad sense. To achieve this they argue requires extensive efforts in a wide range of areas both political, economic and social (Swedish Government k 1998: 64).

4.2 Findings – Security

Findings – the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

View on Security:
The lack of a clear and well defined discussion about development that is found in the documents by the Ministry of Defence is similar to the substandard discussion about security found in the documents Policy for Global Development and Policy Platform for Development Aid (2013/14). In general, security is not given an intrinsic value, security is given its value in relation to development. The security concept is compared to the development concept discussed above less nuanced. Since there is a focus on humans in the documents from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs one would assume that there would be references to human security which is only mentioned in the document Policy Platform for Development Aid 2013/14 (Swedish Government f 2013/14: 35). In the document Policy Platform for Development Aid (2013/2014) one can identify two dimensions of security in the discussion. First off, it is state centric security related to the security sector that is being discussed there is also traces of human security in the documents (Swedish Government f 2013/14: 37; Swedish Government f 2013/14: 35). The focus on the security sector is a recurring theme in these documents. One example of the importance of the security sector is found in the document Policy for Global Development (2007/2008) they write as follows:

“The importance of a functioning security sector is often associated with conflicts, and especially with how crucial it is for development. Poverty reduction efforts may be jeopardised unless a country’s security and the need to reform the security sector, are considered. Lasting peace and functioning, democratic society requires that the security sector; military, the police and the entire chain of justice, is under democratic control and transparency, it is efficient and competent and respect human rights” (Swedish Government h 2007/08:39)

It is visible here that security sector and reforms of the security sector is of course important in itself but it is most often put in relation to development which highlights a mutuality. Another aspect of security that is highlighted in the document Policy for Global Development 2005/05 is how the senders bridge the national and the global when they motivate why a strong international Swedish contribution is desirable. They write as follows:

” International cooperation to deal with crises and armed conflict (such as cooperation against terrorism and for disarmament, cooperation against the uncontrolled spread of small and light weapons and for the strengthening of non-proliferation regimes) contribute to international security as well that of Sweden. This is about our own security and that of poor people in various parts of the world. There are therefore good opportunities of identifying measures that promote Sweden’s security as well as equitable and sustainable global development.” (Swedish Government c 2005/06: 24)
Security perspectives in international commitments aiming at promoting peace and security:

In comparison with the documents above, one can identify a slight change in focus regarding the discussion about security. The lack of a clear perspective in the discussion about security, especially regarding human security is not as noticeable as in the documents above. One perspective of security that is visible in the documents *Peace and Security for Development 2010* and *To Prevent Armed Conflicts 2000/01* is the human security perspective. According to their interpretation of the concept, human security is here related to the following: “Human security focuses on the individual's need and right to physical security and health, access to material necessities of life, the right to adequate social and economic base and, most importantly, respect for her or his personal privacy and freedom.” (Swedish Government I 2000/01: 9). The Ministry of Foreign Affairs also argue that the broadening of the security concept is more holistic and contains security centred around the state as well as human security, which is according to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs a precondition for societal stability which in turn is a precondition for regional and international peace and security (Swedish Government I 2000/01: 6).

Compared to the focus on human security that we can see in the document above, the document *National Strategy for Swedish Participation in International Peace and Security Operations 2007/08* does not mention human security at all. In this document the senders clarify the basis for Swedish commitment in international peace promoting operations in the following way:

“Swedish participation in peace promoting operations is ultimately also about promoting our national security and Swedish interests. As its base lies the defence of a number of universal norms and values, such as democracy, human rights, gender equality, human dignity and development. Also contribute in efforts to protect and promote the general interests such as a world order, with its basis in international law, in order to achieve peace, freedom and reconciliation” (Swedish Government h 2007/08: 51).

As we can see in the quote above, there is the same type of argument regarding the relationship between Sweden’s security and the global security that was seen in the document Swedish Government c 2005/06: 24 et alt.
Conflicts a changed pattern:

In the documents from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs it is often reflected up on and stated that the nature of conflicts have changed (Swedish Government h 2007/08: 4; Swedish Government d 2007/08: 10 et alt). The Ministry of Foreign Affairs write that international operations are rarely about promoting peace in interstate conflicts. They argue instead that the biggest risk to our “collective security” is not between states, it has its origin within states and in how individual states act. This description is rather symptomatic and as mentioned it can be seen in many documents (see above).

Findings – the Ministry of Defence

View on security:

In the introduction in the document *A Strategy for Swedish Security DS (2006:1)* there is a writing that could be used to clarify what the ministry of national defence means with security. They express what security is concerned with in the following way” Ultimately, safety is about protecting values, people and self-determination, and to maintain the belief in a democratic society” (Swedish Government j 2006:1). In this document the emphasis is put on societal security, security that individuals lack capacity to manage (Swedish Government j 2006:15). The senders suggests that the objective for Swedish security should be “to protect our ability to maintain our basic values of democracy, rule of law and human rights, to protect the life and health of the population and to safeguard the functioning of society” (Swedish Government j 2006:16).

In the document *Security in Cooperation Context Analysis DS (2007:46)* we also find a writing that could be said to be a definition of what the ministry of defence defines as their main task. According to the writing the main task of the military defence is defined by the Ministry of Defence as to be “the ability to conduct armed combat and that the armed forces is a security policy instrument that helps to protect our ability to maintain basic values and interests” (Swedish Government l 2007:46). In the same document the Ministry of Defence also defines the goals for Swedish security. These goals are to safeguard life and health, to safeguard the functioning of society, to protect our ability to maintain our basic...
values of democracy, rule of law, human freedoms and human rights. Everything that threatens these three principles is seen as a security threat (Swedish government l 2007:46).

Shared views about conflicts:

In the documents from the Ministry of Defence is a repeating theme in which the senders argue that there has been a change in the global conflict pattern. As in the documents above the senders argue that there has been a change in how conflicts are expressed since the end of the cold war. The biggest risk of conflicts turning into armed conflicts is no longer between different states but within states (Swedish Government j 2006:1; Swedish Government l 2007:46).

Security a global matter:

In the document *Security in Cooperation Context Analysis Ds* (2007:46) there are traces of the same global idea about security that we found in the document *Policy for Global Development 2005/06: 24 et alt*. That is that, Swedish security is connected to the global security. In this document we can see that there is a global dimension of security. According to the writing there is an emphasis on international cooperation and the idea that Sweden’s security is connected with other countries security (Swedish Government l 2007:48). That Swedish security is linked with the global security can be seen in several documents the core of the argument is that it has become harder to separate national and international security and Swedish interest from international interests which according to the documents also legitimizes an active role internationally (Swedish Government j 2006:1; Swedish Government l 2007: 10; Swedish Government j 2006:11; Swedish Government j 2006:16.) In relation to that they also argue that Sweden cannot isolate itself, for that can have fundamental consequences (Swedish government l 2007:10). It is argued that international cooperation creates trust and commitments between stats and thus lays the foundation for the collective security (Swedish government l 2007:48). Sweden have a responsibility to enhance international peace and security and by taking part in international crisis management Sweden contributes to international security and fulfils our responsibilities to protect and defend Swedish interests and values (Swedish government l 2007:10).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security and development as defined by the actors – main features</th>
<th>Ministry of Defence</th>
<th>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Concept of security | Security are protecting of values, people and self-determination, and to maintain the belief in a democratic society.  
Objective for Swedish security “to protect our ability to maintain our basic values of democracy, rule of law and human rights and human freedoms, to protect the life and health of the population and to safeguard the functioning of society”.  
Societal security.  
National and international security increasingly coincides.  
Swedish security and interests legitimizes an active role internationally.  
changing conflict pattern | State centric security, related to the security sector and security sector reforms.  
Human security.  
National and the global security are linked and affect each other. A strong international presence is for that reason desirable.  
Security is collective.  
Security centred around the state as well as humans.  
Developmentalization of security. Security is important in relation to its effect on development.  
Cooperative view on security.  
Changing conflict patterns. |
Findings – the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Security and development as a nexus:

When reading the documents with security and development nexus in mind it is sometimes hard to get an understanding of the sender’s position in relation to the potential linkage between security and development. This is mostly because of the lack of stringency in their reasoning’s in the documents. In the documents written by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs one can identify three different patterns in their discussion of security and development that is directly related to or relatable to the security and development nexus paradigm.
The first pattern) is where the idea about security and development as something linked together and dependent on each other is traceable but is made very general. In most cases, the senders discuss security and development in a general way, without being precise in what type of development or security they are refereeing to.

The second pattern) this pattern is similar to the security and development nexus, but in these cases the discussion is not referring to both factors. Most often the security dimensions is missing in their reasoning and are exchanged with conflict which leaves us with a development and conflict nexus instead of a security and development nexus. Indeed, conflicts are on the other hand a state of insecurity, but in relation to security and development nexus thinking conflicts would be a result of either that a satisfactory level of security or development cannot be reached which in turn spills over and affects the other factor (be it security or development) negatively and in total this creates breeding grounds for conflicts.

The Third pattern) where the linkage between security and development is explicitly made and acknowledged. Compared to pattern one, this pattern shows a higher form conceptual distinction regarding the concept security and development. All these three variations can most often be seen in the same document.

One example of pattern one where we can detect nuances of security and development nexus formulated in a rather big and general statement is found in the document Policy for Global Development (2005/06) where they state the following:

“The policy pursued in the different sectors in the policy for global development - Respect for human rights, democracy and good governance, gender equality, sustainable use of natural resources and care for the environment, economic growth, social development and security, Conflict and security, and global challenges / global common utilities - are mutually reinforcing” (Swedish government c 2005/06:6)

In the quote above security and development is being linked together and it also seems as everything is linked with everything without any distinctions and there are no possibilities to deduce if this mutuality is stronger between some sectors than to others. Hence, it seems as if all sectors are equally important and equally reinforcing in relation to other sectors, regardless of the sector. Furthermore, the concept of security is as we can see rather undefined. There are just references to security in a broad sense. It should be mentioned that the document Policy
**Global Development (2005/06)** is the document in this category where a nexus between security and development is highlighted the most. In the same document in the presentation of Swedish Policy for Global Development the sender refers to a conclusion that is drawn in a United Nation’s report which states that ”development, peace and security and respect for human rights are inextricably linked and together form the premise for a life in dignity” (Swedish government c 2005/06: 7). Furthermore, under principle c (conflict and security) the Swedish Government and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs mention that there is a need for greater coherence and cooperation between development and security policy nationally and internationally (Swedish Government c 2005/06: 24). Working towards greater coherence and cooperation between development and security policy also states as a goal in this policy paper (Swedish government c 2005/06: 61). The sender also writes that this linkage should be highlighted and reinforced even further in the future: “The Government seeks to enhance the linkage between issues related to security and development and intends to conduct a dialogue with interested parties about conditions and opportunities to link security to Millennium development goals” (Swedish Government c 2005/06: 75)

In the light of that writing one could assume that there would be an even stronger emphasis on the linkage between security and development in the document from the following year, however that is not the case. In the **Policy for Global Development** from (2007/08) the signs of the security and development nexus paradigm have rather faded away and is less visible in this document than in all the other documents written by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

There are also writings in the documents equivalent of pattern two (Swedish government c 2005/06: 24; Swedish government e 2004/05: 30). One example of this is when conflicts and development discussed as in the following quote “Violence and armed conflict is one of the major obstacles to poverty reduction. Freedom from violence is a basic prerequisite for the other freedoms and rights, and is a necessary factor for development” Swedish government f 2013/14: 35). The nexus between security and development might not be expressed clearly, however as we can see when there is violence (expression of insecurity) there will not be any development

**International commitments aiming at promoting peace and security**
Security and development as a nexus:

In the light of studying the documents, there are reasons to assume that security and development is seen as a nexus. However, this is clarified to different degrees. In the documents related to international operations the patterns described above can also be seen here. The pattern that is the most visible in these documents is pattern one. One example of this is found in the document National Strategy for Swedish Participation in International Peace and Security operations (2007/08). It is here expressed that improved collaboration between civilian and military actors in multifunctional peace support operations should be pursued because as they mention “the link between security and development is central, possible and practicable synergies with development cooperation should always be sought after” (Swedish Government h 2007/08:8). This shows that there is both an understanding of security and development as two factors that are linked and that this understanding should be implemented on the ground. Later in the document the conviction that there is a linkage between security and development is expressed even clearer in the following quote “Security, development, democracy and human rights presuppose and reinforce each other. A stable security situation is fundamental to democracy, respect for human rights and the rule of law and economic and social development to be achieved” (Swedish Government h 2007/08:15)

The conviction that there is a linkage between security and development is expressed clearest in the document Peace and Security for Development 2010/14. In the introduction where the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as explains as follow ”Although the links between security and development is now generally acknowledged and internationally accepted, there is a need for continued development of knowledge and research in the field(…)There is also a recognized inverse relationship between security and development” (Swedish Government b 2010: 8)“If we focus on the selection of words in the quote, words such as “generally acknowledged” and “internationally accepted”, points towards that the sender have embraced the discourse related to security and development nexus and seems not to question it.

There are also writings in which the concepts of security and development is specified and narrowed down. A writing that represents the third pattern and which indicates that there is a linkage between security and development in this document is where the sender discuss economy. They write as follow: “For economically excluded people poverty and the absence of human security are intimately linked, the factors associated with poverty -lack of rights, power and
participation- also provides concrete reasons to that armed conflicts emerges and continues” (Swedish Government I 2000/01: 15)

Findings – the Ministry of Defence
Security and development as a nexus:

In the documents from the ministry of national defence there are just as in the documents above implicit and explicit writings that can be linked with the security and development nexus. The most frequent pattern is the second pattern. In line with the second pattern they argue for example that resource scarcity and increased social and economic gaps increases the risk of societal tensions and that conflicts degenerates into violent armed conflicts (Swedish government k 1998: 9). Indeed, conflicts is on the other hand an expression of and factor leading to insecurity but according to the security and development nexus paradigm the risk of conflicts increases when one of the factor, security or development are not meet and in turn creating a situation where the other factor is unable to be meet to a satisfactory level. But in many cases it is just one of the factors in a two variable equation that is mentioned.

There are also more specific writings regarding the nexus between security and development that is equivalent of pattern three where the sender refer to the nexus and defines security and development in a more detailed way. In the document A strategy for Swedish security Ds 2006 for example the senders write as follow “For economically marginalized people poverty and lack of human security are intimately linked. At the same time, factors associated with poverty, such as lack of rights, power and participation, also concrete breeding grounds that leads and maintains conflicts” (Swedish government j 2006: 19).

The document that can be said to be the most influenced by or at least the document that showcases the most visible connection with the security and development nexus thinking amongst the documents from the ministry of national defence is Security in Cooperation Context Analysis Ds 2007. In this document, one can identify writings that can be placed within pattern one. One example of this can be found the introduction chapter where the sender writes the following “International collaboration to strengthen democratic institutions and promote long-term sustainable development is fundamental to strengthen security” (Swedish Government l 2007: 8). In this writing it is not hard to detect similarities with how
security and development is seen within the security and development nexus. What is rather surprising in these documents is that it is the developmental side of the nexus that are the most conceptually distinct rather than security which could be assumed since these documents have been written by the ministry of security.

5.0 Analysis:

In the light of the material that have been presented above, it is possible to argue that security and development is seen as a nexus and that the security and development nexus paradigm have trickled down into Swedish policy. Writings such as the following enable such a conclusion “the link between security and development is central” (Swedish Government h 2007/08: 8). However, the discussion about the linkage between security and development is in many cases done with the help of the broad concepts security and development and fails to discuss the linkage in a more detailed level. For example, instead of discussing the relation between human security and human development as a nexus they refer to security and development which is more general and broader. This is most likely affected by the fact that the policies are not primarily developed by academics but by elected politicians which results in that the use of concepts is not refined.

By studying the documents it is not possible to argue that the writing regarding the linkage between security and development have been made clearer throughout history. As was clarified above, the strength in the writings in which they try to establish that security and development is linked in a nexus varies and as mentioned above the conviction of this can be made clear in one year and less clear in the next year. Furthermore, the variable level of clarity can vary not only from year to year, but also in the same document.

As been made clear above it is possible to detect three different patterns regarding security and development nexus in the document. The most common pattern that are visible is pattern one and two. Conceptually these patterns are rather problematic, this is particularly so with pattern on because as argued by Tschirig, all forms of development is more or less and even not affected by all forms of security (Tschirgi 2005: 39). Thus, the use of general concepts makes a complex nexus a non-complex matter. One question that is worth mentioning here, brought forward by Tschirig in connection with these broad writings is, what is supposed to
be linked with what, at what level and for what purpose (Tschirgi 2005: 39). It is arguably so that different levels (micro, meso, macro) and different perspectives and point of reference (humans, states, national, global) of security and development affects each other directly to a varied extent which is also argued by Tschirgi (Tschirgi 2005: 39). There is a need to make some linkage more important in relation to each other than others. These questions must be dealt with at a policy level. If not, the polices based on a nexus between security and development will most likely not generate a better result than without a nexus thinking between security and development.

The issues raised above related to the use of broad concepts do not only cause possible operationalization issues, it also causes issues from an analytical standpoint. Since Stern and Öjendal have developed an analytical framework that is developed out of theoretically demarcated understandings of security and development their six nexuses builds on a greater theoretical and conceptual precision and due to that this creates a discrepancy between their six nexuses and the policies. This should not be understood as if their models are uninteresting or unusable in general, it just means that in this particular case a problematic situation arises. This problem is also related to the working process that are used here where the concepts defines the material because there will always occur situations where the findings cannot fit into the concepts. An alternative approach in the line of Stern and Öjendals mapping that would have been interesting to match up their work with would be to not start in theory but to go from real cases and against empirical observations construct security and development nexus narratives bases on what is found in the policies. This would have been an interesting inductive way to work more rooted in realpolitics than in theory.

One observation that can be made from the reading of the documents are that the discussion about development is much more developed than compared to the discussion about security. This is particularly noticeable when the two actors discuss the linkage between security and development. When doing so most often the senders lumps up security into one big concept with one meaning apart from when security sector and in some cases when human security is discussed. This is true regardless of what department it is discussing the linkage. The word development is also the word that is used the most when comparing the use of the words security and development quantitatively in the documents. Altogether, this indicates that the documents are more development oriented than security oriented.
Despite the slightly critical introduction, there are writings that allows for an analysis with the framework that I have chosen. In the documents from the ministry of foreign affairs and the ministry of defence it is possible to identify four types of security and development narratives. When you analyse the writings with the help of the analytical framework it stands clear that in most cases the connections that are being made between security and development by the two actors derives from the same security and development nexus narrative as the writings from the ministry of national defence. The nexuses that are found in the policies just differs at one point and that is when it comes to good governance which according to Stern and Öjendals model belongs to the security –development as a technique of governmentality narrative. This linkage is just mentioned by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The other three security and development nexus narratives can be found in the documents from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as well as in the documents from the Ministry of Defence. In essences there are four different nexuses within the documents from the two departments. These nexuses are security development nexus: deepened, broadened, humanized, globalized security-development, security-development nexus as modern (teleological) narrative) and security –development as a technique of governmentality. In the section above, I have presented the findings that support this assumption, but for the sake of reliability and the transparency I will discuss some of the writings above that contains the four different nexuses. One writing that can be used to illustrate study three nexuses from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is the following writing:

“The policy pursued in the different sectors in the policy for global development - Respect for human rights, democracy and good governance, gender equality, sustainable use of natural resources and care for the environment, economic growth, social development and security, Conflict and security, and global challenges / global common utilities - are mutually reinforcing” (Swedish government c 2005/06:6).

As we can see, in this quote there are several perspectives that are being linked together. If we look at the writings with the analytical framework in mind it is then possible to link the writings with a few of the security and development nexus narratives that Stern and Öjendals framework provides us with. In the light of the writing and the analytical framework it allows us to see linkage between the security–development nexus as modern (teleological) narrative, Globalized security-development, Security development nexus: deepened, broadened, humanized. In the quote they are also discussing good governance which demands a technical ability of the concerned government. This is mentioned as a bio political dimension in stern and Öjendals model which places the writing within security – development as a technique of governmentality narrative.
Another writing that I argued exemplifies the linkage between security and development in the clearest way is the following writing: “For economically excluded people poverty and the absence of human security are intimately linked, the factors associated with poverty -lack of rights, power and participation- also provides concrete reasons to that armed conflicts emerges and continues”( Swedish Government I 2000/01: 15)

Due to the preciseness that the writing shows in both the security dimension and the development dimension is much easier to place the writing within the framework than compared to the other writings. As we can see, the sender discuss economy and if this would have been a discussion about economy in a general sense the writing would have been placed within the security-development nexus as modern (teleological) narrative. However, since their point of departure for the economic discussion is excluded people it is more appropriate to connect it with security – development nexus: broadening, deepening and humanizing.

Without the demarcation in the economic discussion this would rather have been a case of both security-development nexus as modern (teleological) narrative) and security – development nexus: broadening, deepening and humanizing. The linkage between security-development nexus as modern (teleological) narrative and the security – development nexus: broadening, deepening and humanizing is possible but it is not developed into its own category in Stern and Öjendals framework. Most likely since the two perspectives is not theoretically coherent. Security – development nexus: broadening, deepening and humanizing is much more a micro perspective compared to the macro oriented security-development nexus as modern (teleological) narrative. To be fair, I also want to bring forward an example from the Ministry of Defence. In the quote below three security and development nexus narratives can be identified.

“That it is important to address the root causes of conflicts such as poverty, lack of democracy and human rights and over-exploitation of natural resources. International cooperation that strengthens democratic institution and stimulates long term sustainable development is crucial for strengthening security”

In the quote above we are able to see a few different development dimensions that are being linked with security. If we relate the writing to Stern and Öjendals narratives, three of their narratives becomes visual in the documents. First off, due to due to the emphasis on
international collaboration and cross border cooperation and the focus on conflicts the writing relates to *Globalized security-development narrative*. They also put emphasis on democracy and democratic institutions which are aligned with the *security-development nexus as modern (teleological) narrative*. Lastly, they also discuss the linkage in relation to sustainability, natural resources which relates to the *security development nexus: deepened, broadened, humanized* due to the focus on sustainability.

In other word there are reasons to argue that security and development is seen as a nexus. In the documents I find three different patterns in how the nexus in discussed. These three variations touches upon the nexus to a varied degree some more precise and some more general. With the help of my analytical framework I have been able to detect four security and development nexus narratives. In the documents from the ministry of foreign affairs one can identify four security and development nexus narratives which are: *security development nexus: deepened, broadened, humanized, globalized security-development, security-development nexus as modern (teleological) narrative and security – development as a technique of govermentality*. In the documents from the ministry of defence three narratives can be found, these three are *security development nexus: deepened, broadened, humanized, globalized security-development and security-development nexus as modern (teleological) narrative*. As we can see the narratives that have been identified in the documents just differs at one point and that is when it comes to the *security – development as a technique of govermentality* which can only be found in the documents from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. So, to a great extent the actors link security and development out of the same narrative. It is also interesting to see that the narratives that have been found in the documents are both micro and macro perspectives. That we find different narratives aiming at different levels and with different points of departure regarding security and development is perhaps not that unexpected since the policy shall reflect a complex reality which might be impossible to do adequately if you remain in the same narrative.

So what can be said in the light of what has been written above? This (at least according to his analytical frame) indicates that the two departments first off have an understanding of security and development as being linked. In general the actors link security and development out of the same narrative. As mentioned in the introduction linking security and development is motivated on the basis of solving policy issues or because security and development underpins each other. The argument that is used by the actors to motivate why security and
development should be merged together is in accordance with the latter argument. In other words, it is not the coherence argument that Chandler is critical of. On the other hand, when the actors argue why security and development should be merged together they do not back it up with any substantial empirical evidences which can be linked with the other criticism that Chandler brings forward. As mentioned in the chapter outlining the security and development nexus discussion Chandler argue that the security and development nexus paradigm builds more on rhetoric than on empirical evidences. The findings from this study does not contest his critique, rather it does the opposite.

What also can be said on the basis of the findings is that the analytical framework based on the narratives developed by Stern and Öjendal do have baring at an empirical level and can therefore be said to be generalizable. This study is just one study on a limited set of documents and it is therefore meaningful to elaborate further in order to extend and possibly adjust already existing narratives. In the graph below the narratives that have been found in the documents can be seen together with writings supporting the narrative. Since all narratives were not found only four of the six can be seen in graph.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The four narratives found in the policies</th>
<th>Ministry of Defence</th>
<th>Ministry of Foreign affairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>security development nexus: deepened, broadened, humanized</td>
<td>“International collaboration to strengthen democratic institutions and promote long-term sustainable development is fundamental to strengthen security”</td>
<td>“For economically excluded people poverty and the absence of human security are intimately linked”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalized security-development</td>
<td>“International collaboration to strengthen democratic institutions and promote long-term sustainable development is fundamental to strengthen security”</td>
<td>“Climate change and resource scarcity can reinforce already existing risk factors and by that worsen the security situation in developing countries”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security-development nexus as modern (teleological)</td>
<td>“International cooperation that strengthens democratic institution and stimulates long term”</td>
<td>“International cooperation that strengthens democratic institution and stimulates long term”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Conclusions:

In sum, in the text above, I have with the help of a content analysis analysed Swedish policy documents from the ministry of foreign affairs and the ministry of national defence to answer my research questions:

What discourses of security and development can be found in the documents from the the ministry of foreign affairs and the ministry of national defence? How do they conceptualise these two concepts?

How do the actors link security and development together in the documents? How is the nexus between security and development argued for?

In the light of the analytical framework, out of which narratives do the nexus/nexuses identified in the documents derive from and are comparable with?

The first question is of a descriptive character (see graph) and stands for itself but for the sake of being clear a short summarise might be in place. When it comes to security it seems as many perspectives or views within the frame of security is shared between the two actors. Both actors seem to agree with the notion that national and international security is linked together which in turn legitimizes an active role internationally. Thus, security is collective and should be achieved collective and cooperative. Both actors have a macro perspective in their security discussion. In the document from The Ministry of Foreign Affairs we can also
see a micro perspective in their discussion of human security. Both actors also seems to agree that the conflict patterns that are visible today have changed and that the biggest risk of new conflicts erupting is today greater within states than between. It can also be said that both actors puts an instrumental value to security. In the case of The Ministry of Foreign Affairs security is put in relation to its impact on development whilst in the case of The ministry of defence, it is securities ability to maintain living standards, a free and democratic society etc.

When it comes to development there are not as many shared points as regarding security. However, we can see that both actors see development as a conflict preventing mechanism. Just as security was related to development in the documents from The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is development related to security when it is discussed by The Ministry of Defences. When development or poverty is discussed by The Ministry of Foreign Affairs there are some recurring themes such as the rights perspective, the perspectives of poor people on development and equitable and sustainable development, the focus on the individual and that they have a holistic and multidimensional view on poverty. Although, the focus is put on the individual, it should be mentioned that they do discuss macro measures such as democracy and good governance. These can on the other hand be argued to be instruments to reach the main goal of an equitable and sustainable development.

Regarding the second question I have found three different patterns in how the senders link security and development into a nexus. The clarity in which this is done differs depending on the pattern. Different patterns can be found in the same document. Most often it is the developmental side of the nexus that gets the most attention. The argument to why security and development should be merged together is based on the notion that security and development is linked and hinges upon each other. That is, there will not be development without security and no security without development. The coherence argument can on the other hand be seen, but it is not used as a main argument to why security and development should be seen as a nexus.

Concerning the last question, there are writings that can be linked and understood at a deeper level with the help of Stern and Öjendals six security and development nexus narratives which I have argued for above. Four of their six narratives can be found in the documents from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, these are: Security development nexus: deepened, broadened, humanized, globalized security-development, security-development nexus as modern
(teleological) narrative and security – development as a technique of govermentality. Three of their six narratives can be found in the documents from the Ministry of Defense, these are: security-development nexus as modern (teleological) narrative, Globalized security-development and security-development nexus as modern (teleological) narrative. The nexuses found in the policies from the two actors are to a high degree aligned with each other’s narratives, it differs on one account which is the security – development as a technique of govermentality which can only be found in the documents from the ministry of foreign affairs. This implies then that I have reason to argue that their narratives do have analytical bearing on empirical cases.

In the analysis chapter above I have already discussed my findings in relation with the critique that has been brought forward against the security and development nexus (which was presented in the Introduction and in the part called Outlining the security and development discussion). With specific focus on Tschirgi and Chandlers thoughts. Thus, it is no use to repeat that again. What is more important is to highlight what can be said from these observations.

First off, given that the security and development nexus paradigm will remain an influential paradigm on Swedish policy it might be wise to thoroughly clarify, or at least more thoroughly clarify, what should be linked with what and at what level. This could be done in a separate policy paper specifically about this matter. Furthermore, since the core of the security and development nexus is to highlight the need of linking development and security and the civil and the military it would therefore be logic that such a policy paper are written by both the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Defence. By writing it as a cooperative policy it increases the transparency between the departments which could also erase the potential of protectionism that might erupt as a way to secure its own department’s activity (securitization of development and developmentization of security).

In future policies it will also be of importance to motivate why security and development should be linked together, there should also be a clearer discussion of the expected outcomes and goals. This could possibly reduce the risk that failure in operations and projects in post-conflict countries, failed stead and weak states will be blamed on coordination and lack of coherence as Chandler warns us of.

Another criticism that was brought forward above is the lack of empirical proof when the actors argue for why security and development should be merged together. The risk of this as
argued by Chandler, is that it will leave a gap between policy and practice. Since this is the case in the documents studied here consequently, there are therefore reasons to study if this have had the effects that Chandler points out. This is a question that can only be answered with the help of field studies. This is a good start but not enough. Another suggestion for further research at policy level is to look at policy documents at a lower level than those that have been studied here. If we look at policy document as hierarchically structured the documents that have been studied here are at the top of this hierarchy. Thus, it would be interesting to study more instrumental documents in which the organisation and structure of the military could be studied more concrete. With the help of a policy tracing method such a study could answer if the security and development nexus paradigm that exists in the policies at higher level(which this study shows) have had an impact on the army’s work structure in failing states, conflicts and post-conflicts countries or crisis areas.

Lastly, as have been argued above, the nexus is a complicated architecture with regards to operations in post-conflict countries, failed states and weak states. A complicated architecture that have the potential of failing which will leave the more powerful side of the nexus the possibility to hijack the other one’s agenda. Writings such as the following “Sweden's security is closely connected with the global development” at least leads the thought towards that development can be securitized when consequences of failing or weak states development threatens Swedish security (Swedish Government k 1998: 69).
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