

Abstract

“Norway and Sweden- allies in the war in Afghanistan”

A study of Norway’s and Sweden’s foreign policy regarding involvement in Afghanistan

This thesis intends to identify Sweden’s and Norway’s Afghan policies and to explore how these policies can be explained through perspectives of both realism and liberalism.

Study intends to use theories within realism and liberalism to investigate if an overall strategy behind Afghan policies can be identified. The study is based on qualitative-comparative analysis of Swedish and Norwegian foreign policy statements, delivered by Ministers of Foreign Affairs in each of the two countries in question.

The results of the study indicate that Afghan policies of both Norway and Sweden are a mixture of both realist and liberal policies with preponderance of liberal policies.

Use of military force as an indication of realism’s ultima ratio in international politics and liberal policies towards Afghanistan as indications of liberalization process of a non-liberal state.

These two theoretical perspectives can be regarded as a continuum as opposed to two discontinuous opposite poles, when analyzing Afghan policies of Norway and Sweden.

International liberalism is argued to be the overall strategy that is driving the Afghan policies of Norway and Sweden forward.

Key words: Norway’s Afghan policy, Sweden’s Afghan policy, realism, liberalism, liberalization process, security community, liberal internationalism.

Acknowledgments

I would like to use this opportunity and deliver my thank-yous.

First of all, I would like to express my appreciation and sincere thanks to outstanding P.O. Norell for his guidance and inspiration throughout the past three years of MPA 4.

P. O. Norell has contributed with enormous amount of substance and knowledge to the course of Master of Public Administration and Governance.

Next I would like to thank my supervisor Hans Löden for his assistance, inspirations and wisdom.

Abbreviations

ARTF: Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund

CEP: Civil Emergency Planning

CSFP: Common Security Foreign Policy

D: Democracy

DDR: Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (of Military or paramilitary armed forces)

EAPC: Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council

ECHR: European Court of Human Rights

EEAS: European External Action Service

EOD: Explosive Ordnance Disposal

ESDP: European Security and Defence Policy

EU: European Union

F: Freedom

FP: Foreign Policy

FPA: Foreign Policy Analysis

GNI: Growth National Income

HR: Human Rights

ISAF: International Security Assistance Force

KFOR: Kosovo Force

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization

NBG: Nordic Battle Group

NRF: NATO Response Force

NORDCAPS: Nordic Coordinated Arrangement for Military Peace Support

ODIHR: Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights

OEF: Operation Enduring Freedom

OSCE: Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe

P: Peace

PPF: partnership for Peace

PRT: Provincial Reconstruction Teams

RL: Rule of Law

SSR: Security Sector Reform

UNAMA: United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan

UNSMIA: United Nations Special Mission to Afghanistan

UNSC: United Nations Security Council

WMD: weapons of mass destruction

Content

Chapters

1- Introduction; Political and historical background	8
2- Purpose of research and theory	11
2.1-Purpose of the research	11
2.2-Theory.....	13
2.2.1-Realism.....	15
2.2.2-Liberalism	20
3- Methodology and content analysis	25
3.1-methodology.....	25
3.2-Document analysis	26
3.2.1 Sweden.....	26
3.2.2 Norway.....	27
3.3 Disposition.....	27
4- 4.1-Framework of Swedish involvement in Afghanistan	29
4.2.1-Swedish involvement in Afghanistan	30
4.2.2- Swedish foreign policy.....	30
4.3-Swedish statement of government policy, 2002	31
4.4-Swedish statement of government policy, 2004	33
4.5-Swedish statement of government policy, 2008	36
4.6-Swedish statement of government policy, 2010	38
4.7-Swedish statement of government policy, 2011	41
4.8-Summerizing Sweden´s foreign policy.....	46
5- 5.1-Framework of Norwegian involvement in Afghanistan	49
5.2-Norwegian foreign policy	50
5.3-Norwegian statement on foreign policy, 2002	52
5.4-Norwegian statement on foreign policy, 2004	54
5.5-Norwegian statement on foreign policy, 2008	56
5.6-Norwegian statement on foreign policy, 2010	59
5.7-Norwegian statement on foreign policy, 2011	62
5.8-Summarizing Norway´s foreign policy.....	65
6- Categorizing, comparison, tables and discussion.....	69
6.1- Categorizing Sweden´s foreign policies, both in general and Afghan policies.....	69
Table 6.1; Sweden´s foreign policies, general and Afghan policies.....	70
6.2-Categorizing Norway´s foreign policies.....	72
Table 6.2- Norway´s foreign policies, general and Afghan policies.....	72
6.3- Comparison between Sweden and Norway	75
Table 6.3; Comparison of Swedish and Norwegian core values, threats, Afghan policies and resources to achieve security goals	75
6.4-Loaded words.....	78

Table 6.4: Usage of loaded words , comparison between Sweden and Norway.....	79
6.5- Discussion	81
7- Conclusion	90
Bibliography	91

Chapter 1: Introduction

Political and historical background

Some events in history have infamously played a crucial role as a trigger for other subsequent worldwide events with immense global consequences. The assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, heir to the Austro-Hungarian Empire on 28 June 1914 in Sarajevo, Bosnia is considered as such, believed widely as an immediate trigger for the WWI of 1914-1918. Attacks of September 11, 2001 on America, which consisted of simultaneous attacks on World Trade Center in New York and on Pentagon, are also seen as a crucial event, which acted as trigger for the subsequent military actions taken by primarily USA against Afghanistan in 2001 and the invasion of Iraq in 2003. These attacks have shaped global events for at least the first decade of 21st century if not more. Subsequently after the September 11, 2001, USA launched its “war on terror” or “war on terrorism”. On September 16, 2001, the American president at the time, Georg W. Bush on his arrival to the White House made following remarks on question asked regarding attacks of September 11, in which he mentioned war on terrorism.

This crusade, this war on terrorism is going to take a while, and the American people must be patient. I'm going to be patient. But I can assure the American people, I am determined. I'm not going to be distracted....Those who harbor terrorists will be brought to justice. It is time for us to win the first war of the 21st century decisively, so that our children and our grandchildren can live peacefully into the 21st century (President George W. Bush, 2001).

On September 20, 2001, during a televised address to a joint session of congress the phrase of “war on terror” was again used by the president G. W. Bush when he said:

Our war on terror begins with Al Qaida, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped, and defeated. Americans are asking, why do they hate us? They hate what we see right here in this Chamber, a democratically elected government. Their leaders are self-appointed. They hate our freedoms, our freedom of religion, our freedom of

speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other (Bush, 2001).

In the wake of the attacks on America, US government initially issued an ultimatum on September 20, 2001 to the Taliban government of Afghanistan to turn over Osama Bin Laden and al-Qaeda leaders operating in Afghanistan or face military attack. Taliban government of Afghanistan demanded evidence for al-Qaeda's involvement in September 11 attacks and USA's demand were not met and subsequently America launched a war and invaded Afghanistan on October 7, 2001.

The military operation was named Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF). United Kingdom was also along with American government in war in Afghanistan from the initial phase of operations. The U.S. led invasion of Afghanistan was initially without authorization from United Nations.

The International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) came first into existence in accordance with Bonn Conference, which led to formation of the Bonn Agreement in December 2001 that facilitated a multi-lateral partnership among Afghan Interim Authority, United Nations and other participating countries.

United Nations Security Council's resolution 1386 was adopted on 20 December 2001, which was a reaction to the request to UNSC, according to the Bonn agreement to consider authorizing the early deployment to Afghanistan of an international security force. UNSC's resolution 1386 authorized as it had been envisaged in Annex 1 to the Bonn Agreement, the establishment of an International Security Assistance force to assist Afghan Interim Authority in maintaining security, initially for a period of six months in Kabul and its surrounding areas (United Nations Security Council, 2001).

After formation of ISAF, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1401 on March 2002, reaffirmed earlier UN resolutions on Afghanistan; 1378 (2001), 1383 (2001) and 1386 (2001) and endorsed establishment of UNAMA which replaced earlier United Nations Special Mission to Afghanistan (UNAMA). Resolution 1401 reaffirmed UN's commitment to sovereignty, independence, integrity and national unity of Afghanistan and reiterated its endorsement of the Bonn Agreement and stressed the vital importance of combating "the cultivation and trafficking of illicit drugs" and endorsed the establishment of a United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA).

This resolution stressed also provision of “focused recovery and reconstruction assistance“ primarily through the Afghan Interim Administration and implementation of the Bonn Agreement (United Nations Security Council, 2002).

On 13 October 2003 the mandate of ISAF, which initially was limited to Kabul and its surrounding areas was extended by United Nations Security Council, after adopting resolution 1510 (2003) to cover the whole of Afghanistan (United Nations Security Council, 2003). International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) with as many as more than 40 countries have been involved in the coalition efforts in Afghanistan and consists of both NATO and non-NATO members. The core of ISAF has been provided by American forces, followed by British forces.

NATO assumed leadership of the ISAF operations in Afghanistan On 11 August 2003, which turned ISAF into a NATO-led operation. This ended the previous six-month national rotations of command as NATO became responsible for the command of ISAF, including planning, coordination, and provision of force commander and ground headquarters.

Chapter 2

2.1 Purpose of the research

In this research work I have chosen to focus on the two Scandinavian countries of Norway and Sweden and their involvement in the war in Afghanistan. A personal reason for choosing Norway and Sweden is due to my involvement with both countries. I have been involved in Norway through my medical professional life as a medical practitioner since 2005 and as chief municipal physician in a municipality in the province of Hedmark since 2007. In 2008 I started to study Master of Public Administration and Governance (MPA), which is a joint Swedish-Norwegian project at Karlstad University. My participation in MPA was my initial inspiration to engage in this current project, which would focus on studying both Norway's and Sweden's involvement in the war in Afghanistan from a political science point of view, which was one of the interesting subject matters I was introduced to during my MPA study.

Norway and Sweden present some striking similarities and differences, which make this case study of the Norwegian and Swedish involvement in war in Afghanistan of great interest. Socially the two countries enjoy a very high standard of living and politically both countries are very stable democracies. They share a 1630 kilometre long land national border and they have very close historical and cultural ties. Norwegian and Swedish languages are both part of present day Nordic languages along with Danish. These languages, which are referred to as Scandinavian languages or North Germanic languages, are considered as being derived from the same linguistic origin i.e. one of tree branches of Germanic languages which in turn is a sub-family of Indo-European languages. This means a very close linguistic heritage that generally enables both Norwegians and Swedes to have a good level of understanding of each other's written and spoken language.

Work forces in both countries are traditionally highly organized in trade unions. Economically and industrially both are highly industrialized with market economies. Both Sweden and Norway are known for their relatively high personal income tax levels and a very substantial middle class and extensive social security and welfare systems. They have strong liberal values with respect for freedom of the individual as a core liberal value, democratic participation and representation, highly developed social welfare systems and equal opportunities such as equality in access to social services in society such as education, welfare and health care.

Historically both countries have Christian background with Evangelical-Lutheran Church as the major Christian church, while majority of people are secular.

There are highly developed governance structures in the two countries, with separation of powers into three independent branches of powers as executive, judiciary and legislature. Sweden and Norway have political systems, which can be categorized as constitutional monarchies with parliamentary democracies. The strong liberal tradition in both countries is deeply anchored in both societies, in all social, economic and political spheres of life, and because of the relevance to this case I will later in this paper elaborate on liberalism.

It is worth noting that the styles of liberalism both Norway and Sweden exercise can on the basis of characteristics of their systems be identified as “liberal” liberalism also called social welfare or social democratic liberalism.

During the past decade, there have been three Parliamentary elections in Sweden, 2002, 2006 and 2010. Prior to 2006, Social Democratic Party was in Power, with Göran Persson who served as Prime Minister from 1994 to 2006, when Social Democratic party lost the election to the centre-right coalition, Alliance for Sweden. In 2006 and 2010 Alliance for Sweden has formed governments, although after the latest elections of 2010 the government is not a majority but a minority government. The constellation of parties in Alliance for Sweden consists of four parties. Moderate party, is the major party, which is a centre-right, liberal conservative party. The other three parties are Centre party, Christian Democrats and Liberal people’s Party (Swedish Institute, 2011).

In Norway prior to 2005 the coalition in power consisted of three centre-right parties of Conservative party, Christian Democratic Party and Liberal party that held power from 2001 to 2005. The coalition in power since 2005 has been a centre-left coalition consisting of Labour party, which is a socialist left party, and Centre party that is a centrist party. Norway and Sweden present apparent similarities and differences in their involvement on a European as well as on an international level. Norway is not a member of European Union (EU) but is a longstanding member of North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO). On the other hand Sweden has been a member of EU since 1995 but not a member of NATO. At the same time both countries are engaged in the war in Afghanistan despite their different alliances. Norway is involved directly as a NATO member and Sweden is also involved in war in Afghanistan as

a non-NATO member, but through framework of relationship between non-NATO members with NATO, within NATO-led operational command.

In this study, I will look into both countries involvement in war in Afghanistan with respect to foreign policy of Norway and Sweden towards the specific case of war in Afghanistan. This is achieved by looking into available official documents such as foreign policy statements of both Norwegian and Swedish governments, which includes statements from Swedish Minister of Foreign Affairs to Riksdagen and Norwegian Foreign Minister's statement on foreign policy to Storting. Foreign ministries in Sweden and Norway are known as Regeringskansliet and Utenriksdepartementet respectively.

Research questions of interest in this paper with regard to Swedish and Norwegian involvement in war in Afghanistan can be formulated as follows:

What are the foreign policies of Sweden and Norway regarding ongoing involvement in Afghan war?

How can we explain Norway's and Sweden's foreign policies adopted in relation to Afghanistan and involvement in the Afghan war using existing concepts and theories of Realism and/or Liberalism?

Can we identify an overall strategy, as driving force for the Sweden and Norwegian Afghan policies?

2.2 Theory

The involvement of Norway and Sweden in the war in Afghanistan is a consequence of government's foreign policy in each of the two countries. In order to understand and analyse this complex matter that falls within the realm of foreign policy analysis I see the need to elaborate on Foreign policy (FP) and foreign policy analysis (FPA) and some relevant theories in this field. The working assumption in Foreign Policy Analysis is that the state is a social institution or construction, which operates in two environments. One environment is the internal, which consists of all the institutions that are within the territory of the state and the other is the external that is composed of other states and their mutual interactions and relations. States are constantly engaged in intervening in both of their environments. The

dealings of a state with its external environment forms the foreign policy of the state, which can then be defined as strategies, approaches and decisions also decision to do nothing, taken by the state or national government in its relations and dealings with other states and external entities (Smith, Hadfield,&Dunne, 2008).

States implement their foreign policy through different means such as diplomacy and war.

Foreign policy analysis (FPA) is a subdivision of International relations (IR), which (i.e. International Relations) deals with study of diplomatic, military and strategic relations among states and focuses on subject matters of cooperation, conflicts, war and peace. The relevant unit of study here is the state. FPA deals with finding explanations to issues within the field of foreign policy and try to explain foreign policy and foreign policy behaviour of states. This is also what the intention is in this case, which is finding answer to our questions: what are foreign policies of Sweden and Norway regarding war in Afghanistan? And how can we explain these policies?

Foreign policy analysis can also deal with both actors and structures involved in foreign policy. FPA's focus can vary on three different aspects in finding explanation to foreign policy matters. These three perspectives are firstly, role of actors or nation states; nation states are considered as unitary actors. Secondly, structural factors, where nation states are not unitary actors but institutional structures where individuals act on their behalf. And thirdly, decision-making processes.

In this study, the focus is on the foreign policy as policy decisions/ "actions" taken by nation states rather than the decision-making processes.

One very important objective of any state's foreign policy is to achieve security. National security or security of the state is one of the most important concerns of any state and security policies are part of the state's foreign policy. The referent object of security is the nation state. Fear is believed to be the driving force behind attempts to gain security and threats are the fuelling factor behind feeling of fear and insecurity in relations among states. National security policies of the state deal with protection of the state's values and interests from external threats. One of the most important objectives of foreign policy is to attain a sense of national security. When we consider threats to the state's internal values, we have to keep in mind that threats can also originate internally, and then the security policy will be a part of the state's domestic policy. As Leffler has argued national security is about "protection of core

values of the state, identification of threats to those values and adoption of policies to protect core values” (Leffler, 2004).

Nordlinger has in his book, *Isolationism Reconfigured* has discussed both strategy and national security. According to Nordlinger Strategy can refer to ”a state’s purposeful interactions with others”. On the other hand Strategy in its narrowest meaning can also refer to threatened or actual use of force. Nordlinger has described national security as the preservation of the country’s highest values as these are purposefully threatened from abroad, primarily by other states, but other external actors as well (Nordlinger, 1995).

In this current case the rational choice theory is relevant as it can elucidate how assumptions in a theory such as realism are relevant and how theories can be interrelated. Rational choice theory is based on the presupposition that individuals are rational, self-interested, with goal oriented behaviour, making ends-means calculations who intend to maximize own benefits. States are also considered as rational actors who make use of process of rational decision-making based on preferences and profit maximization. The process of rational decision-making consists of setting and ranking the goal, evaluating the possible alternatives and choices, evaluation of consequences and maximization of profit. Two theoretical schools of thoughts within international relations and foreign policy are of most relevance in this case study: Realism and liberalism. They will be used in order to find a suitable framework, which can be used to identify components and elements of interest in analysing this case at hand. The theories are also used to enable us to find explanations to the answers to the research questions.

2.2.1 Realism

The most fundamental school of thought in international politics is realism. It is deeply rooted in insight gained by foreign policy practitioners of “real” politics or “realpolitik“ through many generations. Realism consists of a cluster of theories and related arguments, which basically derive from three fundamental and elementary premises about the general manner in which humans, human societies and world in general function. These assumptions form the underpinnings of realism. Realism’s assumptions are: Groupism, egoism and power-centrism.

Groupism underscores the importance of groups in human psychology and human relations as humans seek a sense of identity and belonging to a group. Group membership can satisfy these needs. Belonging to a group can also foster solidarity that generates group cohesion, which is necessary in human relations as individuals in wider society and ultimately in the world, face each other as members of groups. The same assumption is also valid for nations. Nation-states have been the most important human groups on the international arena for centuries and one of the most important origins of in-group cohesion is nationalism, other contributing factors are language and religion.

Egoism expresses a belief that humans as individuals are self-centred and self-interested and egoism is a fundamental driving force behind political behaviour. A classic realist aphorism underscoring this point is: “Inhumanity is humanity under pressure” indicating self-centeredness and egocentricity aspects of human nature.

Power-centrism emphasizes the importance of power in human affairs and interactions. Power manifestations in form of social influence and control, on the one side and access to and control of resources on the other side, is constantly a source of competition and rivalry in human relations. A crucial factor to decipher and understand politics in any circumstance is the interaction between social and material power. This interaction evolves under the pressure and potential threat of using material power or brute force to restrain or dominate the other side of the argument (Smith et al., 2008).

Kenneth Waltz who is considered as the main theorist of neorealism has put this point as follows: “The web of social and political life is spun out of inclinations and incentives, deterrent threats and punishments. Eliminate the latter two, and the ordering of society depends entirely on the former, a utopian thought impractical on this side of Eden.” (Waltz, 1979).

Realism itself consists of several theoretical subschools of classical realism, neorealism and neoclassical realism.

In *Classical realism* the influence of core realist assumptions of groupism, egoism and power centrism in human affairs implies that politics will often be conflictual in absence of a central

power and authority to restore order. When there is no authority to establish order there will be a condition of *anarchy*. Realists believe that the scope condition of anarchy cause problems for state's security which can bring about potential conflicts for states and is a fundamental cause of war. Anarchy within the realist context is not condition of chaos and lawlessness but absence of formal decision-making authority in international scene, as opposed to sovereign authority within a sovereign state. This underscores the importance of power and conflict in international relations according to classical realist belief.

Classical realists have theorized the great amount of already available experiences into general theories. But in spite of the solid body of theories the weakness of classical realism has been claimed, by critiques to be lacking clarity in when to put a specific realist theory into use for analysing a specific foreign policy issue. To translate a general realist theory into a specific foreign policy issue one has to try to use a combination of knowledge of theoretical schools within realism, in-depth understanding of specific realist theories and a third element of how three factors of assumptions (e.g. groupism), theories (e.g. defensive realism) and conditions (e.g. scope condition of anarchy, use of force) mutually are connected and affect each other (Smith, et al., 2008).

This algorithm suggested by realists is a useful tool, which will be to utilize later, by identifying the factors of importance and relevance in our actual case regarding Afghan war. That is to say I will identify what assumptions are relevant, which scope condition or conditions are present in this issue and which theory or theories among theories available in realisms' repertoire could be considered as relevant and are capable of explaining the issue.

Neorealism has tried to update realists thinking by transforming realism's core ideas into a top-down, deductive theoretical framework, in an attempt to rectify the weaknesses of classical realism which has been due to lack of ability to differentiate between human nature, the internal attributes of states, and the overall system of states. Neorealism has been criticised for failing to take into account some important factors in international relations such as geography and technology. This realization has led to formation of two theoretical sub-schools i.e. defensive realism and offensive realism; the one as well as the other are very significant theories, when we consider foreign policy and security matters as in our current case. Defensive realism suggests that factors such as a strong group identity as it manifests itself in form of nationalism, technological or industrial capabilities and human resources of a

country can make a nation or country more resistant to be subdued and conquered by other powers in an anarchic world. This underscores the importance of domestic factors inside a state, which affect the potential capacities of a state and contribute to possible causes for either war or peace.

Offensive realism takes into account the potential of condition of anarchy to generate conflicts. With no authority to enforce agreement and establish harmony, states cannot feel secure that the conditions of the present-day peace will also remain the same in future. As a result states believe that there is no guarantee against the possibility of other states potentially can develop capabilities in future which can overcome their natural defensive capabilities, putting potential enemies in a position of strength capable of conquering or subjugating others. In the offensive or aggressive realist thinking the belief is based on assumptions that the structure of the international system is not only prone to conflicts but also nurtures conflicts and as a result rational states feel compelled to pursue offensive strategies in their search for security (Mersheimer, 1995).

In offensive realism we can find following characteristics; the essential role of different factors which we have to be aware of in dealing with issues of foreign policy analysis, international structure, role of nation-states as rational actors, pursue of security as a strategic goal for nation-states and offensive strategies as means of reaching state's overall security objective. This corroborates classical realist argument that argues for competitive nature of human affairs under anarchical conditions. This will lead to the state taking counter balancing measures including internal and external balancing. As an example we can mention United States who tries to stay as the strongest military force in the world, by trying to optimize and modernize its military power on a constant basis to keep its military supremacy. This is an expression of internal balancing. Participation by U.S. in military alliances as NATO alliance is an example of external balancing for all parties taking part in the alliance. When states are faced with threat or threats from other entities they will react. Balance of threat theory suggests that states will balance against a perceived threat poised by other states that is to say the state that feels threatened will counterbalance against the perceived threat. Three variable factors constitute threat potential of a state. These factors are firstly aggregate capabilities of a state that is to say a state's overall economic and military potential. Secondly, geography of a state i.e. geostrategic situation and thirdly, perception of aggressive intentions by other states. When a state becomes powerful either economically or militarily or a combination of both, its location and behaviour generally will be perceived as

threatening from viewpoint of other neighbouring states and others. States who feel threatened will adopt counterbalancing measures such as internal and external balancing against the emerging state and balancing strategies will then become prominent features of foreign policy of other states that feel threatened. An example to illustrate this point could be, in this case Norway being a Western country and geographically very close to Eastern block and Soviet Union chose to join the NATO in 1949 to face the threat of Eastern block and Soviet Union, as a member of NATO alliance (Pape, 2005).

Neoclassical realists and neorealists both believe that foreign policy of a country is first and foremost shaped by its place in international system and its capabilities and relative material power.

Neoclassical realists believe that the effect of systemic factors on a country's foreign policy has a more indirect and complex nature, which takes place through effects on domestic factors. Therefore the neoclassical realists take into account both systemic and domestic variables which in combination lead to a specific foreign policy action. Realism and all its variants have the state's power at their core and have a structural approach to foreign policy analysis. In neorealism the structure in international system is considered to be an important defining factor, a combination of both international structure and domestic power factors are important, although nation state is considered as the core actor. I believe the context of the issue in every foreign policy matter, subjected to analysis is very important and therefore the neoclassical realism, which pays attention to the context of the issue, provides a useful perspective. National security from a realist point of view is seen as a vitally important national interest of any state. Realists believe in the concept of the state as being the sovereign and central player. This is the principle of Statism. The other principle is survival, that is to say survival of the state is the first priority of any state and as a result, every state take appropriate measures to ensure its own survival. Survival is primarily achieved on the premise of "self-help", which means that the state depends on its own resources and capabilities in the anarchical international system in struggle to achieve its survival and security. This constitutes the principle of "self-help" (Smith, et al., 2008).

Realists believe traditionally that power accumulation especially military power is the best foreign policy to achieve national security. There is difference of opinion as to either emphasize the role of power or security in this equation. Offensive realists believe gaining more power relative to other states is the best way to achieve national security, this is known as states being power maximizers. A good example of such a state is United States, who tries

to stay as the most powerful state all the time. In other words, offensive realists believe in the anarchical international system where security is not plentiful and states are uncertain about intentions of other states which motivates foreign policy makers of the state to maximize the power position of their own state.

As a result national security of the state is a variable that is dependant on relative power of the state. Defensive realists on the other hand see this matter from another angle, as they believe in the same anarchical condition of international system, in order to achieve survival of the state by “self-help”, an appropriate foreign policy would then be to gain appropriate amount of power rather than overwhelming amount of power. This is security maximization rather than power maximization. Principle of “collective security” is an attempt to replace the realist self-help in balance-of-power system. In collective security doctrine, the “collective” will provide public assurances of security to its members backed by collective will of all participating nations. Collective security is basis for NATO alliance, which is of great relevance in our case. Another alternative is states forming “security communities” where they share a collective sense of identity and security. European Union (EU) can be considered as an example of security communities in this context. Constructivists consider security and threats as social constructions (Smith, et al., 2008).

2.2.2 Liberalism

The second school of thought of relevance is definitely, liberalism. The liberal school of thought is characterized by a fundamental feature, which is the significance and centrality of “freedom of the individual” as a core value. This constitutes a belief in “moral freedom” and belief in the right of every individual to be treated as an ethical subject. Three sets of rights are fundamentally important in liberalism. The first one is freedom from unrestrained, tyrannical exercise of power such as arbitrary arrest, detention and prosecution, so called negative freedoms. These freedoms include freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of conscience, equality under the law and freedom to hold and exchange property without fear of arbitrary seizure. Liberalism also requires rights, which are necessary in order to facilitate conditions needed for promotion and protection of capacity and opportunity for freedom so called “positive freedoms”. Socioeconomic rights such as equal opportunity in access to education, employment and health care services for all individuals in the society. The third

liberal right is the right of democratic participation or representation that is prerequisite to ensure the other two rights. To achieve these freedoms equally without compromising one for the other is a challenge (Smith, et al., 2008).

In order to attain a meaningful combination of social order in the society with individual freedoms, two ethical courses of action or high roads have been suggested by liberal tradition. One is Conservative liberalism or laissez-faire liberalism and the other is Social democratic liberalism also called social welfare or liberal liberalism. Both are committed to a political order through which all rights that can at times be discordant with each other are accommodated. Liberalism has a fundamental effect on the foreign policy of liberal states. It has been seen through the past several centuries that liberalism creates peaceful relations among liberal states “peace among liberals”. Immanuel Kant in eighteenth century mentioned a zone of peace, “pacific federation” or ”pacific union“ (Smith, et al., 2008).

History of foreign relations of liberal states indicates that liberalism has influenced foreign policy in a direction that has established peace, but this peace exists primarily in a circle consisting of liberal states. There are examples of both communist states and pluralist states that have been engaged in wars against each other, as Chinese war against Vietnam and Vietnam against Cambodia, all being communist states. That is to say liberalism has a peace producing effect amongst liberal states. It is believed that liberal states practice a “peaceful restraint” in their relations to other liberal states as liberalism creates restraint in waging war against other liberal states. In other words a separate peace exists among liberals.

This “separate peace” forms the basis for many alliances both military alliances such as NATO, US-Japan alliance and ANZUS that is a military alliance including US, New Zealand and Australia and non-military alliances such as European Union. Second effect of liberalism on foreign relations of liberal states is a type of aggression or enmity towards non-liberal states. This hostile attitude towards non-liberals is called “imprudent vehemence”, which manifests itself parallel to peaceful restraint in foreign relations primarily towards other liberal states. Liberal states have been engaged in many wars against non-liberal states. Liberal imprudent aggression exercised by liberal states has been underlying feature of many wars liberals have waged against non-liberals. Other causes of wars in addition to aggressive imprudence waged by liberals against non-liberals have been blamed as either calculations or miscalculations of interest or mutual suspicions. In relations between liberal states and

powerful non-liberal states a “deeply held suspicion” is often the characteristic feature. As an example we can mention existing suspicion often in relations between liberal countries as Norway in relations with a non-liberal country like Russia or China, which is often marked by an implicit and some times explicit suspicion, often rooted in human rights cases. Third effect of liberalism in the international relations of liberal states is a phenomenon, which is called “supine compliance”.

It can take two forms, either a failure to support allies or a failure to oppose enemies. Self-indulgent isolationism or appeasement has also been seen, exercised by liberal states towards other liberal states in crisis, either economic, social or security wise. As an example for supine compliance, a historical example to mention is WWII period when America was initially standing aside while both France and Britain were in grave danger from Nazi Germany. France was invaded on May 1940 and conquered on June 1940 and Britain was fiercely attacked in a continuous campaign named the battle of Britain, during summer and autumn of 1940 by Nazi Germany. Another shortcoming for liberals has been tendency to engage in policies of self-indulgent isolationism as each state tries to preserve itself in ever changing international equations letting other liberal states to their own devices, some times in difficult circumstances (Smith, et al., 2008).

Generally liberal foreign policy bears the impact of liberalism's zone of peace with other liberal states and their common core values of central position of individual rights, private ownership rights and representative government. Liberals can differ as they choose to prioritize either property or welfare in their international preferences and try to evaluate the risk level of isolation as oppose to internationalism. Liberalism and realism have some ideas in common as they both believe that states exist under state of anarchy but they disagree on the nature of the anarchy. Realists believe in the rivalry or balance of power as a zero-sum game where one parties gain in power means decrease in the power and influence of the competing or the rival party.

Liberals see the contest amongst each other not as a zero-sum-game, but as either positive-sum game or a negative-sum game, that is to say the rivalry amongst liberal states has a more benign nature, where the loss of one rival liberal state is not seen as one's gain and vice versa. In other words positive sum game can be explained as between two liberal states gain of one is also seen as the gain of the other one, a win-win situation.

Lack of ability to coordinate with other liberal states or failure to trust other liberals can subvert the coordination and cooperation among liberal states and it can cause what is called inter-liberal security dilemma. This dilemma can be mitigated through realising the fact that mutual beneficial effects to all liberal states can be achieved by trade, formation of alliances such as military alliances and trade partnerships that strengthen unions against non-liberal states.

European union being a political alliance involving both trade and security matters is a good example of union amongst liberal countries. Liberals tend to focus more on domestic structures and individual differences and believe that the international system's principal influence is not as great as realists tend to believe.

Liberalism plays a very consequential role in shaping foreign policy of liberal democracies both in a bottom-up and a top-down manner, which can be explained as either due to power of public opinion, which is overwhelmingly liberal and demands liberal policies or liberal values of majority of political elite, which promotes liberal policies.

With respect to national security, liberal internationalists have an "expansive notion of national interest" with particular interest in world peace. Liberal internationalists consider threats; such as wars, terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and human rights violations can lead to instability and danger, not only in the directly affected areas, but also in other parts of the world other than the area actual in turmoil.

Traditional threats have been military threats from nation states to others but newer threats have been proved to be threats such as international terrorism, climate change and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (Smith, et al., 2008).

According to Liberal internationalists, national security is dependent on global security and hence the quest for liberal values of free trade, world peace, democracy and human rights. Leffler's approach provides us with more comprehensive tool to achieve the goals of this paper. Using Leffler's approach to national security we can address the key questions of our case, which deals with matters with great relevance to national security as in the core of the definition of national security by Leffler there are core values of the state, identifying threats on the basis of those core values and adoption of policies in order to protect the core values of the state.

This research work will try to apply such an approach in analysing this case. On this basis one needs to identify the core values and external threats to the two countries in question, i.e. Sweden and Norway.

External threats manifest themselves when a state defines its core values, threats can then be defined on the basis of risks they pose to the state's core values.

Moreover events in the international system and changes in the power distribution are contributing to determination of the threats. Policy makers' perceptions play a significant role in how core values of the states are defined and external threats are determined, taking into account the context of domestic politics within which these factors manifest themselves.

Chapter 3

Methodology and document analysis

3.1 Methodology

It is imperative to identify the components of importance and relevance to the study in order to execute an analysis. That is to say one has to determine which internal values are defined as internal core values by governments of Sweden and Norway. Moreover it is also necessary to determine which external threats both Norway and Sweden consider as outside threats that they are facing. Threats in question are those posed to Norway and Sweden's core values and security. In addition I need to identify which foreign security policy goals and objectives both countries have and which instruments and resources are being utilized to obtain foreign policy objectives especially in relation to Afghan war involvement. Subsequently on this basis it will be possible to identify their Afghan policies and analyse the type of foreign security policy Sweden and Norway apply with regard to Afghanistan and ascertain if there is an overall strategy, which can explain the policies. Using official documents including foreign policy statements by Swedish and Norwegian governments outlining their respective government's foreign and security policy in general and policy regarding Afghan war in particular, I will try to extract components needed to execute this study as outlined above.

Primarily will be used a qualitative-comparative methodology, which consists of reading the foreign policy documents of Swedish and Norwegian governments closely and extracting the points relevant to the case at hand, according to the working framework, summarise and list the main findings of relevance for each document, and if possible detect and recognize, the ideological positions or specific policies, which are characteristic of any theoretical school of thought like; liberal, realist, mixture of both or neither for each studied document.

More specifically, Swedish and Norwegian foreign policy documents will be used, where six time spots have been selected relating to specific years of 2002, 2004, 2008, 2010 and 2011. These years have been chosen to gain insight into the policies of both countries over the time period of interest since 2001 till now. The time period can be divided into different phases: a-start phase (2002, 2004), b-between start and prior to present phase (2008, 2010) and c-present phase (2011).

2008 has been selected as one of the years to be included because in 2008 Sweden issued two national strategies, one *National Strategy to meet threat of terrorism* and the other *National Strategy for Swedish participation in international peace support*.

There will also be a brief look into these two strategies documents issued by Swedish government, although they are not included in the main list of documents in the study. Documents will be studied in a chronological order.

3.2 Document analysis

This study is a qualitative study and documents that are included in the study will be subjected to qualitative document analysis in order to gather and register the data. Data that are relevant and interesting to the study are foreign policies with respect to Afghanistan as it is the focus of the study, foreign policies in general, expressions of values which can be considered as the state's internal value, in addition to conditions, factors and elements consider by each of the countries in question as threats.

For each country, the selected documents that have been included in the study, will be studied thoroughly and content of documents that are relevant to the research questions, i.e.

Afghan policies, general foreign policies of relevance to the case, internal values of the state and external threats will be extracted.

For each document, the findings of document analysis will be presented in a section named as document analysis, within four topics of foreign policies in general, Afghan policies, internal values and (external) threats.

In addition to the qualitative content study of each document, a quantitative test or evaluation of the documents will be performed, by enumerating the times specific "loaded words" have been used in each document.

In this regard "loaded words" of interest will be; security, freedom, democracy, human rights, threat, terrorism and name of Afghanistan. This will give us an overview of the type of language, which has been used by each government's foreign policy makers in these documents. The data will be used to make a comparison in the usage of language with respect to the "loaded words" between Swedish and Norwegian policy makers.

3.2.1 Sweden

In the case of Sweden, Sweden's foreign policy declarations will be used as material. These documents are also called statement of Government Policy in the Parliamentary Debate on Foreign Affairs that takes place in February each year. Sweden's Minister of Foreign Affairs

makes the foreign policy statement to Riksdagen on an annual basis. As noted above I will use foreign policy declarations relating to following years: 2002, 2004, 2008, 2010 and 2011.

3.2.2 Norway

In the case of Norway, government documents known as “statement or address by Minister of Foreign Affairs to the Storting on Foreign Policy” will be used as material.

These statements or addresses are delivered to the Storting by Minister of Foreign Affairs, on regular basis, one or several times a year. Documents which will be studied are from the same years as for the Swedish documents, i.e. following years: 2002, -04, -08, -10 and 2011, according to the chronological order. There could be multiple strata of investigation, some of which are mentioned in the following: **1**-Swedish and Norwegian governments’ foreign policies (core values, threats, strategies, goals, actions, resources to be used) regarding involvement in Afghan war. **2**-Countries international and/or regional commitments regarding involvement in War in Afghanistan, such as commitment to NATO in case of Norway or commitment to EU in case of Sweden. **3**-Public opinion towards involvement of Norway and Sweden in Afghan war from start until now. However here in this paper, the study will be concentrated primarily on the first point mentioned above. In the following chapters Swedish and Norwegian involvement in war in Afghanistan will be studied.

3.3 Disposition

In chapter two the research questions were introduced and thereafter concepts and theories relevant to the research questions were explained.

The methodology has been presented in chapter three. In chapter four Swedish case will be explored with respect to Afghan policies, internal values and external threats, using documents of Statements of Government Foreign Policy that are included in the study relating to years: 2002, 2004, 2008, 2010 and 2011.

Then the analysis of documents will be performed in order to identify the relevant data, such as Afghan policies, internal values and external threats for each of the documents and at the end of the chapter, the findings will be summarized.

In chapter five, Norwegian case will be studied in the same manner as in the Swedish case, using foreign policy statements of the Norwegian government for the same years and at the end of the chapter results of the document analysis will be summarized to highlight the findings.

In chapter six the Swedish and Norwegian foreign policies both general and Afghan policies in particular, identified in chapters four and five, will be organized in separate tables 6.1 and 6.2, respectively and policies will be categorized according to the nature of the policies as being either liberal, realist, both or neither. Then a comparison will be made between Sweden and Norway in table 6.3.

Discussion of the research and answers to research questions will be in chapter six.

In chapter seven a conclusion will be presented as brief recapitulation of the answers to the research questions.

Chapter 4

4.1 Framework of cooperation between Sweden and NATO and Swedish involvement in Afghanistan

One need to clarify the framework within which, Sweden has been involved in ISAF, which is a NATO-led operation. Swedish case will be studied here first and Norwegian case study will proceed after that. Sweden's participation in ISAF has been within framework of cooperation between NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) and non-NATO members, which includes several settings such as Partnership for Peace (PFP), Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), NATO-led crisis management operations such as ISAF in case of Afghanistan. Sweden's cooperation with NATO within the framework of Partnership for Peace (PFP) has been in place since 1994. Sweden is a member of EU and as a result it adheres to EU foreign and security policy.

The Treaty of Lisbon has created two new institutions, which has consequences on EU's external action.

These newly formed positions and structures are firstly, a president of European Council (renewable 2 1/2 year term) and secondly, a High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (5 year term). High Representative is assisted by European External Action Service (EEAS).

Swedish membership in EU means that Sweden participates in the EU Common Foreign Security Policy (CFSP), where common goals are agreed upon by member states. According to the government viewpoint reflected by Swedish Foreign Ministry, the EU's Common Foreign Security Policy (CFSP) is part of Sweden's foreign policy.

The common goals set by CFSP are severalfold. Firstly, to safeguard the common values, fundamental interests, independence and integrity of European Union.

Secondly, strengthening the security of the union. Thirdly, to preserve peace, strengthen international security, to promote international cooperation, to develop and consolidate democracy, rule of law, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

EU member states have agreed on a security strategy and jointly express the common view of the world in terms of security-related matters and how to formulate the strategic goals of the EU. From viewpoint of Swedish government, membership in the EU means that Sweden is a member of a political alliance, where member states do not have defense obligations in relation to each other but are engaged in collective responsibility for Europe's security.

4.2.1 Swedish involvement in Afghanistan

With respect to post 9/11 war in Afghanistan, Sweden has taken part in the Afghan war by contributing to International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), since its establishment at the end of 2001. ISAF was not initially NATO-led, but later became a NATO-led operation. Within the framework of ISAF, Sweden has since 2006 been in charge of the Provincial reconstruction team (PRT) in Mazar-e-Sharif in northern Afghanistan. The Swedish contribution consists of around 500 personnel and has been responsible for security and reconstruction in northern Afghanistan, in Mazar-e-Sharif area including responsibility for security in four provinces of Balkh, Jowzjan, Sar-e Pol and Samangan. On the official website for Swedish involvement in Afghanistan, following can be read.

Why is Sweden in Afghanistan? UN and the international community face major and extensive challenges in Afghanistan. Sweden wants to contribute to a lasting solution to Afghanistan's problems and therefore takes part in the international efforts in the country. The Swedish commitment to strengthen Afghanistan's capacity to maintain stability and security, democracy and human rights and provide opportunities for the Afghans to improve their living conditions and sustainable economic and social development (Regeringskansliet, 2011).

4.2.2 Swedish foreign policy

The aim is to explore Swedish Afghan policies as well as identifying Sweden's internal core values and external threats. Relevant general foreign policies will also be studied in order to provide a wider context in the study of Swedish Afghan policies.

Each February Sweden's Minister for Foreign Affairs presents the government's Statement of Foreign Policy, also called foreign policy declaration in the Riksdag.

The Statement of Foreign Policy explains the government's position or positions regarding various situations around the world and what course of action government has already adopted or will adopt in dealing with those situations both at present and during the coming year. In this chapter, Swedish governments' foreign policy declarations of years 2002, -04, -08, -10 and 2011 will be studied. Content of each foreign policy statement will be studied in

relation to factors mentioned earlier i.e. with respect to general foreign policies, Afghan policies, internal core values and external threats.

Sweden's Ministry of foreign Affairs is the branch of Swedish government responsible for foreign relations. According to Sweden's Ministry of Foreign Affairs or Regeringskansliet, Sweden's Foreign Ministry together with Swedish missions abroad are responsible for Sweden's relations with other countries and Sweden's policy is pursued via direct relations with other countries and also through bodies such as the EU and the UN according to Swedish Government Offices. According to Government Offices of Sweden foreign policy is described as:

Foreign policy is about Sweden's policy towards other countries. The prevention of risks and threats is an important part of security policy, which in turn is part of foreign policy (Government Offices of Sweden, 2011).

4.3 Statement of foreign policy, 13 February 2002

Statement of government Policy in the Parliamentary debate on foreign affairs on 13 February 2002 marks the start phase of Swedish involvement in the post 9/11 war in Afghanistan (Sweden's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2002).

The content of this and following declarations will be studied according to the analytical framework that has been described in methodology section.

4.3.1 Document analysis; General policies:

According to this statement, Sweden has proposals for an overall Swedish policy for global developments. This statement reflected Swedish government's position on many issues, including EU's role in global peace and security. EU is mentioned as a powerful force in the work for global justice and Sweden works through EU.

According to this statement, Sweden and EU intend to improve protection for people in conflicts and take an active part against human trafficking. Sweden believes that war crimes, genocide, crimes against humanity must be punished.

Regarding EU enlargement, Swedish position was that a larger EU promoted more equitable world and enlargement was a priority for Sweden's EU policy and it was important to Sweden to enhance security and cooperation in Sweden's vicinity in areas such as Barents Sea and Baltic Sea region. Sweden supported Baltic countries to join EU and NATO.

Statement stated clearly that OSCE, council of Europe, EU and NATO formed the foundation of EU's security architecture and United States' commitment to Europe was seen as a crucial factor in the EU's security structure.

According to the statement Sweden's security goals were described as to preserve Sweden's peace, independence, contribution to regional stability, security and strengthen international peace and security. According to this document, Sweden has pursued policy of non-participation in military alliances and wished to stay neutral in case of regional conflicts (Sweden's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2002, p. 9).

Adequate defence capability was mentioned as central component of Swedish security policy and Sweden was active in efforts to promote disarmament and non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD).

4.3.2 Internal values:

Statement indicated that Sweden wanted to make the world a better place and UN was most important global actor for justice. Sweden believed that it was essential to protect rule of law (RL) and to support those states striving for democracy, good governance and sustainable development.

According to the statement, Sweden believed in "equal worth of people" and its demands for values of human rights, democracy and economic justice were based on that belief. Promotion of democracy and human rights stated as being of central importance for EU and Sweden.

Statement indicated that "today's globalized economy and borderless markets" must be matched by values transcending borders based on democracy and human rights (Sweden's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2002, p. 3).

Regarding trade and globalization statement indicated that fairer world was based on open trade and globalization made boundaries between foreign and domestic policy less distinct.

According to this foreign policy statement "Justice, democracy, human rights and sustainable development must be globalized" and Sweden must work for same values in Sweden, EU and

throughout the world. Justice and development should be foundation for global welfare structure as stated in the statement.

Sweden believed that capital punishment violated the right to life and had no place in modern legal system.

4.3.3 Threats (external):

Regarding threats, it was stated that EU and Sweden must take an active and vigorous part in fight against International terrorism considered as a very significant threat. In addition to that, statement raised the issue of threat of ethnic tensions in Europe and else where.

4.3.4 Afghan policy:

Statement indicated that Sweden had been quick to join International security force in Afghanistan and Sweden was active in relief operations in Afghanistan. Sweden intended to invest up to SEK one billion over the following three years. According to the document, high priority was given to women and children in Afghanistan who had suffered from conflict and oppression.

Increasing security was believed as prerequisite for reconstruction of Afghanistan and return of refugees and civilian and military efforts in Afghanistan were important work for global peace and security.

4.4 Sweden's Statement of foreign policy, 11 February 2004

Content of this statement will also be studied in relation to factors mentioned earlier i.e. with respect to general policies, Afghan policies, core values and external threats (Sweden's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2004).

4.4.1 Document analysis; General policies:

This statement stated the same fact regarding Sweden's non-participation in military alliances as in 2002.

With respect to Security, it was indicated here that from Sweden's viewpoint, Security must be built globally and in cooperation with others and security required democracy, human rights and international law. To increase security for Sweden and globally, it was essential to prevent arm conflicts, stop ongoing wars and limit their consequences through cooperation with others. Sweden was acting against civil war, ethnic cleansing, terrorism, human traffickers and organised crime and active in poverty reduction.

Sweden's viewpoint was that, EU's contribution to global security had to be strengthened and Sweden must meet the threat identified in EU security policy.

According to the statement (2004), relationship with United States- the "Transatlantic Link", considered as crucial for Europe's security and underscored that despite differences of opinion, both Sweden and US share the same values, " we share essential basic values of democracy and human rights" (p. 5).

Membership in EU was described as central for translating Sweden's values into action and EU enlargement was believed to have made it possible to solve internal conflicts in Europe by peaceful cooperation. Statement had also called for Sweden to make use of the opportunities as a result of enlarged EU, by adopting active policy and by building alliances, not at least with new member state, Nordic and Baltic countries. Capacity of EU to discover potential crises at an early stage and prevent them must be strengthened. Relations with EU neighbours must be developed.

Regarding security and multilateralism statement of foreign policy (2004) stated, "we are dependant on effective multilateralism for our common security" (p. 13).

A stronger UN would provide a stronger global security and efforts to develop and reform UN must be pursued. Moreover Sweden was seeking to strengthen its capability at a national level, in the EU, between EU and UN and with other organisation to promote global peace and development. According to the statement EU must develop its UN policy and its cooperation with UN.

Statement of 2004 expressed that Sweden's values required a fair and sustainable global development and coherent policy to be pursued by Sweden in the EU and UN. Open and fair world trade considered as an important engine for growth and development throughout the world and development cooperation as a major factor in Sweden's cooperation with rest of the world. Sweden intended to raise its development assistance to one percent of Growth National Income (GNI).

4.4.2 Internal values:

Regarding internal values the statement of government foreign policy (2004) expressed that Sweden's values of Peace, security, poverty alleviation, democracy, global development, rule of law, human rights and international law have their explicit foundation in the UN and democracy, human rights and international law are the basis for security.

Solidarity and joint cooperation to build security on principles of human rights, democracy and rule of law were the guiding principles for Swedish foreign and security policy.

According to the 2004 statement, "Values are not realized by words and ideas. If they are to mean anything, values must be put into action" (p. 1).

If the fight against terrorism was to be successful, "respect for human rights and international law is vital" (p. 5).

The statement indicated that realisation of Sweden's foreign policy required that "an administration meet the highest international standard" (p. 8).

4.4.3 Threats (external):

As described in the statement (2004), Sweden must "meet the threats identified in EU's security strategy: terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, environmental disasters, regional conflicts, civil war and disintegrating states" (p. 11).

International terrorism described as growing threat to the security and to fundamental rights and freedoms. Underlying causes of threats were mentioned as breaches of human rights lack of democracy and legal certainty, injustice and poverty.

4.4.4 Afghan policy:

Sweden was preparing joint action with fellow Nordic countries and other troop contributors to strengthen security in rural areas of Afghanistan, to combat drug trade, terrorism and to facilitate reconstruction.

Sweden has been represented in NATO-led security force in Kabul and as responsible for educating Afghan lawyers in human rights.

As stated by the statement, “In today’s world, security must be built globally and jointly, and entail freedom and security for all. Security requires democracy and respect for Human rights and international law.” (Sweden’s Statement of Government policy, 2004, p. 1).

4.5 Statement of Foreign Policy, 13 February 2008

Statement of the government Policy in the Parliamentary debate on foreign affairs in the Riksdag on 13 February 2008 will also be studied here in relation to the same factors mentioned earlier i.e. with respect to general policies, Afghan policies, internal values and external threats (Sweden’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2008).

4.5.1 Document analysis; General policies:

In this statement (2008) the same facts regarding non-participation in military alliances and commitment to liberal values of freedom, peace and human rights were reiterated as in previous statements of 2002 and 2004.

According to the statement (2008), Sweden would take “a Proactive role in developing EU as a global actor, especially in peace and security policy” (p. 3).

In addition the statement indicated that EU has special position in Swedish foreign and security policy (p. 3). Other important points according to the statement (2008) are, “A broad national consensus must continue to provide the framework for the development of our security policy” (p. 3).

The statement expressed that future security of Sweden seen as founded on community and cooperation with other countries.

Sweden will not remain passive should another EU member state or Nordic country be struck by disaster or attack and Sweden expect the same from these countries (p. 4).

The statement (2008) stated that the new EU treaty (Lisbon), “obliges Member states to abide by the principle of solidarity and fair sharing of responsibility in safeguarding Europe’s security (p. 4). Moreover it indicated that Sweden contributed to Nordic Battle group (as lead nation) and International peace operations should operate within framework of EU, UN and NATO. According to the statement, regarding Sweden’s national strategy, “the aim is to bring

foreign policy, aid policy and defence policy closer together and improve coordination of these three” (p. 4).

Sweden was “proactive to strengthen European Neighbourhood policy”.

Work of United Nations is considered to be of central importance to Sweden, and through “well-functioning multilateralism” many of the greatest problems could be solved (p. 9).

4.5.2 Internal value:

Regarding Sweden’s foreign policy the statement (2008) indicated that, “Sweden’s foreign policy is to contribute to freedom, peace and reconciliation” and efforts to promote democracy, human rights and sustainable development underlie Sweden’s entire foreign policy (p. 2).

The cornerstone of today’s Europe, according to the statement (2008) was the “protection of democracy and respect for human rights” (p. 14).

Regarding globalization, the statement (2008) expressed that, “Sweden will continue to press for greater free trade and competition. The development of trade is an important driving force for good globalization” (p. 20).

With respect to Sweden’s position towards women’s rights the statement expressed that “Efforts to increase women’s power over their lives have a central position in Sweden’s global development policy” (p. 14).

Areas with “democratic deficit” were described by the statement as an area that Sweden remained strongly committed to assist.

The statement (2008) stated that, “Human rights and democracy will be given greater emphasis in the design of our development assistance” (p. 15).

4.5.3 Threats (external):

The same factors as in 2002 and 2004 were mentioned regarding international terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

The statement (2008) indicated that, “there is a need for intergovernmental cooperation that can also deal with threats from non-state actors” (p. 12).

4.5.4 Afghan policy:

According to the statement (2008) Sweden's commitment to Afghanistan described as "long-term" (p. 12).

Sweden was to open embassy in Kabul in 2008.

As stated by the statement (2008) Sweden will be a force to conduct "peace-building and state-building operations" in different part of the world, including Afghanistan (p. 9).

Developments in Afghanistan in past year (2007) are of concern. Opium production has been increase to levels not seen in the last century.

According to the statement "Sweden is seeking to give United Nations a stronger coordinating role in the joint peace-support operations in Afghanistan" (p. 11).

Moreover political and economic efforts must be strengthened in Afghanistan, which required guaranteeing security in the country, through better combination of domestic and international initiatives (Statement of government policy 2008, p. 11-12).

Sweden was closely cooperating with other Nordic countries on future policy for actions in Afghanistan (p. 12).

4.6 Statement of foreign policy, 17 February 2010

According to the 2010 foreign policy statement there were many challenges for Sweden and the EU in the area of foreign policy. The following are the elements of interest to our case with respect to the same analytical framework applied to all documents. The statement of 2010 is the first foreign policy statement under Treaty of Lisbon (Sweden's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2010).

4.6.1 Document analysis; General foreign policies

Regarding the global situation, the statement (2010) has acknowledged the state of multipolarity and stated that, "Through European cooperation nations of Europe can bring their influence to bear in multi-polar world" (p. 2). Moreover the statement has added that, "the world of tomorrow will be shaped to a great extent by Asia's emerging strength" and Sweden must take action to "harness the opportunities and meet the challenges that this entails" (p. 7).

According to the statement, Treaty of Lisbon seen as a decisive step in strengthening the EU as global actor by "matching its economic weight with political power" (p. 2).

The same facts regarding being part of a political alliance and Sweden will not remain silent if other EU members are attacked has been stated in this document as in previous documents.

It has also been stated that, “Our foreign policy is a part of the common European foreign policy, and a decisive part of our day-to-day work is about being involved in shaping and communicating this.” (p. 2).

Regarding the question of disarmament, the foreign policy statement of 2010 has stated, “Our goal remains a world without nuclear weapons” (p. 12).

With respect to trade and globalization, foreign policy statement of 2010 has stated that “Free flow of information and global electronic infrastructure are a foundation for economic development and greater freedom in the world” (p. 8).

The statement of 2010 has also addressed the question of energy security. According to the statement:

“Energy issues are an integral part of foreign and security policy... We must therefore take the role of energy issues into account in our foreign policy analysis and our actions. And at the same time we will use our foreign policy tools to promote security of supply to Europe.”
(Foreign policy statement, 2010, p. 12).

According to the statement, Sweden will use foreign policy tools to promote security of energy supply for Europe.

Poverty reduction is the key point of departure for all Swedish development policy. Regarding the Treaty of Lisbon, the statement of 2010 stated:

As a result of the Treaty of Lisbon, Sweden’s foreign policy has become even more strongly integrated in the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union. This gives Sweden a new responsibility and new opportunities to work for freedom, peace and reconciliation in the world around us (Sweden’s Statement of Government Policy/ Foreign Policy declaration, 2010, p. 14).

4.6.2 Internal values:

According to the statement (2010), EU as a global actor has come into being, as a result of

“Institutional reforms and political leadership” and EU’s success will ultimately depend on its “attractiveness, economic weight and values-based social model” (p. 4).

Democracy is indispensable basis of European cooperation. Soft power of EU has made countries to move toward stability and prosperity. Globalisation brings freedom and prosperity.

The statement (2010) stated further that, “Effective multilateralism” is a cornerstone of Swedish and EU foreign policy and “A strong and well functioning UN is a prerequisite for effective multilateralism (p. 7).

Regarding human rights, the statement stated, “Defense of human rights is a linchpin of Swedish foreign policy” (p. 8).

4.6.3 Threats (external):

The statement of 2010 stated that, “In a globalised world, foreign policy risks know no borders” (p. 9) and threats that originating far away from Sweden can be as palpable as those threats originating in Sweden’s geographic proximity.

According to the statement, terror groups active in Afghanistan and neighboring Pakistan carry out attack with far reaching geopolitical consequences. In addition, “Ninety percent of all heroin sold in our country” comes from Afghanistan (p. 9).

Regarding international terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, there are statements conveying the same positions as in the previous statements of 2002, 2004 and 2008.

4.6.4 Afghan policy:

Regarding the Sweden’s involvement in Afghanistan statement stated that, “Sweden’s commitment in Afghanistan is based on our steadfast determination to help the Afghan people build up a functioning state, lay the foundation for representative government, combat poverty and promote long-term stability” (Sweden’s Foreign Policy statement, 2010, p. 9).

In addition to that the statement further explained that Sweden’s commitment in Afghanistan was determined by the realization that groups that threaten “the fragile reconstruction process” in Afghanistan, also represent threat to the rest of the world.

4.7 Statement of foreign policy, 2011

The latest statement of foreign policy was delivered on 16 February 2011 by Foreign Minister Bildt. Document analysis will be executed in the following.

(Bildt, C., Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden, Regeringskansliet, 2011).

4.7.1 Document analysis; General foreign policies:

The statement (2011) started with expressing, "Europe's voice is needed in the world and Sweden's voice is needed in Europe. The European Union must be a strong voice for freedom and a strong force for peace". Moreover it has stated that, "European foreign policy is our foreign policy" (p. 1).

According to the statement (2011), "Membership of the European Union means that Sweden is part of political alliance and take its share of responsibility, in the spirit of solidarity, for Europe's security" (p. 3). Moreover Sweden contributed to Nordic Battle group (as the lead nation) and indicated that Sweden believed that international peace operations should operate within framework of EU, UN and NATO.

Statement (2011) has added that "Sweden is taking a proactive role in efforts to strengthen the European Union's capacity to contribute to civilian and military crisis management" (p. 3). The statement has stated that future security of Sweden founded on community and cooperation with other countries and "Sweden will not remain passive if another EU member state or Nordic country suffer a disaster or an attack" (p. 3).

Moreover statement has indicated that Sweden was actively involved in developing EU as a global actor, especially in peace and security policies. EU has special position in Swedish foreign and security policy. Broad national consensus provides framework for the development of Sweden's security policy.

Regarding cooperation and multilateralism the statement (2011) has stated:

"Global challenges require effective multilateralism and global forms of governance. A strong and well-functioning United Nations is a prerequisite for effective multilateralism, which is a cornerstone of Swedish and European foreign policy." (p. 12).

According to the statement:

The treaty of Lisbon opens up opportunities for European Union to promote democracy and human rights around the world...A Stronger union raises expectation – and those of the rest of the world- of an attentive, powerful and responsible Europe. (p.1)

Statement added that, during the past year European External Action Service (EEAS) has been established as a key tool for achieving an effective coherent European foreign policy and Sweden continues to contribute to development of EEAS with view to pursuing strategically important issue on the global arena.

Regarding the enlargement of EU, the statement stated that, “Europe does not end at the outer border of the European Union” (p. 4).

Statement has expressed that, Turkey’s democratization process has moved forward. Turkish EU membership, once conditions are met, would strengthen Turkey and EU.

With respect to Russia, statement stated that, it is in EU’s interest that Russia develops into a partner, but Russian institutions must be modernized, for Russia to operate under rule of law with full respect for human rights and democracy (p. 6).

The starting point for Sweden’s overall development policy described as poverty reduction by promoting sustainable and equitable development, human rights, democracy and a strong civil society. Sweden’s development policy is based on solidarity and takes a holistic approach.

Sweden’s economic stability enhances its opportunities to pursue an active foreign and development policy.

Regarding globalization it has been stated, “Globalization influences our security policy interests” (p. 13).

According to the statement, Sweden is seen as one of the world’s leading humanitarian actors, which provides support in humanitarian crises primarily through UN.

4.7.2 Internal values:

With respect to internal values of peace, freedom and human rights, there are statements as earlier years of 2002, 2004, 2008 and 2010. According to the statement, in the context of EU cooperation, Sweden has a responsibility to contribute to freedom, peace, security and development “in our immediate vicinity and globally” (p. 1).

Sweden's commitment to freedom and democracy south of our union must be just as strong as our commitment to freedom and democracy east of our union. Sweden has discreetly provided tools to break through regimes' Internet blockades. Freedom of Internet paves the way for people's freedom (p. 2).

According to the statement, Nordic identity fits within framework of European identity.

The statement of 2011 stated that, EU's relations with its strategic partner countries create improved conditions for asserting the EU values and United States is the EU's principal strategic partner (p. 6).

Regarding values and globalisation, the statement has expressed that international law and respect for human rights are "precondition for sustainable globalisation" (p. 10). Moreover it has stated that, "Freedom of worship is an integral part of an open society" (p. 11).

4.7.3 Threats (external):

Regarding international terrorism and proliferation of WMD, the same was stated as in earlier statements of 2002, -04, -08 and 2010.

Emergence of violent extremism and latent conflicts in southern Caucasus were mentioned as threatening the stability of the entire region (p. 3).

Regarding the threats originating from Afghanistan, the statement stated that, "terrorist groups with bases in border areas between Afghanistan and Pakistan pose a potential regional and global threat" (p. 7).

One of the most important challenges facing Sweden and international community according to the statement (2011) is, "to secure and facilitate the flows that give globalisation its power" (p.13).

4.7.4 Afghan policies:

Regarding Afghanistan the foreign policy statement of 2011 stated that, Swedish commitment in Afghanistan is strong and long term and Sweden's presence in Afghanistan is based on broad political consensus.

According to the statement, “Sweden’s initiatives in Afghanistan lay a solid foundation to contribute to peace, security and development, as well as to help the Afghan people to build up their country” (p. 7).

Responsibility for security will be gradually transferred to Afghans and this would affect the areas where Swedish forces were stationed. Peaceful and democratic development in both Afghanistan and Pakistan is in interest of Sweden and developing and strengthening relations with Pakistan is also seen as in strategic interest of EU (p. 7).

According to the statement, Sweden provides support to UN coordination efforts to help Afghans succeed in assuming the responsibility transfer. There is plan for all Swedish initiatives to be transferred to civilian leadership in 2012.

In addition to Swedish government foreign policy declarations, during the course of the study I have come across two national strategies relevant to foreign and security policy announced by the Swedish government, through government communications, which are firstly a *national strategy to meet the threat of terrorism*; Government Communication, 2007/08:64, (Reinfeldt, 2008). Secondly is there *National strategy for Swedish participation in international peace-support and security building operations*. Government Communication, 2007/08:51, (C. M. o. F. A. Bildt, Sweden, 2008)

According to the communication submitted by Swedish government to the Riksdag (skr. 2007/08:64) outlining a *national strategy to meet the threat of terrorism* the Afghan case is discussed as being such a challenge.

Swedish government considers its international peace-support operations as a preventive measure against terrorism and hence considers also its involvement in ISAF in Afghanistan as such, an operation with particular importance. ISAF goals are improving security in Afghanistan, improving Afghan government’s influence and control in all provinces and strengthen its capacity to maintain stability, security, democracy and human rights. Strategies for reconstruction in the country including the judicial system are of importance in both planning and executing stages of operations. According to this national strategy achieving regional security in Afghanistan is also important to global security which according to the

government strategy statement can be achieved by “hindering the spread of Islamist extremism and international terrorism” emanating from Afghanistan (Reinfeldt, 2008).

National strategy for Swedish participation in the international peace-support and security building operations. According to this document, Sweden’s involvement in operations and conflicts is an act of solidarity with people and regions that are in conflict situation or are under threat of potential conflict. The foundation upon which national strategy for engagement in peace-support and security building operations is built is to protect “universal norms” such as democracy, freedom and human rights in addition to protection and promotion of peace and reconciliation and in general the world order.

Military and civil reconstruction efforts should be seen as supplementary to Sweden’s support for security and development in any region.

Geographically distant threats are in this day and age becoming as palpable as threats closer to “home”. Sweden sees threats to international security as threats to Swedish security and sees Swedish security to be strengthened by integration in EU. Sweden considers its membership in organizations of EU and UN and its close cooperation with NATO as key elements in Swedish foreign, security and defense policy. EU’s role in European security policy arena has been strengthened after Lisbon Treaty, Sweden acknowledges that EU cooperation has special place for Swedish foreign policy.

Effective multilateral system is a decisive factor for success in peace-support operations and multilateral players in this arena of peace-support work as Sweden sees are: UN, EU, NATO and OSCE (Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe).

Foreign policy instruments available for Sweden as a result of membership in EU include a wide range of alternatives from development policy, trade policy, political dialogue to civil and military crisis management operations under ESDP.

Policy instruments available for Sweden, which are relevant in contribution to peace and security, are primarily military or civilian peace-support, conflict preventing measures, mediations, dialogue, sanctions or reconstruction operations.

Sweden’s objectives were described as: To strengthen cooperation between EU and NATO as EU is increasing its crisis management capacity and both organizations have civil and military operations in Afghanistan. Sweden would increase its capabilities to operate in international peace-support activities under every possible command as UN, EU or NATO.

According to the document, Sweden believed that in post conflict countries there was often great need for Security sector reforms (SSR), which included Armed forces and juridical authorities.

It was important to contribute to Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) operations prior to or simultaneous to Security Sector Reform operations. Swedish armed forces must contribute to achieve Sweden's security policy objectives (C. M. o. F. A. Bildt, Sweden, 2008).

4.8 Summarizing Swedish foreign policy

To recapitulate and summarize the content of the review of Swedish foreign policy statements, the essential policy points that have been extracted will be listed here.

In instances where specific policies can be related to a theory, it will be noted in italics in front of the relevant policy in question.

4.8.1 Summarizing Swedish foreign policy, general policies:

The prevention of risks and threats, which are important part of Swedish foreign and security can be interpreted here as *Threats and conflicts as source of war (Realism)*.

The role of UN as important global actor for justice, peace, security, democracy, liberal freedoms can be interpreted as: *UN representing the current world order, core liberal values rooted in UN*.

Sweden's values are rooted in liberal values and have their explicit foundation in the UN. Promotion of liberal values are central to Sweden and EU. EU is considered by Sweden as a force for global peace and Sweden working through EU. Statements such as EU's foreign policy is "our foreign policy" and EU cooperation is key in Swedish foreign policy are interpreted as Sweden being in the *Liberal zone of peace and security community of EU*.

Sweden stresses the importance of multilateralism and importance of effective multilateral systems and cooperation with UN, EU and NATO. Sweden considers membership in EU and UN in addition to close cooperation with NATO, as key elements of Swedish foreign policy. This is interpreted as indication of *multilateralism* that is a *characteristic of liberal internationalist strategy*.

Sweden does not take part in military alliances but at the same time Sweden is a member of a political alliance of EU. Sweden's emphasizes its dual Nordic and European identity.

Sweden reiterates that it will not remain silent if other Nordic countries are attacked. These are interpreted as Sweden being in the *security community of EU* and *rejecting collective defence/security of NATO*. Moreover it can be interpreted as security within the *liberal zone of peace* and sign of *realism's assumption of groupism* within this context.

United States commitment to Europe considered as a crucial factor in the EU's security structure. Importance of relations with USA for Sweden can be interpreted as Sweden, acknowledging the role of USA as a superpower at the same time, both belong to the same *liberal zone of peace* and Sweden's external balancing in form of strong relationship between Sweden and the Superpower or the *hegemonic power (Realism)*.

At the same time acknowledging the multi-polar world. Through European cooperation nations of Europe can bring their influence to bear in a "multi-polar world". These statements are seen as realist way of considering the world order as *uni-polar, bi-polar or multi-polar* and *theory of balance of power*.

Swedish armed forces must contribute to achieve Sweden's security policy objectives. Armed forces have dual task, defending Swedish territory and contributing to peace and security on international arena. This is interpreted as expression of *realism's internal balancing*.

In a globalised world, foreign policy risks know no border. Threats originating far away, can be as palpable as threats originating in Sweden's geographic proximity. Considering threats from Afghanistan and geographically distant threats. Europe does not end at the outer border of the European Union. "Newer threats" such as internal terrorism, emergence of violent extremism and disintegrating states are perceived as threats to Sweden. These statements are interpreted as expressions of *liberal expansive notion of security and national interest*.

Globalization and free trade brings freedom, prosperity and interdependence that is interpreted as indication of *globalization as a liberal value*.

4.8.2 Summarizing Swedish Afghan policies:

Substantial part of the statements regarding Sweden's Afghan policy have stated that, Sweden considers terrorist groups in Afghanistan as being threat to both regional and global security. Moreover Sweden wants to achieve security both regionally and globally by hindering spread of extremism and international terrorism from Afghanistan and democratic development in Afghanistan is described also as being in Sweden's interest. These policies have been

interpreted as, *threat as source of insecurity, conflict and war* from viewpoint of *realism*, as well as realist assumption of *egoism* and self-interest. On the other hand, same policies can be interpreted from a liberal viewpoint, as *liberal expansive notion of security and national interest, liberal quest for global peace and security and liberal imprudent vehemence towards non-liberals*.

Sweden's commitment to Afghanistan is described in the documents as long-term, based on broad political support and Sweden's policies are to strengthen nation-building and state-building in Afghanistan. Creating and maintaining stability, security, democracy and human rights in Afghanistan and bring institutions under democratic governance and insight. These policies are interpreted as *liberalization process of the non-liberal country or state*. Using military force in Afghanistan is also interpreted as both realism's idea of military force as *ultima ratio* or the last resort in the arena of international politics and *liberal imprudent vehemence towards non-liberal states*.

Chapter 5

5.1 Framework of Norwegian involvement in Afghanistan

Norway is a long-standing member of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

NATO was formed in 1949 to counter the threat of communism posed by then Soviet Union and its sphere of influence in Eastern Europe, which then together formed the Eastern block. Then Soviet Union and eight other Eastern block countries were members of a mutual defence treaty commonly known as Warsaw pact that was established by Soviet Union's initiative in 1955. The Western Europe along with USA and Canada formed the western alliance under NATO umbrella was a counterbalance to the Warsaw treaty of communist Eastern block. The core of the NATO treaty has been the famous article V of the Washington Treaty which ensured *mutual defence guarantee* to NATO members "one for all and all for one" or the *collective defence principal*.

As described earlier the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) is a NATO-led security operation in Afghanistan, which was formed initially in accordance with Bonn Agreement in December 2001. United Nations Security Council (UNSC) resolution 1386 has been the framework of participation of both Norway and Sweden in Afghanistan since 2001 (United Nations Security Council, 2001).

A brief chronological overview of Norwegian contribution and involvement in the post 9/11 Afghan war can be described as follows. Norway has been contributing to the war in Afghanistan in different ways, partly through contribution to US-led Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) and also through engagement in ISAF that is now a NATO-led operation. Initially ISAF's mandate was in Kabul area until October 2003 when the mandate of ISAF was expanded by UNSC to cover throughout Afghanistan.

Norway has also been contributing with Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRT) in Meymaneh area, which is the capital of Faryab province. Norway's contribution to ISAF consists of a fighting force around 500 soldiers. Norway has established representation in Kabul since December 2001 when Norwegian embassy was put in place, originally as a two-person mission. Norway has also been involved in humanitarian assistance and development cooperation in Afghanistan by contributing to Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund (ARTF). In the late 2001, the first Norwegian troops were deployed in support of American

operation Enduring freedom (OEF), that contribution consisted of Special Forces along with demining and Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) personnel who helped to clear the airports in both Kabul and Kandahar for explosives.

In 2002, Norway helped as well with transport plane (C-130) and transport control at Kabul airport still in support of operation enduring freedom. In April 2002, Norway moved its National contingent governance (NCG) and national support element (NSE) from Kandahar to Kabul. At the end of 2002, Norway deployed six F-16 fighter aircrafts supporting the operation Enduring Freedom and in 2003, Norwegian Special Forces were deployed in support of Operation Enduring Freedom for the second time for duration of 6 months. In November 2003, a company of the Telemark battalion was deployed to Kabul as part of International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), the force was in charge of security in two police districts in Kabul until the middle of 2004 when it was taken into Kabul Battle group 3 (BG 3) for which Norway was in charge of until January 2006.

In 2004, Norway contributed also to PRT in Meymaneh and in September 2005, Norway took over the responsibility for the PRT in Meymaneh from British forces.

Norway contributed with Special Forces in support of OEF for the third time in 2005, and since then, Norway has had an engineering unit in Mazar-e Sharif that has built Camp Nidaros. In 2007, Norway sent Special Forces to Afghanistan for a fourth six-month rotation and this time was the first time under ISAF's command.

Norway sent its first military advisor to the UN mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA) in 2007, which has been maintained until present day and in 2008, Norway deployed 3 helicopters for medical evacuation to PRT in Meymaneh with 280 Norwegian troops. The helicopters have since then been continuously stationed there. Norwegian contribution with around 500 troops is ongoing substantially located in Meymaneh (Forsvarsdepartementet, 2011).

5.2 Norwegian foreign policy

In the following, Norway's foreign policy will be studied particularly with respect to its Afghan policies. In addition to that the study focuses on identifying Norway's internal core values and sources of perceived threats. General foreign policies of relevance will also be studied to provide a wider context in the study of Norway's Afghan policies.

Norway's Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Utenriksdepartementet) describes its primary task as to work for Norway's interest internationally in order to safeguard Norway's freedom, security and prosperity.

Norway's interests are defined in terms of its strategically important geographical location, open economy and its vast natural resources as oil and gas. Cooperation with like-minded countries is described as best way to achieve Norway's interests.

Moreover an important duty of Foreign Service is to manage conflict with other countries to the advantage of Norway while avoiding disputes. As well as to work for promotion of peace, security, international legal system, economically just world order and sustainable development, in addition trying to find solutions to the problems within the mentioned areas in Norway's interests. According to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs a state's most important responsibility is to provide security for the state and the aim of security policy is to safeguard country's sovereignty and political autonomy.

It is worth mentioning that Norway's Ministry of foreign Affairs is the only ministry in Norway with two ministers. One is the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the other is the Minister of Environment and International Development.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is both preparatory and executive body in issues of foreign policy, economic foreign policy, aid and development. Department for security policy and the high North is part of Foreign Ministry and is responsible for dealing with issues relating to Norwegian security policy interests, cooperation with NATO, OSCE, global security matters, fight against international terrorism, peace operations, international crisis management, arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation efforts.

Foreign Minister holds annually foreign policy addresses to Storting during the year on different issues. They are delivered in form of statements of foreign policy and addresses to Storting. Regarding method and Content analysis; factors including commitments, value declarations and foreign policy goals and threats will be looked into in the following as in the Swedish case. Norway's Minister of Foreign Affairs delivers statement on foreign policy to the Storting each year, some years on different and several occasions.

In this part of the study, documents including statements and addresses to the Storting delivered by Norwegian Minister of Foreign Affairs on foreign policy relating to the same

spot years as already studied in the Swedish case, that is to say years: 2002, -04, -08, -10 and 2011 in the same chronological order, will be studied.

The statement of 2010 is different in a sense that unlike other statements, the Minister of Foreign Affairs' statement delivered, 9 February 2010 exclusively deals with Afghan issue and a second statement delivered in March 2010 deals with other foreign policy issues. With respect to the study's document analysis, content of above-mentioned documents will be studied with respect to Norway's Afghan policies, foreign policy in general, core values, external threats.

Norwegian foreign policy statements available electronically at the Norwegian government website (Document Archive), are not provided with page numbers by the database provider.

5.3 Foreign Minister's statement on foreign policy to Storting, 2002

Content of this and the following documents will be studied to identify relevant data as described earlier.

According to the statement, "The global coalition established in response to gruesome terrorist attacks last year is a clear manifestation of our will to engage in joint action" (Petersen, 2002).

5.3.1 Document analysis; General foreign policies:

According to the statement, Norwegian government was concerned with the elimination of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) specifically regarding Iraq's WMD and their means of delivery. Statement stated that, "reaction to Iraq must be anchored in international law".

Fight against international terrorism, must be won by concerted effort under the auspices of UN Security Council. Military measures must go hand in hand with political, diplomatic, legal and economic measures.

International peace, security and stability were mentioned as goals.

5.3.2 Internal values:

Human dignity, “our democratic way of life”, democracy and human rights were mentioned as values in the statement.

5.3.3 Threats (external):

According to the statement, the most immediate threats to international peace and security were international terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and “those who use such means to attack our societies”.

According to Norway’s Minister of Foreign Affairs, Petersen J., “uncertainty is in itself is threat to international peace and security” (Petersen, 2002).

5.3.4 Afghan policies:

Statement stated that, Al-Qaeda was destroyed, Taliban government defeated and, reconstruction was underway.

Statement added that, there was readiness on the part of the international community to continue efforts to combat international terrorism in Afghanistan, in addition to support for the reconstruction activities in Afghanistan and supporting military operations. Security, stability and Afghan reconstruction were mentioned also as goals.

As Petersen mentioned in this statement, security and stability were basic preconditions to achieve goals in Afghanistan. Stable security situation was another goal as it was considered essential for civilian government of Karzai to consolidate its position.

According to Petersen both US-led military coalition and ISAF were necessary to support the reconstruction efforts and provide assistance to Afghanistan.

Norwegian involvement in Afghanistan was described as “long-term” and wanted to make sure that humanitarian assistance to Afghan people was as effective as possible and supported reconstruction in its broadest sense and as chair of Afghanistan Support group, Norway was working to coordinated efforts of donor countries and the UN.

According to the statement, creating security and stability were preconditions for reconstructing Afghan society and military measures were necessary to safeguard Afghanistan's security, which is part of the reasons for Norway participation in military operations.

The military operations, both the US-led military coalition and International Assistance Force (ISAF) considered as necessary to support the reconstruction efforts and to provide effective assistance to Afghanistan.

These were the perspective of Norwegian participation in Afghanistan as stated by Petersen.

5.4 Minister of Foreign Affairs' statement to the Storting on foreign policy, 27 January 2004

Norway's Minister of Foreign Affairs, Jan Petersen's statement on foreign policy to Storting is the second Norwegian government's document, which is the subject of the study in the Norwegian case.

According to Petersen's statement, "During the Cold War era it was relatively unproblematic for us to gain the understanding and support of our close friends and allies because of our vulnerable geographical position. Now the situation has since changed radically. We are no longer regarded as threatened...But our need for good, responsive partners has not lessened (J. P. Norway's Minister of Foreign Affairs, 2004).

5.4.1 Document analysis; General foreign policies:

Regarding matters of partnership with others, the statement expressed that good contacts and networks based on shared values and interests would often determine the success of efforts, when Nation were facing challenges. In addition, networking mentioned as necessary in order to gain recognition and acceptance for "our" i.e. Norway's views and interests. According to the statement, Norway must be prepared to contribute in areas important to its allies demonstrate readiness to support its close partners.

According to Petersen, Norway's strong support for UN, reflects Norway's determination to take responsibility and aim of Norwegian foreign policy described as being both to safeguard national interests-directly and indirectly and to fulfil Norway's shared political and moral

obligations. The one does not exclude the other and cooperation with EU was given as an example.

Regarding cooperation with EU, he stated:

“ By co-operating constructively with the EU, we are helping to build peace and stability in Europe... supporting economic growth, promoting social cohesion, reconstructing war-torn societies and supporting democratic reform. By doing so, we are also investing in our own security” (J. P. Norway’s Minister of Foreign Affairs, 2004).

The statement further added that, EU and NATO enlargements entail great changes in the foreign policy landscape of Europe and differences of political culture and economic development among NATO allies must be reduced through cooperation and concerted effort. Forced cooperation will lead to inequality and oppression according to the statement.

EU enlargement was expressed to weaken influence of Norway in relation to EU.

According to the statement, EU’s security strategy emphasised Europe’s responsibility for contributing to security and stability in neighbouring countries and strengthening multilateral cooperation to combat terrorism and other security threats, corresponded largely with Norwegian policy.

Statement stated that, Norway had been actively involved in the efforts to improve the efficiency of the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR).

5.4.2 Internal values:

Statement indicated, Norway strongly supported International law and freedom. In addition Norway made efforts to achieve a world based on binding international cooperation.

Norway’s effort to support UN considered as in “our self-interest”.

5.4.3 Threats (external):

Threats mentioned in the statement included: International terrorism and proliferation of mass destruction.

5.4.4 Afghan policies:

Situation in Afghanistan described as difficult, which would take time to resolve. Moreover statement mentioned NATO's continued involvement in Afghanistan as a key topic.

Expansion of areas of ISAF operations in Afghanistan and importance of Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRT).

Norway was prepared to take part in one of the PRT teams in Afghanistan with other Nordic countries and the UK.

5.5 Foreign policy address to Storting, 20 May 2008

Norway's Minister of Foreign Affairs Støre started this address by indicating that the purpose of foreign policy was to safeguard Norwegian interests and to promote values important to Norway. According to Støre foreign and security policy should strike a balance between continuity and renewal.

He added, "If we want others to play relevant role for us, we have to make sure we have relevance for them" (Støre, 2008).

Substantial parts of the address was dealing with energy related matters, challenges and relations with respect to Russia (Støre, J. G., Norways's Minister of Foreign Affairs, 2008).

5.5.1 Document analysis; General foreign policies:

According to Støre, "Foreign and security policies must strike a fine balance between continuity and renewal". He stated that, policy of engagement based on recognition of the fact that Norwegian security and interest must be safeguarded by maintaining focus on "our neighbouring areas" and by demonstrating engagement "beyond our neighbouring areas".

Engagement described by Støre as hallmark of Norwegian foreign policy, which provided Norway with access to key international decision-makers and arenas, which were important for Norway in other contexts as well.

Støre added that, "Norway must build a community of interests with key actors, because we also need partners to promote what is important for Norway".

Støre stated, modern realpolitik was a matter of grasping the breadth of the new global community of interests.

According to the statement:

Norway must ensure to have the best possible understanding of political and strategic developments in the forums for global energy policy where strategic decisions are made....Norway is neighbour to a large country with interests and ambitions in our neighbouring area... this situation reinforces the need for Norway to be part of a strong Euro-Atlantic security structure.

Norway has presence in Azerbaijan and considering presence in Central Asia, these countries and regions are vital “ to our core interests”.

Regarding security policies Støre (2008) stated the following:

The Nordic countries are now integrated in broad European cooperation schemes. We do not consider the Nordic sphere to be the defining framework in the areas such as defence, the economy and trade as was the case in 1940s and 1950s. NATO and / or the EU are the mainstays of the five Nordic countries’ foreign and security policies.

Every country is free to choose its alliances, as we did in 1949.

As Støre (2008) indicated, “The use of military is included in range of tools, but only as a supplement to a broader approach that emphasises political, economic, cultural and social factors”.

5.5.2 Internal values:

According to Støre, “policy of engagement is a value-based policy. A policy that is based on values such as solidarity, respect for human rights, peace and international legal order that protect the weak and restrain the strong” (Støre, J. G., Norway’s Minister of Foreign Affairs, 2008).

5.5.3 Threats (external):

With respect to threats, the statement indicated that, “the greatest challenges of our time can not be geographically isolated. They know no borders”.

Threats mentioned in the statement were: religious and cultural tensions in many societies, including Norwegian society, global competition for scarce energy resources, international terrorism, poverty, climate change, spread of diseases, migration, environmental degradation, conflict and instability.

The statement mentioned that, trends such as democratic values were on the wane and authoritarian forms of government were winning ground, which constituted challenges for Norway.

5.5.4 Afghan policies:

According to the statement, Norway advocated closer coordination of international efforts in Afghanistan. Norway as a member of the core group, was responsible for preparation for the Afghan donor conference, which was to be held in Paris on 12 June 2008.

Støre stated that, “Participation in ISAF has an impact on Norway, both directly, due to the operation’s significance for stabilising Afghanistan...and indirectly, since the operation is also intended to prevent Afghanistan becoming a hotbed for international terrorism once again and to support efforts to combat the country’s growing opium production” (J. G. S. Norway’s Minister of Foreign Affairs, 2008).

Furthermore, developments in rural areas of Afghanistan and mountain areas of Pakistan mentioned as key factors affecting transatlantic and Norwegian security. According to Støre, Military approach alone in Afghanistan was not sufficient and Afghanistan’s future could not be safeguarded by military means alone.

Regarding a new strategy, statement added that, ISAF’s troop contributing nations had agreed on comprehensive political-military strategic plan for Afghanistan, which underlined the need for “Afghan ownership”, closer coordination and regional approach.

5.6 Foreign policy address to the Storting , 2010

Norway's Minister of foreign affairs delivered an address to the Storting on February 2010 specifically on the situation in Afghanistan and another general statement on other foreign policy matters on March 2010. Both documents will be studied together as one to ensure the same balanced content regarding Afghan and non-Afghan issues.

Foreign Minister Støre J. G., in his statement acknowledged that in foreign policy arena, individual issues attract attention and mentioned the attacks of September 11, 2001 and stated the following:

But overriding the individual issues, there are, at different times, various situations or events that define the “ law of nature” in foreign policy. In the last decade the terrorist attack against the US on 11 September 2001 stands out as such an event. Challenges relating to national security have dominated foreign and security policy- in terms of both approach and actions- during this period (J. G. S. Norway's Minister of Foreign Affairs, 2010).

5.6.1 Document analysis; General foreign policies:

According to Støre, new powerful forces of change were affecting all areas including foreign policy area, rapid changes in living conditions, fight for resources, effect of global economic crisis, emergence of new global players previously called “major developing countries” and pointed out the “significant change in the balance of power in international politics”.

He added that, the shift in power started before financial crisis but has since accelerated.

He stated that, new alliances were forming, led by China, India, Brazil, Indonesia, South Africa and others.

In addition, promotion of an international legal order, and strongest possible international legal order is in Norway's best interest. Norway regards continued NATO membership as a mainstay of Norway's security policy.

Norwegian government gives high priority to international disarmament agenda, which touches on security, development, the international legal order, international humanitarian law and human rights.

Norway wishes to underline that NATO's core task remains unchanged, i.e. the collective defence forms the basis of the NATO Alliance.”

Main strategic priority area of the Norwegian government's foreign policy is the High North. According to the Støre (2010), “The armed forces play an important role in safeguarding Norwegian interests in the north. The government has therefore decided to strengthen our operative capacity, for example through acquisition of new frigates and by increasing the capacity of coast guard”.

5.6.2 Internal values:

According to the statement, Norway will maintain focus on universal principles such as human rights, including freedom of expression.

Støre indicated (2010):

“The fact that countries that place less emphasis on these principles are gaining influence which must be met with two-fold response: we should, and we will, continue to develop our relations with these countries, but at the same time we should, and we will, ensure that we do not compromise on universal principles or break international rules”.

5.6.3 Threats (external):

Threats mentioned were: Threat of terrorism and Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Global economic crisis and competition to ensure resources was also mentioned as threats.

According to Støre:

Meanwhile, new, powerful forces of change are affecting many policy areas including foreign policy: increasingly we are witnessing rapid changes in living conditions and a fight for resources due to climate change, the effects of the global economic crisis, and the emergence of what we used to call “major developing countries” as key actors in an increasingly globalised world economy (Støre, J. G., 2010).

5.6.4 Afghan policies:

The situation in Afghanistan was described as complex and Norway's understanding of conflict in Afghanistan, also described as the same as UN Security Council, i.e. threat to international peace and security. Norway's involvement in Afghanistan intends to promote social and economic development in Afghanistan, stability in the region and build Afghan capacity to provide security and development.

According to the statement, Norway intended to strengthen UN's coordinating role in Afghanistan, using "Social and political nation-building and state-building" as measures to make the country stable and thereby eliminate threats from Afghans as well as from international community including Norway.

One of the goals of Afghan policies described as to prevent Afghanistan from becoming base for international terrorism.

Støre (2010) added, "There is no military solution to the conflict in Afghanistan, a political solution must be found".

Moreover military presence was mentioned as necessary to provide sufficient security to allow space for political and economic development in Afghanistan.

Afghans must take the lead in finding political solution and own security and Norway will stress Afghanistan's obligation to uphold fundamental human rights but at the same time Norway realises that Afghans may in future make decisions and hold values that Norway find alien and unacceptable to Norwegian values.

In determining the approach to " Afghan challenge", Norway must take into account the effectiveness of the fight against insurgency, terrorism, and instability is closely linked to the quality of government in Afghanistan, Norway chooses to support.

According to the statement, the "new motto" following London Conference: Afghan leadership, regional cooperation and international partnership.

Support peace and reconciliation process, reintegration program, strengthening Afghan authorities both civil and military.

The statement stated that, distinction between the role of military and civilian actors must be made clear, but coordinated, this is to avoid confusion. Military actors responsible for security and civilian actors focus on social and economic development. This principle described as central to the Norwegian government's strategy for a coherent civil-military effort.

In relation to civilian efforts in Afghanistan in terms of form of assistance and volume provided, Norway has promoted international donor coordination, channelled the assistance through multi-donor trust funds and aligned it with Afghan priorities.

According to the statement, a constructive reconciliation process is dependent on political agreement and the disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration of insurgent groups, i.e. Taliban, "No room for categorical distinctions a "good" or "evil". Norway differentiates between Taliban and al-Qaeda. Prospect of genuine reconciliation process will be enhanced if leading Taliban elements break with al-Qaeda.

Priority areas mentioned in the statement were: Education, energy, resource management and poverty reduction, as well as strengthening the power of women in Afghan society and building a strong civil society.

5.7 Foreign policy address to the Storting, 10 February 2011

This foreign policy address to the Storting, by Minister of Foreign Affairs Jonas Gahr Støre is the latest foreign policy address in the series of such foreign policy statements and addresses available, as part of the body of documents, which have been included in this study.

This documents provides us with insight into Norway's latest foreign policy positions especially regarding Norwegian Afghan policy.

5.7.1 Document analysis; General foreign policies:

In this address Støre indicates that he limits this actual address with respect to Afghan situation and Afghan policy, just to outline the situation and policy, and in a later date he will

elaborate on the Afghan case. This elaboration was not available at the time when the study was concluded.

According to Norwegian Foreign Minister, Støre (2011):

We see new power constellations in the global world community that Norway is such an integrated part of. The world is no longer dominated by two rival powers, as was the case during the Cold War. The world is not led by the US, as it was in the years immediately afterwards. The world has become multipolar, with more, and to some extent new, centers of power. This is the “new normal”.

The international governance system established after World War II is being put under increasing strain. In a multi-polar world with several power centres and no strong global governance system, no single states is in a position to call the shots. Formation of regional arenas is an important aspect.

Støre indicates that Norwegian Foreign policy must focus on strengthening its already existing ties with allies and economic partners in areas considered as “Norway’s part of the world” and at the same time develops relations with others outside this circle.

Støre states that Norway shall seek cooperation with US in areas of common interest such as strengthening international legal order, promoting a more effective UN and a modern NATO. As a NATO member Norway considers adoption of the “new strategic concept of NATO” in November 2010 at NATO’s Lisbon summit as a milestone.

According to Støre the new concept reaffirms the *collective defence principal* as the core task of the alliance and not allowing “far away” operations compromise the NATO’s core task. Norway follows closely developments of EU as Norway considers EU as an important actor both in Europe and internationally and sees great convergence of foreign policy positions between EU’s and its own foreign policy positions. He acknowledges that diminishing influence of west on international arena, which means Norway, has to adjust its policy in its multilateral undertakings (Norway’s Minister of Foreign Affairs, 2011).

With regard to security policy, the transatlantic dimension remains firm, although the military dimension of these ties are less prominent than during the cold war but political dimensions due to Norway’s geography and developments in High North are of utmost importance. It is

in Norway's interest to nurture close relations with US. Seek to cooperate with US in areas of common interest as strengthening international legal order, promoting a more effective UN.

New strategic concept for NATO; i.e. reaffirmation of *collective defence* as NATO's core task is a milestone for the Alliance, not allowing far away operations to take focus from neighbouring areas and NATO's core task.

In today's world, the countries called "the west" no longer have majority in international organisations. This has consequences for the approach Norway need to take in its multilateral efforts, such as in area of human rights.

According to Støre (2011):

The attempts to impose democracy during the past decade cannot be said to have a glowing track record either. The arguments used to justify the invasion of Iraq have served to undermine support for democracy in the region. And in the end, the so-called war on terror was no showcase for liberal values and the promotion of human rights either. (Støre, J. G., 2011)

5.7.2 Internal values:

According to the statement, Norway and EU often take common foreign policy positions in many areas, such as human rights, principles of rule of law, climate and environmental policies.

International agenda for promoting democracy, rule of law, human rights and international humanitarian law must be kept alive and overriding goal described as, defending democracy, rule of law, human rights and international humanitarian law. According to the statement, Norway considers promotion of democracy and human rights as primary foreign policy objectives and Norway must work to ensure that the forces of change strengthen these values rather than undermining them.

5.7.3 Threats (external):

According to the statement, financial crisis is still unfolding and global power is shifting geographically. This trend has become stronger in the wake of financial crisis while China's economic, environmental and political footprint is becoming clearer.

Regarding United States, statement added that, US has been increasingly under strain and world is no longer dominated by two rival powers as in cold war era. Developing countries are not solely looking to west for inspiration and looking to other parts of the world and find other models in entirely different regions.

Distribution of power between states is becoming more equitable, it is a step forward but does not make the world easier to govern and not easier to agree on norms and values.

Countries with strong growth and authoritarian regimes may face popular unrest and uprising in future, economic growth is not enough for stability.

5.7.4 Afghan policies:

According to the statement, following Kabul conference in July 2010 and NATO summit in November 2010, the course is set for gradual transfer of responsibility for security to the Afghan security forces.

The overall security situation in Afghanistan has been described as deteriorating and any lasting solution will have to be the result of a political process.

Støre stated that, Afghans must sit down at the negotiating table with other Afghans, adding that Afghan peace solution will have to involve neighbouring countries.

Norway supports a process along these lines.

Norway believes state's legitimacy is undermined by systematic ignoring and violating human rights, which is seen as root cause of conflict and war. As a result Norway's foreign policy of promoting human rights is a way to increase international peace, security, economic and social development.

5.8 Summarizing Norway's foreign policy

To recapitulating the results of document analysis executed above, there will be a summarizing as it was done previously in the chapter four for the Swedish case.

5.8.1 Summarizing Norway's foreign policy, general policies:

Many statements in Norway's foreign policy documents, underscore role of human rights in Norway's foreign policy and development policy. Promotion of democracy and human rights are described as primary objectives of the foreign policy of Norway.

Systematic violation of human rights undermines any given state's legitimacy, which is described as the root cause of conflicts and wars. It is interpreted as *core liberal values of democracy, human rights as internal values* of Norway. Violation of human rights seen as contributing factor to global insecurity, hence *liberal quest for security* involves protecting human rights.

Regarding the current world order, there are many statement acknowledging the fact that world is no longer dominated by two powers as during the Cold War era and global power is shifting geographically. The current situation is described as multipolar world and "new normal". This is interpreted here as *realism's power transition theory*, as world order established after World War II, bipolar world is under transition to a multipolar world.

Uncertainty in relation to others nations' intentions and objectives is perceived as a "threat" in itself. This is interpreted as sign of *realism's view regarding threat*, as uncertainty about other's intentions can be perceived as a source of threat and can trigger strategies and actions to *counterbalance* that perceived threat.

Engagement is described in statements by Norway's foreign minister as hallmark of Norwegian foreign policy, active engagement gives Norway access to key international decision-makers and international arenas. Norway's policy of engagement has been described as value-based.

Other statement such as: to develop relations with others outside the circle of close allies and multilateral cooperation is the only way to secure Norway's national interests.

Theses are interpreted as *liberal values as foundation of value-based engagement policies*, in addition to *multilateralism*, which is a characteristic of liberal internationalism.

Norway has to adjust itself to diminishing power of west and adjust to multilateral actions.

This can be interpreted as developments towards *multipolarity from realism's perspective*.

Moreover, adjusting to the new condition according to the realism's *balance of power theory*.

Regarding security, Norway's viewpoint is that NATO's core task remains unchanged, i.e. collective defence as the basis of NATO Alliance. Norwegian government regards continued NATO membership as a mainstay of Norway's security policy.

This is interpreted as Norway's security arrangement by *collective security* within NATO and within *liberal zone of peace*.

Building and strengthening alliances, focusing on strengthening existing ties with allies and economic partners in "Norway's part of the world".

Moreover, Norway seeks cooperation with USA in areas of common interest as strengthening the international legal order, more effective UN and more modern NATO.

It is in Norway's interest to nurture close relations with United States. These are interpreted as *realism's external balancing*, at the same time, this external balancing is within framework and NATO/ *collective defence* and *liberal zone of peace*.

Maintaining Norway's cooperation with EU remains a priority and there is great convergence between foreign policy positions of EU and Norway. This has been interpreted as *liberal zone of peace* in relation between Norway and EU.

There are statements regarding strengthening Norway's armed forces. Such statements are interpreted as *realism's internal balancing*.

Norway must engage with new actors and need to defend and promote Norwegian interests does not stop at "our border", and proliferation of WMD (as most immediate threats to international peace and security. Norway's government gives high priority to international disarmament agenda. It touches on security, development, the international legal order, international humanitarian law and human rights. These statements are interpreted here as *liberal expansive notion of security*.

5.8.2 Summarizing Norway's Afghan Policies:

International terrorism located and emanating from Afghanistan is described as threat to international peace and security. This is interpreted as *liberal expansive notion of security* and national interest *and liberal quest for global security*.

Norway's involvement in Afghanistan is long term and involvement is both military and non-military. These policies interpreted as *liberal imprudent vehemence* towards non-liberals and *realism's idea of military force as last resort of international politics/ ultima ratio*.

Norway's attention to Afghanistan is described as in line with NATO's policy, consisting of promotion of universal values of democracy, freedom, human rights and rule of law in Afghanistan, in addition to reconstructing Afghan society or state-building.

These policies are interpreted as expressions of *imprudent vehemence towards non-liberals* and *liberalization process of a non-liberal state*.

Constructive reconciliation process is dependent on political agreement and the disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration of insurgent groups in Afghanistan.

A "Multi-dimensional response" with regard to Afghanistan. These policies are, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration or DDR process.

Fight against illegal drugs and drug economy that has corrupted Afghanistan on multiple levels, is a priority for international community involved in Afghanistan and overall policy is now gradual transfer of power to Afghan authorities decided following Kabul conference July 2010 and NATO Lisbon Summit.

These policies are interpreted as part of *liberalization process of non-liberal* country of Afghanistan.

Chapter 6

Categorizing, comparison, tables and discussion

Foreign policies of both Sweden and Norway have now been explored with the especial focus of this research being on the Afghan policies as the first research question.

We can now proceed to the second research question.

In order to do that, the policies identified under previous chapters of four and five will be categorized according to their liberal or realist nature and will be tagged here in the following tables, Sweden in table 6.1 and Norway in table 6.2. Policies will be categorized here in the tables with two categories of Liberalism and Realism.

This is to achieve a clearer picture of the overall texture of Norwegian and Swedish Afghan policies with respect to realism and liberalism and to evaluate if there is preponderance of one or the other.

6.1 Categorizing Swedish foreign policies in general and Afghan policies in particular.

In table 6.1 Swedish policies both general (section I) and Afghan policies (section II) will be categorized into the two categories of liberalism and/or realism and a short designation or comment on the type of policy will be noted.

In the cases when both elements of liberalism and realism are present in some policies, relevant designations will be registered for the policy in question, in each column side by side. There will be a sum for both general and Afghan policies, in order to demonstrate any preponderance of policies in one or the other category.

Table 6.1: Sweden's policies both in general and Afghan policies in particular

Sweden		
I-General policies	REALISM	LIBERALISM
1. Prevention of risks and threats	Realism theory of external threats to national security, threats emanating from anarchical conditions in international system	
2. Contribute to freedom, democracy, human rights, freedom of expression, sustainable development and globalization.		Liberal policies, promotion of core liberal values+ interdependence as a result of globalization and economic development
3. To work for Strong and purposeful European Union	Realism's external balancing	Liberal zone of peace
4. Protection of Universal norms and world order	Hegemonic balance of power	Liberalism: liberal values, Liberal grand strategy (expansive notion of national interest, interest in world peace)
5. Membership in EU, UN and close cooperation with NATO key elements of Swedish foreign policy	Realism external balancing + security community of EU	Liberal zone of peace+
6. European Union a strong voice for freedom and a strong force for peace. "EU foreign policy is our foreign policy". EU cooperation is key in Swedish foreign policy	Realism external balancing+ EU provides as security community for its members	Liberal zone of peace Promotion of liberal values
7. Increase cooperation between EU and NATO	Realism external balancing + security communities (where states share common idea of identity and security)	Strengthening Liberal zone of peace
8. Swedish armed forces must contribute to achieve Sweden's security policy objectives, dual task, defending Swedish territory and contributing to peace and security on international arena	Realism's self-help theory, security can be achieved only through self-help	
9. Armed forces must develop modern, flexible rapid response force which can put into action in operations with other countries	Realism internal balancing+ external balancing	
10. Try to obtain more high level positions occupied by Swedes and greater influence in EU and international organizations	Realist assumption of power centrism	
11. Sweden should be an active international player	Active in FP arena	Active in FP arena
sum	More realist policies	Fewer liberal policies
SWEDEN		
II-Particular Afghan policies	Realism	Liberalism
1. Sweden's commitment to Afghanistan is strong, long term, based on broad political support	Realism; external threat from Afghanistan	Liberal wars, Liberal imprudent vehemence towards non-liberals Liberalization process of non-liberal country
2. Civilian and military efforts in Afghanistan are important work for global peace and security	Realism theory of external threats to national security, threats emanating from anarchical conditions+ Realist idea of Force as Ultima ratio	Liberal imprudent vehemence towards non-liberals
3. Sweden will be a force to strengthen nation-building and state-building work		Liberalization process of non-liberal country,

within framework of UN and international community in Afghanistan		Multilateralism (Liberal trait/intl. liberalism)
4. Sweden considers terrorist groups in Afghanistan as being threat to both regional and global security	Realism theory of external threats to national security, threats emanating from anarchical conditions and scarcity of security	Liberal internationalism from a National security sense: newer threats e.g. terrorism
5. ISAF operation is part of preventive measures against terrorism	Realism theory of external threats to national security, threats emanating from anarchical conditions (international system), Military intervention (Realist idea of Force as Ultima ratio	Liberal imprudent vehemence+ Liberal expansive notion of security and national interest
6. Operation in Afghanistan is long term, peace-support, and security building type of operation. Contributing to peace, security, development cooperation (DDR). Assisting Afghans in rebuilding the country		Liberalization process of non-liberal country (as in case of forcible liberalization of post WWII Germany and Japan)
7. Bring institutions under democratic governance and insight.		Liberalization process of non-liberal country (as in case of forcible liberalization of post WWII Germany and Japan)
8. Enhancing Sweden's development cooperation in Afghanistan, gradual transfer of responsibility to Afghan authorities		Liberalization process of non-liberal country
9. Democratic development in Afghanistan (is in Sweden's interest)	Realist (Egoism)	Liberalization process of non-liberal country
10. Achieving regional security in Afghanistan and hindering spread of Islamist extremism and international terrorism	Realism theory of external threats to national security, threats emanating from anarchical conditions (international system) Military intervention	Liberal war, Liberal imprudent Vehemence + liberal expansive notion of security and national interest, Liberal quest for global security
sum	Fewer realist policies	More liberal policies

The result of rough summation of policies in each column, shows that in the case of Sweden's general policies there is an excess of realist type policies and in the case of Sweden's Afghan policies, there is a preponderance of liberal type policies.

6.2 Categorizing Norway's foreign policies, both Afghan policies and general policies

In table 6.2 Norwegian policies both general (section I) and Afghan policies (section II) will be put in the two categories of either liberalism and/or realism. When both elements of liberalism and realism are present in a policy, relevant designations will be registered for the policy in each column, under both categories of Realism and Liberalism.

There will a sum at the bottom for both general and Afghan policies, which will indicate if there is a preponderance of liberal or realist policies.

Table 6.2: Norway's policies both in general and Afghan policies in particular

Norway	Realism	Liberalism
I-General policies		
1. Promotion of democracy and human rights are primary objectives of Norwegian Foreign policy (FP)		Promotion of liberal values-Liberal core national security goals (democracy, human rights, free trade) Liberal quest for global security via liberal values
2- World is no longer dominated by two rival powers as in cold war era. This situation is the "new normal", -International governance system established after WWII is being put under increasing strain.	Multi-polar world, Power transition	
3- Achieve increase in international peace, security and economic development.		Liberal foreign policy, Global security, (liberal expansive notion of security and national interest) protecting and expanding Liberal zone of peace+ interdependence as a result of globalization and economic development
4-Ignoring and violating human rights systemically undermines any given state's legitimacy, Norway believe this is root cause of conflicts and wars	Threats and conflicts as source of war (Realist theory)	Promotion of liberal values, Liberal imprudent vehemence
5- Uncertainty in relation to others nations intentions & objectives is a "threat" in itself	Threat (balance of threat theory)	
6- proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) as threat to international peace and security	Threat, Realism theory of external threats to national security, threats emanating from anarchical conditions (international system)	Liberal internationalism, expansive notion of national security, interests in world peace, threats of terrorism., WMD
7- NATO as the most important forum for transatlantic cooperation	Security communities/ collective security	Liberal Zone of peace
8- Multilateral cooperation as only way to secure Norway's national interests. -Engagement is hallmark of Norwegian foreign policy. Norway's policy of engagement is value based. -Policy of engagement based on recognition of the fact that Norwegian security and interest	-NATO's collective security+ ties with US as external balancing +	Multilateralism + Liberal zone of peace+ core liberal values

must be safeguarded by maintaining focus on “our neighbouring areas” and by demonstrating engagement “beyond our neighbouring areas”. , - Great convergence between foreign policy positions of EU and Norway.		
9- Engage in preventing and resolving conflicts	Conflicts as root cause of war (Realist way of thinking)	
10- Nation/state building using different tools” multi-dimensional response” : peace diplomacy, development assistance, good governance and respect for human rights using military means when necessary		Liberalization process, Liberal imprudent vehemence (Liberal war)
11- Norway must engage with new actors and need to defend and promote Norwegian interests does not stop at “ our border”. , -Norway has to adjust itself to diminishing power of west and adjust to multilateral actions.	New powers emerging (power transition)	Globalisation
-Building and strengthening alliances (Petersen), focusing on strengthening existing ties with allies and economic partners in “Norway’s part of the world” / circle (Støre). Develop relations with others outside this circle.	External balancing	Liberal zone of peace (priority of external balancing is within the liberal zone of peace)
- Seek cooperation with USA in areas of common interest as strengthening international legal order, more effective UN and more modern NATO	External balancing	Liberal zone of peace
- Great convergence between foreign policy positions of EU and Norway		Liberal zone of peace
- Norway has to adjust to diminishing power of west and multilateral actions	Realism, power centrism, survival of state	
sum	Equal	Equal
Norway		
II-Particular Afghan policies	Realism	Liberalism
1. International terrorism located and emanating form Afghanistan is threat to international peace and security	Threat as source of conflict, Realism theory of external threats to national security, threats emanating from anarchical conditions	Liberal expansive notion of security and national interest, Liberal quest for global security
2. Involvement in Afghanistan is long term Military+ non-military	Realist idea of Force as ultima ratio	Liberalization process of non-liberal country
3. Norway’s attention to Afghanistan is in line with NATO’s policy.	Security communities/ collective security	Liberal imprudent vehemence towards non-liberals+ Liberal expansive notion of security and national interest
4. Achieve Security and stability in Afghanistan	Realism theory of external threats to national security, threats emanating from anarchical conditions (international- system) Military intervention	Liberal imprudent vehemence towards non-liberals+ liberal expansive notion of security and national interest
5. Reconstructing Afghan society /state building		Liberalization process
6. Promotion of Universal values of democracy, freedom, human rights and rule of law in Afghanistan		Liberalization process of non-liberal country+ Liberal imprudent vehemence
7. Using “multi-dimensional response” with regard to Afghanistan. DDR process (Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration)		Liberalization process of non-liberal country
8. Both ISAF and US-led coalition are necessary in Afghan reconstruction		Liberalization process of non-liberal country (Liberal allies: Norway

		Sweden NATO, US; Multilateralism
9. Fight against illegal drugs and drug economy, which has corrupted Afghanistan on multiple levels a priority for international community in Afghanistan		Liberalization process of non-liberal country, global security
10. Challenge in Afghanistan at the present is whether involved Afghan parties are capable of negotiating politically with one another with contribution of neighbouring countries to the process		Liberalization process of non-liberal country
11. Overall policy is now gradual transfer of power to Afghan authorities		Liberalization process of non-liberal country
12. Norway's policy is to support political process. Lasting solution in Afghanistan will be achieved through a political process		Liberalization process of non-liberal country, multilateralism
sum	Fewer Realist policies	More Liberal policies

Table 6.2 presents an overview of Norwegian policies. In section I, general foreign policies and in section II, Norway's Afghan policies, are listed in columns, as policies have been categorized, based on their liberal or realist characteristics. A rough summation of the policies for each section is at the bottom of each section.

Summation shows a preponderance of liberal type policies with regard to Afghan policies, and regarding general policies an equal weight of both liberal and realist type of policies.

Findings of both tables 6.1 and 6.2 shows the same pattern regarding Afghan policies of both Norway and Sweden. That is to say a preponderance of liberal policies in both Norway's and Sweden's Afghan policies.

In other words we can characterize Sweden and Norway's Afghan policies as primarily of liberal character.

It can be argued here that the overall policies, both general and Afghan policies in particular, consist of a mixture of both liberal and realist type policies.

This indicates that the positioning of Norwegian and Swedish policies on a realist-liberal scale should be regarded as a continuum, rather than two discontinuous opposite poles. The middle of this hypothetical scale will represent a fair balance of both realist and liberal policies.

6.3 Comparison between Sweden and Norway

A comparison between Sweden and Norway will be done here with regard to values, threats, policies and resources to achieve their foreign policy goals.

In the following section, there will be an effort to ascertain the nature of the components in Sweden's and Norway's Afghan policies.

To achieve this purpose, the following components that are arranged in a table are utilized:

1- State's core values, 2- Threats, 3- Foreign policy/

national security goals regarding Afghanistan, 4- National security interests and 5- Resources to achieve national security goals. Thereafter we can discuss what these components will enable us to conclude with regard to the essence of Norway and Sweden's Afghan policy as part of an overall foreign policy strategy, which Norway and Sweden are pursuing. This will be done in the section of discussion.

Table 6.3: Comparison between Swedish and Norwegian core values, threats, Afghan policies and security interests based on prior findings.

	Sweden	Norway
1-Core values	Freedom, democracy, human rights, sustainable development, Globalization: <i>Core Liberal values, also a key feature of Liberal internationalist strategy</i>	Promotion of universal values of Freedom, Democracy & Human rights, Women's rights: <i>Core Liberal values, also a key feature of Liberal internationalist strategy</i>
2-Sources of threats	-International terrorism (located in Afghanistan in particular), Terrorist groups in Afghanistan as being threat to both regional and global security. Emergence of violent extremism, ethnic tensions, latent and manifest regional conflicts (in EU and elsewhere), proliferation of WMD, civil wars, disintegrating states: <i>newer threats, non-traditional threats</i>	-International terrorism in Afghanistan (a threat to International peace and security). -Proliferation of WMD. -Uncertainty in relation to other states' Intentions: <i>Newer threats, non-traditional threats</i>
3-Foreign policy and national Security goals (spec. in relation to Afghanistan)	-To develop and consolidate Democracy, the rule of law , and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms (in general and) in Afghanistan Liberalization of non-liberal state - Prevention of risks and threats to global peace and security (which Intl. terrorism in Afghanistan poses): <i>Liberal expansive notion of security and national interest</i> -To strengthen nation-building and state-building work within	-Promotion of Democracy, human rights, rule of law in Afghanistan: Core Liberal values -Promote international Peace & security by State-building /nation-building in Afghanistan: Liberalization of non-liberal state -Norway's attention to Afghanistan is long-term, in line with NATO's policy: <i>Collective security, Liberal expansive notion of National</i>

	framework of UN and international community: <i>Democratization of non-liberal state</i>	<i>security.</i>
4-National security interests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Safeguard the common values, fundamental interests, independence and integrity of the European union - Strengthen the security of the union in all ways -To preserve peace and strengthen international security - Democratic development in Afghanistan is in Sweden's interest: <i>Liberalization process of non-liberal country + Realism's egoism</i> -To promote international cooperation: <i>expansive notion of National security</i> -Effective multilateralism is a cornerstone of Swedish and EU foreign policy. –Sweden has proactive role in developing EU as a global actor especially in peace and security policy., -EU has special position in Swedish foreign and security policy. - European foreign policy is our (SWEDEN) foreign policy: <i>Liberal zone of peace + Liberal foreign policy, Global security, Liberal expansive notion of security and national interest+ Security communities (EU)</i> - Sweden is not part of any military alliance. Future security of Sweden founded on community and cooperation with other countries:<i>Rejecting military alliance of NATO, but endorsing EU's security community</i> 	<p>-International peace and security, Human rights, Democracy : <i>expansive notion of National security</i></p> <p>-Norway's interest is that NATO's core task remains unchanged i.e. collective defence, which forms the basis of the NATO alliance: <i>Collective security</i></p> <p>Transatlantic relations with US :<i>External balancing</i></p> <p>-Safeguard Norway's inhabitants and territory, sovereignty and political autonomy:<i>self-interest and national security</i></p>
<p>5-Resources to achieve National security goals (Specially with regard to Afghanistan)</p> <p>a-Military b-Economic c-political</p>	<p>a- Military: cooperation between Sweden and NATO: NATO-led ISAF operation as preventive measures against terrorism : <i>Security Community of EU + (External balancing with NATO/ Collective defence-security of NATO+ cooperation within liberal zone of peace+ Liberal Imprudent vehemence towards non-liberals)</i> + Swedish armed forces contribute to achieve Sweden's security policy objectives. Armed forces have dual task of defending Swedish territory + contributing to peace and security on international arena.</p>	<p>a-Military: membership in NATO, NATO-led operation in Afghanistan =ISAF: <i>Collective defence-Security of NATO</i></p> <p>b: Close international cooperation and good relations with neighbouring countries: <i>Multilateralism, a key feature of Liberal internationalist strategy</i></p> <p>c: Cooperation with EU+ transatlantic relations with US: <i>Liberal zone of peace + external balancing</i></p>

	<p><i>Security communities</i> c-EU membership+ UN To utilize foreign policy instruments available; development policy, trade policy, political dialogue to civil and military crisis management operations under European Security and defense policy (ESDP), It is a national strategy to bring foreign policy, aid policy & defence policy closer together and improve coordination of these three:<i>Security community of EU+ Liberal Imprudent vehemence towards non-liberals</i> <i>Multilateralism, a key feature of Liberal internationalist strategy</i> - Try to obtain high level positions occupied by Swedes and greater influence in EU & international organizations: <i>Realist power centrism</i></p>	
<p>Strategy to achieve and preserve national Security goals (In Afghanistan)</p>	<p>Liberal internationalism? Realism/Defensive realism, balance of threat?</p>	<p>Liberal internationalism? Realism/Defensive Realism, balance of threat?</p>

The comparison in the table above shows that there is a great deal of convergence between Sweden and Norway with regards to core values, perception of sources of threats to Norway and Sweden, national security interests, goals and instruments to achieve these goals.

One of the important points regarding resources to achieve the national security goals is that, NATO is in the centre for both Norway as a member and for Sweden that is not a member. Nevertheless cooperation with NATO has a substantial importance in achieving the foreign policy objectives for both Norway and Sweden. At the end of the table some strategies are mentioned as possible overall strategies for Norway's and Sweden's Afghan policy, which will be elaborated on during the discussion.

6.4 Loaded words

During the course of this study one cannot avoid noticing the recurrence of some special words, phrases or sound bites. Sound bites are a useful tool in conveying messages and values. Some distinct words are often at the core of sound bites.

I have tried to identify these special words, which have such a quality, that is to say they are related to values and convey specific value or moral standing or otherwise.

Eleven loaded words have been selected as relevant to this case.

They are as follows:

1-Democracy, 2-Freedom, 3- Human rights, 4-Sustainable development, 5- Rule of law, 6- Globalization, 7-Terror/ terrorism, 8- Security, 9-Threat / threats, 10-Conflict and 11-Afghanistan/ Afghan. One group consists of the six following words: democracy, freedom, human rights, stainable development, rule of law and globalization that can be categorized as liberal words. Another group consist of four words: Terror/ terrorism, Security, threat/threats and conflict, which can be shared and used evenly, both in liberal and in non-liberal context. Hence a look into the usage of these “loaded words”.

Gaining an insight into which “loaded words” are used and how often these words have been used by the Norwegian and Swedish Ministers of Foreign Affairs in the documents analyzed in this study, can help to demonstrate the type of language and rhetoric that have been used. As a baseline, the year 2001 was selected, as both Norwegian and Swedish documents of 2001 were delivered before September 11, 2001.

To gather data each document has been screened by the available search mechanism in Web browser of Safari for the word of interest i.e. “ loaded word”.

The following table (Table 6.4) shows the usage of the “loaded words” of interest in the documents studied here, which consist of Norwegian and Swedish documents that have been included in this study. Swedish and Norwegian foreign policy statements of 2001, have been used here to establish a baseline in this regard.

Table 6.4: Usage of loaded words in the government documents included in this study.

Loaded words	2001 S/N baseline	2002 S/N	2004 S/N	2008 S/N	2010 S/N	2011 S/N	Total S/N 2002- 2011	S/N
1-Democracy	12/1	12/5	8 / 1	15/1	8/ 0	12 /12	55/19	2.89
2-Freedom	4/0	1/2	6/ 3	15/3	13/ 2	25 / 4	60/14	4.28
3-Human rights	10/1	11/6	22/5	19/15	12/ 9	19/19	83/ 54	1.53
4-Sustainable Development	4/0	4/0	1/0	6/0	0/0	1/0	12/1	12.00
5-Rule of law	0/0	1/0	2 /2	1/3	2/0	3/6	9/9	1.00
6-Globalization	5/0	3/0	1/0	5/2	7/0	6/0	22/2	11.00
7-Terrorism/ terror	0/0	5/31	7/4	4/11	2/3	5/1	23/50	0.46
8-Security	15/24	20/19	32/12	33/17	17/22	27/13	129/112	1.15
9-Threat-s	3/2	4/3	7/5	3/3	4/3	5/0	23/11	2.09
10-Conflict	15/17	11/18	14/9	8/9	7/5	5/10	45/33	1.36
11-Afghan/ Afghanistan	0/0	3/19	3/10	5/20	9/10	7/10	27/ 73	0.36

Loaded words used in: Foreign policy declarations of Swedish government to Riksdagen (S) and Norwegian Foreign policy statement to Storting (N) in the same time spots as documents were studied with respect to their content. Same time spots as shown. Sweden/ Norway (S/N)

Data gathered here can be used in different ways and different alternatives for comparison are possible. One alternative is to look into the usage of one or a group of “loaded words” in Swedish and Norwegian documents from the same year or from different years to make a comparison. Another option is to look into the total usage of one or a group of “loaded words” in both Swedish and Norwegian documents.

As an example, I have looked into usage of “liberal-loaded” words as democracy, human rights, freedom, rule of Law and globalization, using the total number used for each word, for all the time spots.

It is possible to ascertain that Swedish documents contain higher numbers of liberal loaded words regarding all the above-mentioned “liberal loaded words”.

The exception here is the “rule of law”.

Use of value loaded word of “democracy” in Swedish documents compared to Norwegian document is 2.89 times more, “Freedom” 4,28 times more, “Human rights” 1.53 times more and “Globalization” astonishing 11.00 times more, which is a huge difference. Two other value-loaded words, which attract attention in this data, are “Terror/ terrorism” and “Afghanistan”. These two words have been used (in total) more in Norwegian documents compared to Swedish documents (i.e. year 2002, -04, -08, -10, -11).

Two words of “Terror/terrorism” and Afghanistan have been used more in Norwegian documents, terror/terrorism has been used 2.17 times more and “ Afghanistan” used 2,7 times more. “Rule of law” has been used equally by both. On the basis of these data, one of the findings will be that the language used in Swedish documents contain more liberal loaded words compared to corresponding Norwegian documents.

6.5 Discussion

On the basis of the findings of the study regarding the Afghan policies, it is possible to distinguish many common characteristics. One of the basic characteristics of policies of both Norway and Sweden in their Afghan policies is a commitment to a long-term engagement in Afghanistan, which is characterized by *multilateralism*, involving different organizations such as NATO, EU and UN.

Regarding the internal values aspect of both countries' policies, this study has identified that Norway and Sweden have core Liberal values, as democracy, human rights, freedom and rule of law, as their value ethos, which shapes their foreign policy.

Norway and Sweden consider Afghanistan as a failed-state, in need of both military and civilian intervention to establish security, which both Norway and Sweden see as an important effort to achieve global security. Governments of Norway and Sweden consider their security as part of an overall global peace and security framework.

The study interprets Norway's membership in NATO as an act of external balancing in a collective defence community.

On the other hand, Sweden underlines that it is not part of military alliance but is a member of a political alliance, i.e. EU, which is identified in this study as a security community of EU, rather than collective defence community, which NATO represents.

Sweden has strong relations with NATO, which is interpreted here as manifestation of "soft external balancing", as opposed to Norway's direct membership in NATO.

An important aspect of Norway's and Sweden's Afghan Policies is promotion of core liberal values of democracy, human rights, rule of law and democratic institutions in Afghanistan, which have a central role in both countries Afghan policies.

Study shows that there is a great amount of convergence between Norway and Sweden's Afghan policies.

Regarding the threat aspect, both in general and relating to the Afghan policies in particular, the study has identified that Sweden's and Norway's perception of threats to their national security as well as to regional and global security, is almost identical and consists of "international terrorism" in general and "International terrorism" located in Afghanistan in particular, which is seen as the major threat.

Other threats mentioned are; emergence and spread of "Islamic extremism", threat of civil

wars and disintegrating states. Afghanistan is considered by both Norway and Sweden as a failed-state, in need of state-building assistance. All of the threats mentioned above, have been present in Afghanistan.

With respect to the policy objective aspect of Norway's and Sweden's Afghan policies, these consist primarily of combating threat of "international terrorism", "Islamic extremism", not letting Afghanistan to become a hot bed for international terrorism once again, combating illegal drugs, bring security and stability to Afghanistan and engage in nation-building/state-building efforts in Afghanistan. Furthermore, promotion of democracy, human rights and rule of law and to bring Afghan institutions under "democratic governance and insight" are identified as essential part of Afghan policies of both Norway and Sweden.

Findings of this study, shows clearly that both Norway and Sweden in their foreign policies follow the goal of actively promoting liberal values, not only in general but also in particular in their Afghan policies as identified in the study.

Concerning the Policy framework aspect, findings of the study indicate that Norway sees its Afghan policies and involvement in Afghanistan or "attention" to Afghanistan as in line with NATO's policy. On the other hand Sweden states that its Afghan policies are broadly based, in terms of domestic political consensus and within framework of UN and international community.

With respect to the implementation of the Afghan policies, Sweden and Norway are implementing their respective Afghan policies through ISAF that is a NATO-led operation.

Primary channel of enforcing the Afghan policies has been ISAF.

Instruments available as foreign policy tools, for Norway and Sweden consist of military as well as civilian tools including aid and development policy. A "multidimensional" response in shape of the DDR-process (Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration). In recent years there have been policy statements, which have underlined that solution to "Afghan problem" could not be achieved only by military means but through a political process. Moreover a wish for gradual transfer of responsibilities to Afghan authorities has been emerging.

6.5.1 Assumptions and scope condition

Historically we have examples of forcible Liberalization of Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan after their defeat in World War II. The liberalization processes in those cases have followed after a war and military confrontation, between a liberal side versus a non-liberal side, where the Liberal side was the winner. This current case of Afghanistan has also this historical

resemblance. Using a realist type of approach to the issue, we can identify which assumptions and scope condition are relevant here.

Norway and Sweden's initial action of joining United States and taking part in the military actions in Afghanistan can be interpreted as a manifestation of solidarity and groupism, which is a principal realist assumption. There are also expressions of self-interest, in the policies of both countries, identified in this study. We have seen statements expressing that intervention should be seen as in "our self-interest". These statements are interpreted here as expressions of self-interest, indicating the relevance of realism's assumption of egoism.

As regards to the scope condition, the initial conditions, under which invasion of Afghanistan took place and use of military force can be interpreted as conditions resembling realism's "condition of anarchy" in international system, and the utility of force.

The action on the ground in Afghanistan or implementation of policies has primarily consisted of military action, fighting against the threat of "terrorist or international terrorism" by military means, which according to realist school of thought is an expression of force being "Ultima ratio" or in other words force as a last resort in international politics. This is indicative of the scope condition, which is utility of force, and in the initial stages before involvement of UN, the realism's condition of anarchy can be considered as the relevant condition.

6.5.2 Security policies

To identify and categorize the type of overall strategy as driving force of Norway's and Sweden's Afghan policies, it is important to analyse and understand the type of policies each of the two governments have adopted in light of the alliances, both Norway and Sweden have been a part of.

Norway is obviously a member in a military alliance that is NATO. This is a very manifest form of external balancing. Norway's membership in NATO, have been categorized here in this study as a manifestation of a collective defence community. This act of external balancing is an expression of Norway as a state, has adopted counterbalancing action against a threat. Obviously the time when Norway joined the NATO alliance was during the cold war, in 1949. Here is an important element that we have to keep in mind; Norway has not wished to join EU

that is primarily a political Alliance, for whatever reason Norway may have. At the same time, Norwegian government underlines that there is a great convergence between EU and Norway's foreign policy.

On the other hand Swedish government has repeatedly underlined, according to the findings of the study that they are part of a political alliance of EU and Swedish governments have been adamant about the fact that they are not part of a military alliance, reiterating that this policy has "served us well". Arguing that this policy helps Sweden to stay out of conflicts, if such a conflict arises in their immediate vicinity. In other words, Sweden has chosen not to take part in the "collective defence community" that NATO provides.

Nevertheless Sweden has been engaged in partnership with NATO through different programs between NATO and non-NATO members. This means that Sweden is not obliged to assume any responsibility in a collective defence community as a NATO member, thereby avoiding committing itself to a collective defence principle. However Sweden expresses that it will not remain silent or passive if another EU member or Nordic country is attacked. This can be interpreted as expression of groupism. Sweden has chosen a security community that EU provides and reiterates that Sweden is a member of a political alliance.

This policy of Swedish government's choosing partnership as opposed to membership in NATO, and membership in EU, is interpreted in this study, as a form of "soft" external balancing. This could be a reflection of a realist way of thinking regarding how both Norway and Sweden has chosen to meet their respective security needs i.e. their security strategies.

In case of Sweden possible alternatives for this kind of balancing that could be considered are; either Sweden does not see the external security threats strong enough in order for Sweden to be compelled to or wish to balance against, by a clear-cut action of external balancing, in shape of a membership in a military alliance such as NATO.

Other alternative could be that Sweden does not want to reflect, such a need to the source of the possible external threat, i.e. signalling that the level of threat posed from the source is significant enough which compels Sweden to adopt an external balancing and to join a pure military Alliance which provides collective defence and security.

At the same time Sweden's membership in EU, reflects among many things, a need to take part in an alliance, in this case a political alliance, a "security community" which EU provides. It is a more subtle form of external balancing than direct membership in a military alliance. Both Norway and Sweden have strong European identities and Scandinavian

identities on top of that. They have strong sense of possessing liberal values and belonging to the liberal community, which is interpreted here as both Norway and Sweden as members of "liberal zone of peace". Their inclusion in and connection to the liberal zone of peace manifest itself partly through alliances with different organizations NATO and EU.

External balancing of both countries should therefore be seen within this wider scope of being a member of a liberal zone of peace, in shape of security community of EU or collective defence communities of NATO, Sweden and Norway are members of, respectively.

Geographical localization in Europe does not mean a liberal standing and belonging to the Liberal zone of peace in itself, there are European countries outside this liberal zone. But EU is becoming increasingly the primary zone with Liberal values, which actively advocates the core liberal values. NATO's position in this regard may not be as strong as EU, although there is a great deal of convergence between EU and NATO, since there are many NATO members who are already EU members, there are NATO members who are not considered as being in the Liberal zone, and have not been granted membership in the exclusive EU community. Some of NATO's partner countries are not liberal at all and are totalitarian. Some of the countries involved in the partnership program with NATO have been heavily criticized for their poor human rights records, as an example in this regard Azerbaijan can be mentioned (NATO, 2011).

With respect to other security policies, both Norway and Sweden have reasonable own military capabilities, which are considered of reasonable proportions. Reasonable military capabilities of Norway and Sweden have been interpreted as expression of internal balancing. This behaviour is interpreted as an expression of security maximization. By obtaining just enough military power in terms of own capabilities and at the same time attempting to achieve a higher level of security by external balancing, although through different type of alliances as far Norway and Sweden are concerned. Security maximization rather than power maximization is a characteristic of defensive realism.

Regardless of differences between Norway and Sweden regarding external balancing arrangements they have adopted, the ultimate result regarding specific case of their Afghan policies and concrete actions on the ground in Afghanistan, which includes instruments in use such as use of military force and civilian involvement, are the same. Study identifies several characteristics regarding Norway's and Sweden's policies towards Afghanistan, including liberal imprudent vehemence towards the non-liberal country of Afghanistan, as well as policy of liberalization process of a non-liberal country.

6.5.3 What is the overall strategy as driving force for Norway's and Sweden's Afghan policies?

Study has established the similar foreign policy outcome of Swedish and Norwegian Afghan policies and has identified that Afghan policies of Norway and Sweden are part of an overall liberal policy of liberalization of a non-liberal country.

Nevertheless, manifestations of both realism and liberalism have been seen in Afghan policies. From perspective of realism, defensive realism and "balance of threat" theory at first glance seem to be reasonable to consider.

Balance of threat consists of taking a counter balancing action in face of an actual or perceived threat or threats. In order to prepare to confront the threat, the state will adopt counter-balancing strategies. According to the balance of threat theory, state balances against a real or perceived threat, which causes a sense of insecurity in the state that feels threatened.

The threat is often of a certain size or severity, which necessitates a counterbalancing action.

In this case we have observed through evidence and findings in the study that external threat for both Norway and Sweden is "Threat of international terrorism" as the external source of threat.

In terms of the threat of terrorism in Afghanistan we do not see any clear counter balancing actions in form of internal balancing or external balancing. There was an almost immediate military action or act of war to fight the threat.

It can be argued that the size of threat has not been deemed as an existential threat, capable of threatening Norway and Sweden existentially. Keeping in mind that the initial military action was taken by United States and Britain, the size of threat could have been deemed not an existential threat but merely as a nuisance that could be dealt with by immediate application of force or ultima ratio. Or the threat has been deemed substantially existential, which made a conflict unavoidable.

Defensive realism and balance of threat theory do not offer us the comprehensive explanation to the multifaceted Afghan policies of both Norway and Sweden that includes not only military means, but also civilian means and promotion of liberal values.

Important aspect of Afghan policies of both Norway and Sweden other than the military aspects, is the promotion of liberal values and liberalization process of Afghanistan, which is the primary location of the threat. This means that we have to find the explanation some other

place, other than just realism. As both Norway and Sweden are well-established liberal states, it seems highly credible and reasonable that their foreign policies have been greatly influenced by their liberal values as they actually are. Firstly, Liberal values as we have seen, have dictated and shaped internal values of both Norway and Sweden. As a result of this fact and taking into account Leffer's approach, security of both Norway and Sweden have been almost automatically defined to protect the internal or domestic core values from external threats.

The external threats we have identified through this study in both cases for Norway and Sweden are almost exactly the same i.e. threat of international terrorism (terrorist groups in Afghanistan as being threat to both regional and global security, emergence of violent extremism, ethnic tensions, latent and manifest regional conflicts, proliferation of WMD, civil wars, disintegrating states) which indicates that Norway and Sweden as liberal states have equally identified the same threat or threats i.e. international terrorism and terrorist groups in Afghanistan, as the "external threat" to their core internal liberal values.

The list of policy objectives of both Norway and Sweden in their Afghan policies and generally has also been reflective of "Liberals expansive notion of national interest and security".

Evidently both Norway and Sweden are defining their national security in wider global terms, equating own security with global security, hence trying to achieve global peace and security. The policy declared and followed on the ground in Afghanistan besides the immediate goal of combating terrorism and gaining security, is the promotion of democracy, human rights, i.e. core liberal values along with forming liberal institution and bring institutions under democratic insight and governance that is interpreted as policy of liberalization of the country. Sweden and Norway in their security policies have stated that "our security knows no borders". It is indicative of an important finding of the study that national security of both Norway and Sweden exceeds not only national borders, but also EU and NATO's territorial borders.

This is interpreted as an indication of international orientation towards perception of threats and own security as well as reaction to the threat or threats globally.

When Sweden's foreign policy statement expresses that "threats know no borders", it can be argued that threats being posed mainly to internal values rather than immediate geographical borders of either Norway or Sweden. This can be interpreted as a reflection of the fact that Norway and Sweden as liberal states and members of liberal zone have effectively defined

globally, not only politically but also militarily, as this is the case in Afghanistan.

The component of using military force actively as in Norway's and Sweden's Afghan policies is very consequential part of the overall policies. Since the measure of being a threat or not, is defined in terms of each country's internal core values, which in this case consists of core liberal values, non-liberals are then considered as inherently hostile and on the opposite side. Therefore non-liberals intentions and actions can easily be perceived as threats. This can be argued as reflection of liberal suspicion towards non-liberals or "imprudent vehemence" towards non-liberals. Willingness to take actions against threats, considering threats emanate from entities defined as threatening the internal core values, it is easier for a liberal government to argue in favor of both political and military courses of action, against a non-liberal actor.

Another aspect of both countries' Afghan policies is the fact that both countries stress on a multilateral approach in dealing with the threat in Afghanistan. There is stress on the role of UN as a basis for the actions taken, as well as EU and NATO's role in this regard. That is to say, role of international institutions is of vital importance.

Multilateralism in concert with international institutions, such as EU, NATO and UN, is an essential aspect of Afghan policies of Sweden and Norway.

Both Norway and Sweden are advocates of globalization and free trade.

This is a manifestation of one of the key liberal views that free trade and economy contributes to increasing interdependence among states, which will reduce possibility of conflict and war.

Three essential elements become evident here. Firstly, liberal values, which have shaped the foundation of internal core values of both Norway and Sweden, their threat perception and subsequently their foreign and security policies, including promotion of liberal values in their policies and vehemence toward non-liberal states.

Secondly, favoring multilateralism in actions and emphasis on the role of international institutions. This element has become increasingly substantial after the initial military actions, in approaches taken towards Afghanistan.

Thirdly, interdependence as a result of globalization and free trade and expansion of circle of democracies as a one of the policies of both Norway and Sweden. All three elements argued above, are distinguishing traits of liberal internationalism within the context of the overall strategy in Afghan policies.

On the basis of the findings and analysis executed here, taking fundamentals of Sweden's and Norway's Afghan policies into consideration, it is possible to conclude that both Norway's and Sweden's Afghan policy can be explained in terms of Liberal internationalism as the overall strategy that explains all the components of the two countries' Afghan policies.

The vision of both countries is own security defined in global terms, promotion of core liberal values, and all means put into action, including foreign policy instruments such as military and civilian means to achieve those goals.

Overall strategy of any state is that state's foreign policy, which deals with forming a comprehensive vision for state's national security goals and determining policies to achieve those goals, the so-called "grand strategy".

A grand strategy for Norway and Sweden is in this way consistent with liberal internationalism. Realist theories as defensive realism cannot explain the value aspect of Norway and Sweden's Afghan policies or the element of quest for the global security identified in the policies of Norway and Sweden.

By applying Liberal internationalism we are able to explain all the characteristics of both Norway and Sweden's Afghan policies.

6.5.4 Regarding the possible differences between Norway and Sweden with respect to their Afghan policies, on the basis of the study, it is not possible to detect differences in the actions on the ground.

There is a slight difference in the language used by Foreign Ministers in their foreign policy statements as in case of Sweden, there is greater use of "loaded words" of liberal character in the documents we have studied.

Moreover in Norway's case there are statements, which indicate that Norway sees its Afghan policies as in line with NATO's policy and in the case of Sweden, statements indicate that Sweden consider its Afghan policies are within framework of UN and international community. Nevertheless the concrete actions on the ground and implementation of policies and objectives by both Sweden and Norway are the same.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

This study set out to find answers to three research questions.

The first question of the study was to identify Afghan policies of Norway and Sweden.

This objective has been achieved and first question of the study has been comprehensively answered.

Afghan policies have been listed in detail in tables 6.1 and 6.2. The concise answers to the question of Afghan policies

To combat international terrorism and extremism located in Afghanistan. Prevention of risks and threats to international peace and security, which is emanating from Afghanistan due to terrorism in Afghanistan. Afghanistan is considered as failed state and in need of state-building. To strengthen nation-building or state-building in Afghanistan and to bring security and stability to Afghanistan as part of achieving global security. To promote democracy, the rule of law, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms in Afghanistan.

This study has identified a significant convergence between Afghan policies of Norway and Sweden.

Second question of the study was to try to determine how the two theoretical schools of thought, i.e. theories of realism and/or liberalism, could explain Norwegian and Swedish Afghan policies. This Study has identified elements of both realism and liberalism in the Afghan policies of Norway and Sweden, with preponderance of liberal policies.

Norway's and Sweden's Afghan policies in the liberal category, have been characterized as liberalization process of non-liberal state.

It is important to point out that the mixture of both liberal and realist policies identified in this study, indicates that these two theoretical schools of thought have to be considered as a continuum rather than opposite disconnected poles, in analysing Afghan policies of Norway and Sweden.

With respect to the third research question of the study, that is identifying an overall strategy as the driving force behind the Afghan policies of both Norway and Sweden.

This study has identified characteristics of liberal internationalism in Afghan policies of both Sweden and Norway. This study has argued that liberal internationalism is the strategy that can explain the big picture.

Bibliography

- Bildt, C., Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden, Regeringskansliet. (2011). *Statement of Government Policy*. Retrieved from <http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/16/16/87/dc78c337.pdf>.
- Bildt, C. M. o. F. A., Sweden. (2008). *National strategy for Swedish participation in international peace-support and security building operations* Government Communication 2007/08:51. (2007/08.51). Swedish Government Offices, Information Department Retrieved from <http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/10/80/95/73e64223.pdf>.
- Bush, G., W., XLIII President of United States: 2001-2009. (2001). Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the United States Response to the Terrorist Attacks of September 11, September 20, 2001
 . Available from The American Presidency Project, John T. Woolley and Gerhard Peters, The American Presidency Project [online]. Santa Barbara, CA. Available from World Wide Web: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=63346> The American Presidency Project Retrieved 01.04.2011
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=64731&st=war+on+terror&st1=#axzz1IHZWvhQI>
- Forsvarsdepartementet, N. s. M. o. D. (2011). Kronologisk utvikling av det norske bidraget i Afghanistan/ Chronological development of the Norwegian contribution in Afghanistan. 2011, from <http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/fd/tema/utenlandsoperasjoner/kronologisk-utvikling-av-det-norske-bidr.html?id=632365>
- Government Offices of Sweden, R. (2011, 15.03.2011). Foreign Policy and International Cooperation; . Retrieved 15.03.2011, 2011, from <http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/2094>
- Leffler, M. (2004). National Security, in M. Hogan & T. Paterson, Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations , 2nd edition *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations* (pp. 123-136): Cambridge University Press. (Reprinted from: 2006).
- Mersheimer, J. J. (1995). Back to the Future: Instability in Europe after the Cold War. In S. M. L.-J. S. E. M. In M. E. Brown (Ed.), *The Perils of Anarchy; Contemporary Realism and International Security* (pp. 78-129): MIT Press.
- NATO (Producer). (2011). NATO partner countries. Retrieved from <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-CEB3D272-6E8276E8/natolive/51288.htm>
- Nordlinger, E. A. (1995). *Isolationism Reconfigured: American foreign policy for a new century*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Norway's Minister of Foreign Affairs, J. G. S. (2011). *Foreign policy address to the Storting 10 February 2011, Utenrikspolitisk redegjørelse for Stortinget 10. februar 2011*. Oslo: Ministry of Foreign Affairs Retrieved from http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/ud/aktuelt/taler_artikler/utenriksministeren/2011/redegjorelse_110210.html?id=633292.
- Norway's Minister of Foreign Affairs, J. G. S. (2008). *Foreign Policy Address to the Storting*. Oslo: Norway's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Utenriksdepartementet Retrieved from http://www.regjeringen.no/mobil/en/dep/ud/Whats-new/Speeches-and-articles/speeches_foreign/2008/foreignpolicy_address.html?id=511988.
- Norway's Minister of Foreign Affairs, J. G. S. (2010). *Foreign policy address to the Storting*. Oslo: Norway's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Utenriksdepartementet

- Retrieved from http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/ud/Whats-new/Speeches-and-articles/speeches_foreign/2010/storting_address.html?id=598586.
- Norway's Minister of Foreign Affairs, J. P. (2004). *Foreign Minister Jan Petersen's statement to the Storting on foreign policy, 27 January 2004*. Oslo: Norway's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Utenriksdepartementet Retrieved from http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumentarkiv/Regjeringen-Bondevik-II/ud/Taler-og-artikler-arkivert-individuelt/2004/foreign_minister_jan_petersens_statement.html?id=268198.
- Pape, R. A. (2005). Soft Balancing against the United States. *Journal of International Security* 30(Number 1 , Summer 2005), pp. 7-45.
- Petersen, N. F. M. J. (2002). *Foreign Minister Jan Petersen's statement on foreign policy to the Storting, 16 October 2002*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs Retrieved from http://www.regjeringen.no/en/archive/Bondeviks-2nd-Government/ministry-of-foreign-affairs/Taler-og-artikler-arkivert-individuelt/2002/foreign_minister_jan_petersens-2.html?id=266318.
- President George W. Bush, X. P. o. U. S.-. (2001). War on terror, Remarks on Arrival at the White House and an Exchange With Reporters, September 16, 2001 (Document archive). Available from The American Presidency Project, John T. Woolley and Gerhard Peters, The American Presidency Project [online]. Santa Barbara, CA. Available from World Wide Web: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=63346>
The American Presidency Project Retrieved 01.04.2011, from John T. Woolley and Gerhard Peters, The American Presidency Project [online]. Santa Barbara, CA. Available from World Wide Web: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=63346>
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=63346&st=war+on+terror&st1=#axzz1IHZWvhQI>
- Regeringskansliet. (2011). Varför är Sverige i Afghanistan? Retrieved 15.03.2011, 2011, from <http://www.sverigeiafghanistan.se/Hem.aspx>
- Reinfeldt, F. S. P. M., 2008. (2008). *A national strategy to meet the threat of terrorism*. (2007/08:64). Swedish Government and the Government Offices Retrieved from <http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/10/51/27/64e294b3.pdf>.
- Smith, S. H., A. & Dunne, T. (2008). *Foreign policy: theories, actors, cases*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sweden's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, U. (2002). *Statement of Government Policy in the Parliamentary Debate on Foreign Affairs*. Stockholm: Utrikesdepartementet, Retrieved from <http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/07/02/30/d86a5e1c.pdf>.
- Sweden's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, U. (2004). *Statement of Government Policy in the Parliamentary Debate on Foreign Affairs*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs Retrieved from <http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/07/02/30/13aaf50b.pdf>.
- Sweden's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, U. (2008). *Statement of Government Policy in the Parliamentary Debate on Foreign Affairs*. Stockholm: Utrikesdepartementet, Retrieved from <http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/09/80/15/dc567d20.pdf>.
- Sweden's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, R. (2010). *Statement of Foreign Policy*. Retrieved from <http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/13/97/31/215449c0.pdf>.
- Swedish Institute, T. o. g. t. S. s. s. (2011). SWEDEN.SE (The official gateway to Sweden). Retrieved 15.03.2011, 2011, from <http://www.sweden.se/eng/Home/Society/Government-politics/Facts/Swedish-System-of-Government/>
- United Nations Security Council, U. (Producer). (2001, 27.03.2011). Resolution 1386 (2001). *S/RES/1386 (2001)*. Retrieved from <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N01/708/55/PDF/N0170855.pdf?OpenElement>

- United Nations Security Council, U. (2002). Resolution 1401 (2002). Available from United Nations UN MULTIMEDIA PRODUCTS & SERVICES. (S/RES/ 1401 (2002)). Retrieved 15.03.2011, from United Nations Security Council, UNSC <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N02/309/14/PDF/N0230914.pdf?OpenElement>
- United Nations Security Council, U. (2003). Resolution 1510 (2003) Available from United Nations UN MULTIMEDIA PRODUCTS & SERVICES. (S/ RES/1510 (2003)). Retrieved 18.04.2011, from United Nations Security Council, UNSC <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N03/555/55/PDF/N03555555.pdf?OpenElement>
- Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. New York: McGraw-Hill.