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Strategic climate change communication: The European Wind Energy Association in a discourse strategy trap

Climate scientists argue that the world’s increasing CO₂ emissions are damaging for humans and the planet. If this is true, then how come governments are not rushing to provide sufficient incentives for a fast transition into renewable energy? The thesis proposes an explanation by focusing on included and excluded discourses in the EU climate and energy debate. The research is based on a case study of The European Wind Energy Association’s strategic communication. From a systems theory perspective, the thesis advances that the association actively tailors and conforms to the prevailing discourse of neoliberalism. In doing so, the study suggests that the association becomes an advocator for maintaining the socio-economic status-quo and not an advocator for change. The thesis proposes that this traps the actor’s communication in a discursive space where the necessary societal changes for a full transition into renewable energy becomes difficult to discuss.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Climate scientists have for many years argued: “If humanity wishes to preserve a planet similar to that on which civilization developed and to which life on Earth is adapted, paleoclimate evidence and ongoing climate change suggest that CO₂ will need to be reduced¹...” (Hansen et al, 2008). The most accredited transnational body on climate change, the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, supports this statement. As a greenhouse gas (GHG), CO₂ absorbs infrared radiation, traps heat in the atmosphere, and thus warms the planet. The IPCC identifies CO₂ as the primary cause of global warming (2014). Most climate scientists agree that increasing world temperatures above a 2 degrees limit will have severe consequences for humans, animals, and our way of life (IPCC, 2014). If the world keeps its current level of CO₂ emissions, an average increase between 3.2 and 5.4 degrees can be expected globally by 2100 (IPCC, 2014). Large-scale starvation, displacement of people and extinction of several ecosystems are associated with these climatic changes. Despite this scientific evidence, CO₂ emissions continue to rise, as carbon-rich fuels like coal, oil, and gas remain the primary energy sources for most societal functions like transportation, manufacturing, and heating (IPCC, 2014).

In this reality, one would expect governments to act quickly, decommission fossil fuel power plants, and provide sufficient incentives for a rapid transition into renewable energy. The European Union (EU) initiated a series of such incentives after the Kyoto climate discussions in 1992. The aim was to incorporate climate change measures into other areas of policy (Krzyżanowski, 2013). These initiatives fostered the ‘EU 2020 Climate and Energy Package’, which set an EU-wide 20% renewable energy target by 2020. It secured the EU the title as the world’s most ambitious climate change actor (Bäckstrand & Elgström, 2013).

¹ Reduce the level of CO₂ in the atmosphere from its current 385 ppm to at most 350 ppm (Hansen et al, 2008).
At the time of adoption in 2007, the goal was to increase this target to 30% by 2030 (Krzyżanowski, 2013).

Recently, the EU has been observed to struggle with its climate change ambitions (Parker, Karlsson, Hjerpe, & Linnér, 2012; Spencer, Tangen & Korppoo, 2010). With the onset of the global financial crisis, the discourse surrounding the EU climate debate changed. From addressing climate change as a crisis-oriented issue, climate change was seen as an obstacle to a competitive EU economy (Krzyżanowski, 2013). Attention was directed toward the costs of implementing climate change policies with ministers of finance becoming involved in these environmental policy areas (Bäckstrand & Elgström, 2013). Some observers have pointed out that actions of this kind are typical for neoliberal policies (Bäckstrand & Elgström, 2013; Klein, 2014; Krzyżanowski, 2013) where government functions are left to market forces (Medema, 2010).

The ideas of neoliberalism developed already the 1950s with the Chicago School of Economics (Burns 2004; George 1999). The Chicago school is associated with economists such as Milton Friedman (Van Horn & Mirowski, 2010), who strongly opposed state-control (Schliesser, 2010). Politically, neoliberalism has been connected to the economic policies of former U.K. Prime minister, Margaret Thatcher, and former U.S. President, Ronald Reagan (Jones, Parker, & ten Bos, 2005). As part of a neoliberal perspective, the responsibility for tackling climate change is observed to transfer from government-level to citizen-level (Furedi, 2002; Isin, 2004). This transferal of responsibility is argued to result in small-scale community actions that disguise the large-scale, society-wide changes required to tackle climate change (Žižek, 1994).

1.2 DEFINITION OF RESEARCH PROBLEM

Climate change science emphasizes that change to the way society uses resources and generates energy is needed in order to preserve the planet and its resources on which civilization is depended (IPCC, 2014). Special interests in society fight for these changes to happen, while others fight for maintaining the societal status-quo. The renewable energy industry is an important part of this reality. Especially,
the wind energy industry, which has experienced a large increase in installations over the past years (Global Wind Energy Council, 2015). This has resulted in a need for the wind industry to ‘big up’, as former CEO for the European Wind Energy Association formulates it: “The associations of the wind industry need to big up – like turbines have” (Azau, 2013). Yet, how does a renewable energy association ‘big up’ in the climate and energy debate? Does it actively conform to the status-quo or does it advocate for change?

Against this backdrop, this thesis will explore the strategic communication efforts of a wind energy market actor with vested interests in the EU climate and energy debate. As wind energy is currently the most attractive alternative to fossil fuels globally (Milborrow, 2015), and Europe is the current technological leader in wind energy innovations (EWEA, 2013), the industry association, European Wind Energy Association (EWEA), is chosen as the actor of interest for the study. The study will seek to provide answers to how renewable energy organisations participate in the discourses surrounding the EU climate and energy debate. The research will, therefore, focus on, how discourse spaces are marked in this actor’s communication, i.e. what is included (marked) and what is excluded (un-marked) from the association’s own ‘micro-discourse’. This gives insights into how macro-discourses are built by micro-discourses, and how micro-discourses are products of macro-discourses. In this way, the study centres on a classic strategic communication topic, with strategic communication defined as: “The purposeful use of communication by an organisation to fulfil its mission” (Hallahan, Holtzhausen, van Ruler, Vercic, & Sriramesh, 2007, p. 3).

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTION

Based on the problem definition, this exploratory study sets out to answer the following research question:

**TABLE 1: RESEARCH QUESTION**

| With the European Wind Energy Association (EWEA) as a reference, how did renewable energy organisations participate in the discourses surrounding the EU 2030 climate and energy debate? |
To answer the research question the thesis sets the following supplementary questions (SQ):

**TABLE 2: SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SQ1</th>
<th>Which discourse did EWEA primarily mark in its communication?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SQ2</td>
<td>How did EWEA mark alternatives to its own primary discourse?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ3</td>
<td>Which limitations did the distinctions in the communication produce?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SQ1 inquires about the nature of EWEA’s primary argumentation pattern and ties this to the societal macro-discourses surrounding the EU climate and energy debate. SQ2 addresses how EWEA distinguishes itself from alternative ways of communicating about climate change within the climate and energy debate. SQ3 interconnects SQ1 and SQ2 in inquiring which consequences these choices have for the association’s communication. In this way, the thesis will contribute by problematizing the state of renewable energy in the EU climate and energy debate with the critical potential of showing how the reproduction of a neoliberal discourse can limit the potential for societal change in the climate and energy debate.

**1.3 THE CASE**

EWEA is an industry association with office in Brussels and 54 fulltime employees. The association represents the interests of the entire European wind industry. The goal of the association’s communication campaign was to achieve a 30% renewable energy target in the EU 2030 Climate and Energy Framework. According to EWEA, this target would provide sufficient incentives for a faster transition to renewable energy in the EU. EWEA failed to achieve its goal, as a 27%, EU-binding renewable energy target was adopted in October 2014 (European Commission, 2015). While the reasons for the failure can be ascribed to a variety of factors, the thesis will explore this through an analysis of EWEA’s strategic communication. In this way, the question of why the association failed to achieve its goal becomes a question of how wind energy was communicated as a legitimate source of energy, rather than whether it was communicated as a legitimate source of energy.
1.4 DELIMITATIONS

The study focuses on the strategic communication of EWEA from 2013 to 2014. During this period, the association actively participated in the EU 2030 EU Climate and Energy debate. The association deployed a series of direct and indirect communication strategies counting meetings, discussion seminars, conferences, and text publications. This thesis will concentrate on the text publications of the association, which are publicly available on its website in the form of press releases, articles, blogs, opinion pieces, and reports. This data was chosen, as it considerably contributes to the way, the association communicates about wind energy (Arguments), and the way the association wishes to be perceived (Perception) by its target groups in the EU climate and energy debate.
This chapter looks at the socio-politico context of the study. It describes the prevailing societal macro-discourses surrounding the EU climate and energy debate. The chapter starts by defining the term macro-discourse. It then sketches key historical developments that have coupled climate and energy in the discourse. The focus of the chapter is on the capitalistic and neoliberal ideas that have guided these couplings, and it is described how these ideas dominate the discourses surrounding the climate and energy debate. In addition, the chapter will describe the influence of these ideas in relation to alternative ways of talking about climate and energy. These alternative ways are named ‘alternative discourses’.

2.1 MACRO DISCOURSE

“In many cases, underlying the word ‘discourse’ is the general idea that language is structured according to different patterns that people’s utterances follow when they take part in different domains of social life” (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 1). It is in this way that macro-discourses shape the space in which ideas and opinion can be expressed. They form structures in society as “a particular way of talking about and understanding the world”, or aspects of it (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 1). Following this, a macro-discourse determines what is salient in a debate, i.e. what can be said, and how it can be said. A prerequisite for talking about and understanding the factors that influence decision-making in the EU climate and energy debate is, therefore, an understanding of the macro-discourse.

In line with Krzyżanowski (2013) and Wodak (1996), the thesis views discourses as historical. Macro-discourses are closely related to other discourses produced “in the same or different contexts across different periods of time” (Krzyżanowski, 2013, p. 106). This means that the neoliberal macro-discourse described in the following sections does not exist in a vacuum. It is part of and produced alongside other discourses. These may present themselves as alternative
ways of understanding, expressing, and viewing the world – or certain aspects of it. Processes like the economization, globalization, and securitization of discourse are examples of discourses that have been observed over time. Especially, economization of discourse is of relevance to this thesis. It approaches entities in terms of their economic usability (Krzyżanowski, 2013). A neoliberal macro-discourse would naturally draw on economic discursive processes and express the world in terms of economic parameters (Krzyżanowski, 2013).

2.1.1 CENTRALISATION, CONTROL & ECONOMIC GROWTH

In order to understand the evolution of fossil fuels and their interconnectedness with the current economic drivers of neoliberalism in Western societies, one needs to go back to the late 18th and early 19th century. Up until the 1830s, water was the preferred energy source for industrial manufacturing (Malm, 2013). It was cheaper (Chapman, 1971), more powerful, and more reliable than coal (Malm, 2013). In this way, renewable energy started out as a superior energy source and was reflected as such in the societal macro-discourse.

This changed. Hydropower require fast flows of water from rapids or waterfalls making the energy production a decentralised and intermittent process (Malm, 2013). Favourable water resources, therefore, determined where factories could be located and when production could take place. This meant that factory-owners had to compete to attract labour resources to the areas where the factories were located. Workers were, thus, given the prerogative to demand favourable working conditions (Malm, 2013). According to capitalist thinking, this left factory owners vulnerable (McCulloch, 1833), and coal became the solution to this problem. It ensured a centralised energy production (McCulloch, 1833), which meant factories could be centralised in areas with easy access to cheap labour (Malm, 2013). Like this, the desire embedded in industrial capitalism to control production output, energy generation, and labour resources rendered renewable energy an inferior energy source to fossil fuels (Malm, 2013, Klein, 2014).

From 1760 to 1840, the British industrial sector boomed. It saw a massive increase in the use of fossil fuels and imported raw materials (Spielvogel,
2014). Until 1850, Britain was responsible for over 60% of global fossil fuel emissions (Malm, 2013). Accordingly, the social progress experienced during this period was related to an increase in production, the utilisation of fossil fuels, and to economic growth (Malm, 2013). It is in this context of early industrial progress, that growth and fossil fuels were first linked. Today, fossil fuels are still seen as important drivers for economic growth, why they are often a political priority area.

In the years that followed the Great Depression and World War II, an advance in wealth was measured in the western world in terms of growing profits, production, and demands of goods (Boyle & Simms, 2009). The way to measure ‘progress’ became the GDP: The expansion rate of a country’s monetary value of finished goods and services (Antonio, 2013). Thus, growth became the cornerstone of the capitalist movement (Antonio, 2013). “All economic growth – all change, in fact – must be positive progress, and… more money in circulation must inevitable mean more wealth” (Boyle & Simms, 2009, p. 78). Yet, historically growth has not led to more wealth. Following the logic of positive progress, the economic growth experienced in the West since 1954 should have turned world poverty into a world of wealth. While the global economy has undeniably grown, the gap between rich and poor has too. Human lives are even seen to have become less healthy, more stressful, and more polluted (Boyle & Simms, 2009, p. 37). At the same time, fossil fuels account for 60% of global CO₂ emissions and stand as a highly debated area in climate change discussions (Toke & Vezirgiannidou, 2013).

2.1.2 NEOLIBERAL DRIVEN ENERGY PRIVATISATION

Neoliberalism is the common way to describe the capitalist movement of the past 20-30 years (Saad-Filho & Johnston, 2005). In this paradigm, free market movements and private actors are seen to create economic efficiency, while state-regulation and public actors are not (Saad-Filho & Johnston, 2005). Concepts of privatisation, deregulation, and marketization have, in this way, become dominant ways of addressing industries globally (Cahill, 2014). In Europe, this has led to an increase in the privatisation of public companies and a decrease in publicly con-
trolled services (Saad-Filho & Johnston, 2005). An example is Germany. In line with neoliberal policies, large numbers of municipalities sold off public distribution and utility companies to private corporations during the 1990s (Leidreiter, 2013).

Private actors have historically not been seen to deliver true benefits and innovation, despite promises of progress and investments (Miraftab, 2004; Sclar, 2000). This is particularly true in the energy sector. Here, the movement of privatization of state utilities has been criticised for inhibiting the transition to renewable energy. “Historically, the private sector has played little role in investing in renewable energy generation. Governments have been responsible for nearly all such investments. Current experience from around the world, including the markets of Europe, also shows that private companies and electricity markets cannot deliver investments in renewables in the scale required” (Hall, Van Niekerk, Thomas & Anh Nguyen, 2013, p. 2). Communities and co-ops, supported by ambitious national renewable energy frameworks, are seen to have led the advancements in renewable energy (Klein, 2014). This indicates the presence of an alternative discourse in which an active role of governments is favoured: “An active role for government and public sector utilities is thus a far more important condition for developing renewable energy than any expensive system of public subsidies for markets or private investors” (Hall et al, 2013, p. 2).

2.1.3 CLIMATE CHANGE & GROWTH AS MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL

In the EU, growth is argued to be the main driver for decision-making with climate friendly measures being presented as growth opportunities (Hayes & Knox-Hayes, 2014). Economic growth is, thus, given a dominant presence in the macro-discourse. This trend is especially observable in the 2004 - 2014 Barroso Commission administration. In 2005, José Manuel Barroso announced his dedication to economic growth through the metaphor of a “sick child”. “I have three children – the economy, our social agenda, and the environment. Like any modern father-if one of my children is sick, I am ready to drop everything and focus on him until he is back to health... But that does not mean I love the others any less” (Barroso, 2005). Barroso’s two “healthy” children were the social agenda and the environ-
ment. However, if one returns to the appeal of accredited climate scientist, James Hansen, the environment clearly stands as the sickest child (Hansen et al, 2008).

In placing more importance on the economy, the Barroso administration communicated climate measures as compatible with economic growth: “Our economy is already moving to a new paradigm, and the economic downturn must be seen as a chance to accelerate moves towards a less carbon intensive economy” (Barroso, 2009). The newly appointed President of the European Commission, Jean-Claude Juncker has continued this trend: “My number one priority and the connecting thread running through each and every proposal will be getting Europe growing again… Protecting the environment and maintaining our competitiveness have to go hand-in-hand: both are about a sustainable future” (European Commission, 2014). The growth paradigm is also supported in the discourse of the European Parliament, even though the parties may politically disagree on the approach to achieve it. A recent statement from the president of the Socialists and Democrats Group, Gianni Pittella, exemplifies this. “From the blind austerity dogma of the Barroso era, we are now moving to a new phase focused on investment, jobs and growth” (Bernas, 2014).

Parallel to these neoliberal ideas of economic growth, other discourses have gained momentum in recent years, criticising the growth-based idea of societal progress. These alternative discourses argue that economic growth and climate change are incompatible (Daly & Green, 2009). The Club of Rome already introduced this argument in 1972 in ‘The Limits to Growth’. Early computer models were used to show how humanity would exceed the planet’s ‘carrying capacity’ by the middle of the 21st century, if natural systems continued to be depleted at their current rate (Parenti, 2012). Economic growth is in this way seen to directly conflict with the known limits of greenhouse gas emissions (Anderson & Bows, 2011).

Part of the alternative discourse is also the notion that the importance placed on economic growth allows heavy polluters to argue that growth and jobs will be lost in their sectors in the short term. This makes the long-term prospects of green jobs and green growth in other sectors seem less important. Consequent-
ly, economic growth can also be used to postpone investments in renewable energy and to legitimise breaks with previous promises and commitments. E.g. when U.K. Prime Minister, David Cameron, took office in 2010, he promised that a blue vote was also a green vote (Harvey, 2011). Nevertheless, U.K. support for renewable energy has been scaled down significantly ever since (Morales, 2014). In 2012, the Spanish government abolished the financial support for renewable energy projects (Mallet, 2012). The same scenario has been seen in many other countries across Europe (Scott, 2012).

2.1.4 FITTING IN: NEOLIBERAL DISCOURSE ADOPTION

Over the years, the neoliberal discourse has grown in popularity and has finally become the discourse of power. It is observed to be the language the elites speak to one another (Klein, 2014). What is most important for this study, however, is that climate groups have followed suite in engaging in this elite discourse in order to be seen as serious actors by politicians and industry giants. “Seriousness […] equated presenting climate change as a narrow technical problem with no end of profitable solutions within the market system” (Klein, 2014, p. 211). To accommodate the neoliberal discourse theme of economic growth, renewable energy groups have suggested alternatives like ‘green growth’ and ‘sustainable growth’ to find a win-win situation for the climate as well as the economy. In this perspective, there is often found room to accommodate fossil fuel interests in the climate change discussions. A recent example of this is the featuring of fossil fuel executives as key partners at the U.N. climate summit in 2013 (Tansey, 2013). The summit was sponsored by the PGE group (United Nations Climate Change Conference, n.d.), a panoply of fossil fuel companies (PGE Group, 2015), and hosted alongside a Coal & Climate convention (Vaughan & Vidal, 2013).

Energy security is seen as yet another attempt to fit renewable energy into the prevailing neoliberal discourse. Here, the ideals of energy independence and control over energy resources are sponsored by neoliberal ideas (Toke & Vezirgiannidou, 2013). Especially in the EU, securitisation of energy has been a heavily debated issue in recent years (Toke & Vezirgiannidou, 2013). In 2014, the
issue of energy security gained momentum with the conflict between Ukraine and Russia (Vogler, 2014).

Communicating climate change in terms of energy security has, however, not been a successful way of pushing for more renewable energy. Chiefly because energy security can be achieved by other energy sources than renewables (Toke & Vezirgiannidou, 2013). Securitisation is further seen to impede the collective actions required to address climate change by focusing on immediate action to self-survival irrespective of others (Hayes & Knox-Hayes, 2014). The issue becomes a question of access and affordability, thus disregarding the notion of sustainability (Elkind, 2009). This is where oil, coal, natural gas, and even hydraulic fracturing emerge as favourable energy sources.

2.1.5 THE LEGACY OF FOSSIL FUELLED GROWTH

Today, the price of renewable energy matches that of fossil fuel (Ecofys, 2014). In fact, when environmental and human costs of burning fossil fuels are factored in over the entire lifetime of a power plant (Levilised Cost of Energy), renewable energy proves to be cheaper than fossil (e.g. Lazard, 2014). Wind farms are also approaching the generation capacity of conventional coal plants. An example is the 1,550 MW Alta Wind Energy Centre in the U.S. (Alta Wind Energy Center, n.d.). Moreover, fossil fuel resources easily accessible and cheap to extract are running out fast (Nelder, 2009). Therefore, controversial and dangerous ways have been adopted to reach the remaining reserves. This is seen in the cases of the Canadian Alberta tar sands oil extractions (Penty, 2015) and the deep-sea oil drilling in the Arctic (Shogan, 2015). When considering the rate at which fossil fuel resources are being depleted and the quality and accessibility of the remaining reserves, the reliability of fossil fuels must be seriously questioned.

Despite this, the same attitude towards renewable energy that gained momentum in the 19th century has continued to this day. Fossil fuels compatible with a society based on the principles of centralisation, as they can be controlled, transported, and stored (Malm, 2013). Renewable energy requires a societal structure designed to handle a decentralised and variable energy production (European
Parliament, 2010). As has been outlined, modern society has not been built on these premises. Society thus requires vast investments in smart, flexible grids, cross-border interconnections, and storage facilities to accommodate a large increase in renewable energy capacity (European Parliament, 2010). A neoliberal discourse has been argued to mask these large-scale societal changes (Žižek, 1994). In a neoliberal perspective, climate change is seen as an undeliberate, but manageable by-product of capitalist economies (De Goede & Randalls, 2009; Swyngedouw, 2010). This is seen to remove the responsibility of dealing with climate change from the political arena (de-politicisation) (De Goede & Randalls, 2009; Swyngedouw, 2010). The process of de-politicising climate change is argued to involve strategies of making distinctions using moral, economic, rational, or scientific imperatives (Pepermans & Maeseele, 2014 p. 223). That is, distinctions between what is considered legitimate, and what is considered illegitimate (Pepermans & Maeseele, 2014). Between who are voicing possible demands, and who are voicing impossible demands in the discourse (Pepermans & Maeseele, 2014). Here, demands for change to the societal status quo are often labelled illegitimate and impossible (Klein, 2014). In the end, this means that when neoliberal values of control, privatisation, and centralisation dominate the macro-discourse, the case of renewable energy becomes a hard one to argue.
3. LITERATURE REVIEW

Having introduced the processes and structures that have evolved to become some of the macro-discourses surrounding the EU climate and energy debate, the Literature review will focus on studies within media, lobbyism, and environmental communication. It will examine the actors, voices, and narratives taking part in constructing these discursive forces. As the academic fields covering climate change communication are comprehensive, this thesis only aims to capture a small fraction of the academic literature. Although the word ‘energy’ remains absent from most of the studies, they provide a solid window into the communication literature exploring the discourses surrounding the climate and energy debate.

3.1 MEDIATED POLITICAL DISCOURSES

Recent years have seen an increase in the number of researchers setting out to explore how the phenomenon of anthropogenic climate change is constructed in the media. With the ability of the media to make certain narratives visible in a discourse, mediated political discourses cover the political perspectives and actors taking part in the mediated climate change debate. Researchers have found politics and the media to be deeply interconnected (Anderson 1997; Carvalho & Burgess, 2005). A 2007 study by Boykoff and Boykoff confirms this. It shows how the news curve of climate change coverage follows the developments of climate change policies, rather than what they call a ‘natural’ media cycle (Boykoff & Boykoff, 2007).

With many voices competing to be heard, media studies have concentrated on examining, which actors are dominating the climate change discourse. Allan (1999) finds the media to select sources based on their position in society. He argues this is because of an imbedded journalistic routine that views society as structured bureaucratically and hierarchically. Denham (2010) explains this as: “the higher an official source is placed, the greater his or her appeal” (p. 313).
Supporting this argument are studies finding the media to favour established stakeholders (Carvalho, 2010), such as government officials and law enforcement agencies (Hall, Critcher, Jefferson, Clarke, & Robert, 1978). Others have found the loudest voices in the media to be those representing a carbon-heavy status quo (McCright & Dunlap, 2000; McCright & Dunlap, 2003). The media is, therefore, seen to reproduce the discourse of the elite (Allan, 1999).

Studies have found the media discourse on climate change to favour values such as ‘progress’ and ‘materialism’ (Shanahan & McComas, 1999). In line with this, others have found the media to predominantly focus on the economic consequences of climate change (de Vreese, 2005; Neuman, Just, & Crigler, 1992; Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000). A study by Carvalho (2005) sets out to explore the ideological underpinnings contained in British quality newspapers. Her study shows how Margaret Thatcher’s coupling of economic growth with environmental protection has had a lasting political impact in the U.K. The study shows how a neoliberal discourse has survived during both John Major and Tony Blair’s terms in office. Carvalho states that the discourse seems to have avoided “a sustained critique of the possibility of constant economic growth and increasing consumption and… the profound international injustices associated with the greenhouse effect” (p. 21). This has led Berglez & Olausson (2014) to argue that a neoliberal discourse protects the capitalist order from critical questions, thus leaving no room for alternative political visions in the climate change debate. In this context, a study has observed how NGOs tend to deploy social media rather than news media in their climate change communication (Schäfer, 2012). This indicates a form of exclusion from the mass media channels. Other studies have indicated that the political perspectives frequently questioned by mainstream media and portrayed as a form of undesirable social disorder are those challenging the values of capitalistic globalization (Juris, 2005; McFarlane & Hay, 2003; Opel & Pompper, 2003).

3.2 INTEREST GROUPS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

The many interests seeking to influence the climate change debate make the role of strategic communication, public relations, and advocacy “highly significant”
Various stakeholders constantly seek to influence the political agenda and to construct the issue according to their particular interests (Schäfer, 2012). Scholars have previously researched how industry groups and public relations companies in the U.S. have manipulated scientific statements and exploited the media (Antilla, 2005). There have been studies of the lobby methods and strategies deployed by different actors e.g. NGOs (Brunsting & Postmes, 2002; Gavin, 2010; Greenberg, Knight, & Westersund, 2011; Hall & Taplin, 2008; Pickerill, 2011; Seo, Kim, & Yang, 2009; Zelwietro, 1998), think tanks (Gavin & Marshall, 2011; Holliman, 2011; Lockwood, 2011; McCright & Dunlap, 2003; McNutt & Marchildon, 2009), large corporations (Greenberg et al., 2011; Ihlen, 2009a), and small companies (Kaesehage, Leyshon, & Caseldine, 2014).

Within the fields of environmental communication and journalism, a special focus has been dedicated to exploring the strategies of fossil fuel companies. In the early 1990s, these companies were found to portray climate change as a matter of scientific uncertainty (Schlichting, 2013). One example is Exxon Mobile, which stated that the UN’s 1995 IPCC report “was heavily influenced by government officials and others who are not scientists” (Le Menestrel, van de Hoven, & de Bettignies, 2002, p. 257). In this way, carbon-heavy corporations are seen to place themselves as equally legitimate to address climate change as scientists. Supporters of a carbon-heavy status quo and deniers of climate change have been found to deploy strategies of casting doubt and confusion (Mann, 2012). Misleading and entirely wrong information has been found to be distributed by the fossil fuel industry to obtain favourable coverage of its viewpoints (Revkin, 2005). Scientists and economists have also been found to accept payment from these industries for articles disputing claims put forward in the UN’s IPCC reports (Sample, 2007). Some observers have pointed out how this has created a discourse in which climate scientists’ credibility is constantly questioned. “The climate scientists have to be right 100 percent of the time, or their 0.01 percent error becomes Glaciergate, and they are frauds. By contrast, the deniers only have to be right 0.01 percent of the time for their narrative to be reinforced by the media” (Hari, 2010, para. 7).
Other studies have found the public to dismiss corporations as climate change experts (Greenberg et al., 2011; Jones & Levy, 2007; Levy, 2005). This can explain a shift observed in the communication strategy of carbon-heavy industries. The focus of these industries has become to highlight the economic consequences of adopting climate change measures (Livesey, 2002; Schlichting, 2013). The Heartland Institute has for example been observed to communicate climate change measures as actions that would “cut economic growth by 50%” (McCright & Dunlap, 2000, p. 515). Moreover, researchers have found carbon-heavy companies to portray themselves as helping consumers to become more environmentally friendly (Smerecknik & Renegar, 2010). Here, fossil fuels are positioned as bridging technologies and the only way to a climate-friendly future at reasonable costs (Schlichting, 2013). Guardian journalist, George Monbiot, revealed in 2007 the secret greenwashing of carbon-heavy companies in newspapers. In the newspapers, advertisements from carbon-heavy companies were featured next to urges for cutting CO₂ emissions (Monbiot, 2007). In this context, Ihlen (2009b) has researched how fossil fuel companies have started to portray themselves as ‘sustainable’. The study uses the Norwegian oil industry as case study. It finds the industry to use arguments such as ‘striving to cut emissions’ and being more responsible than other ‘unrealistic’ energy options to justify their new sustainable image (Ihlen, 2009b). The study illustrate that renewable energy organisations do not have patent on sustainability in the climate change discourse. It also stands to show the influence of public relations and lobby efforts in setting the climate change agenda, and how increasingly sophisticated strategies are being deployed (Anderson, 2009).

### 3.3 EXCLUDED DISCOURSES AND RESEARCH FOCUS

This literature review shows how climate change deniers and supporters of a carbon-heavy status quo easily dispute official, scientific information on climate change. This questions who can be named credible sources in the debate. The literature review also showed how an economic discourse, sponsored primarily by government sources and supporters of a carbon-heavy status quo, appears to dominate the climate and energy debate. Mainstream information is found to concentrate more on the economic issues related to climate change than the social and
environmental. This establishes the discourse as askew with some actors being marginalised in the discourse through their exclusion from mainstream news channels. Studies focusing on the actors, voices, and narratives not constructed as mainstream or official sources seem to lack. While some studies mention this imbalance (Juris, 2005; McFarlane & Hay, 2003; Opel & Pompper, 2003), the literature review shows how a majority of studies do not explore this imbalance further. In this context, the communication strategy of the fossil fuel industry has been studied in detail (Davidson, 2008; Jacques, Dunlap, & Freeman, 2008), while little research seems to explore the communication strategy of the renewable energy industry.

In conclusion, a research gap appears to exist in terms of studies exploring the communication strategies of renewable energy organisations. In addition, more research is needed to explore the discourses being marginalised in the climate change debate. The thesis aims to contribute to this line of communication research. It does this through a detailed study a renewable energy actor’s strategic communication in the EU climate and energy debate.
4. RESEARCH DESIGN & METHODS

In this chapter, the research approach and methods of data collection and analysis are described. The chapter starts by an account of the ontological and epistemological stance of the research. It then moves to a discussion of the research approach, the parameters for data collection, and the method used for coding the collected data.

4.1 EPISTEMOLOGICAL AND ONTOLOGICAL STANCE

The study approaches the phenomenon of interest from the systems perspective of Niklas Luhmann. The thesis treats his theory of social systems as a ‘super-theory’ (Luhmann 1984, p. 19), where analyses of all social phenomena from instant social interactions to historical social structures are possible (Knudsen & Vogd, 2015; Lange & Schimank, 2004). According to Luhmann, a system is separated from its environment by a boundary that divides it from its complex exterior (Luhmann, 1982). Contained in this perspective, the researcher herself is a system that uses systems theory as a tool to conduct research. In making a distinction between herself (self-reference) and the environment (other-reference), the researcher is able to observe what observers observe (Kneer & Nassehi, 1997). A so-called second-order observation (Andersen, 2007). All such observations operate by means of a distinction: What is included and what is excluded from the observing system (Baeker, 1993). With systems theory as a foundation, the thesis’s epistemological and ontological stance therefore builds on second-order observations (Kneer & Nassehi, 1997).

As a second-order observer, the thesis makes the observations of others the subject of its own observations. What can be observed is only what these observations allow the researcher to observe, and what the research can discuss is only what these observations allow it to. Luhmann states: “If all knowledge must be acquired on the basis of a distinction between self-reference and other-
reference, it is also the case that all knowledge…is a construction” (2000, p. 5). Following this, the thesis takes a constructivist stance and recognizes meaning as formed through subjective understandings of the world (Creswell, 2007). According to Creswell (2007), the constructivist researcher looks for complexities in meaning, which are often formed through historical and/or social negotiations. Consequently, the research sets out to produce interpretive notions of reality, rather than universal truths (Creswell, 2007).

4.2 TERMINOLOGICAL EXPLANATION
Luhmann defines an observation as an indication within the form of a difference (Andersen, 2007). To explain this, Luhmann uses a circle as an example. He names the inside of the circle the marked (included) space and the outside of the circle the un-marked (excluded) space (Luhmann, 1999). Murray (2013) explains this in the following way: “Communication within a system operates by selecting only a limited amount of all information available outside” (p. 66). In this thesis, the indication of interest is the discourse space EWEA primarily marks in its communication. The operation of making certain spaces within a discourse forms blind spots in EWEA’s observations. What remains un-marked becomes the blind spot of the operation (Andersen, 2007). The systems perspective allows for an explanation of the limits to EWEA’s communication and for an identification of the possible consequences of these communicative limitations.

4.3 RESEARCH APPROACH AND LIMITATIONS
A deliberate choice of qualitative research was made to achieve an understanding of how EWEA observes the social world and to understand why it chooses certain approaches in its strategic communication. An inductive research approach was chosen, as it allows the research to move from specific observations to the discovery of a pattern and the formation of more general conclusions (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2007). EWEA was chosen as case study, because it provides insights to what is judged to be a typical example of how renewable energy associations communicate within in the EU climate and energy debate. While other researchers have studied similar phenomena, this research contributes with a detailed perspec-
tive of an European renewable energy association. A qualitative single case study was chosen accordingly. The qualities of a case study were found valuable for the research. A case study provides in-depth understanding of the studied phenomenon (Morris & Wood, 1991) and allows for an exploration of existing theory (Saunders et al, 2007) within a real life context (Robson, 2002).

In using a single case study, the research has little ground to argue that the findings will occur in more than one case (Yin, 2003). Therefore, the case study cannot be used to draw far-reaching conclusions about the general state of renewable energy organisations in the EU. The qualitative methods used also question the level of subjectivity of the study. It questions whether correct impressions (validity) of the studied phenomenon have been obtained, as well as the ability of other researchers to replicate the study’s findings (reliability) (Creswell, 2007). The studied phenomenon is, however, both dynamic and complex in its nature, why the study deliberately places more significance on the ability of the research to explore the complexity of the topic, rather than its ability to be replicated by others. Several means to ensure the validity of the study have been deployed and are described further in the following sections.

4.4 DATA COLLECTION METHODS

The choice of data collection was guided by three parameters to ensure a holistic appreciation of the case study and allow for an in-debt analysis of EWEA’s communication. Firstly, the collected data should allow for a determination of which arguments the association favoured over others. Secondly, it should allow for a determination of which macro-discourses EWEA reproduced in constructing its own micro-discourse. Thirdly, the data collection must provide answers to why EWEA favoured certain arguments over others. A comprehensive data collection of EWEA’s external written communication fulfils the first and second parameter, where the association’s argumentation pattern forms the association’s micro-discourse. In-depth interviews with key employees working with the association’s strategic communication fulfils the third parameter.
4.4.1 EXTERNAL WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

To determine which macro-discourse EWEA primarily marked, all communication published from 2013 to 2014 on the association’s website was included in the data collection. It was in this period EWEA’s communication campaign took place. To increase the validity of the collected data, it was set as a criterion that EWEA featured as the official source behind the published text. In cases where it was unclear who was the author behind a text, the text was excluded from the data collection. This clear distinction between outside actors guesting the website with material and the association’s own statements allowed body text as well as direct quotes to be included in the data collection. This approach was chosen to include a broad range of texts to allow for a holistic appreciation of EWEA’s communication strategy and to elucidate EWEA’s micro-discourse (See Table 3). Social media updates were excluded from the data collection, as EWEA was found to only use these channels to promote publications already included. These were thusly found redundant. In total, 1,157 pages of text was analysed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3: TYPE AND QUANTITY OF ANALYSED TEXTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEXT TYPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTICLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOG POSTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LETTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITION PAPERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESS RELEASES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAGAZINES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

Interviews constituted the second part of the data collection. With this, the data collection moves from text-near data collection to oral, face-to-face interaction with the association. Four key employees were selected according to their area of responsibility: Strategic communication. See Table 4 below for more detail.

These employees were chosen based on their familiarity with EWEA’s strategic communication and their involvement in developing and selecting the association’s arguments for the 2030 campaign. Naturally, these employees are not the
only voices of the association. However, collectively their considerations form a critical representation of the association’s reasoning and strategic choices.

**TABLE 4: INTERVIEWEE BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEWEE 1</th>
<th>INTERVIEWEE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initials:</strong> I.P.</td>
<td><strong>Initials:</strong> P.T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job title:</strong> Director Public Affairs</td>
<td><strong>Job title:</strong> Deputy Director Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joined EWEA in:</strong> 2011</td>
<td><strong>Joined EWEA in:</strong> 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of interview:</strong> Thursday 12 March, 2015</td>
<td><strong>Date of interview:</strong> Thursday 12 March, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEWEE 3</th>
<th>INTERVIEWEE 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initials:</strong> J.M.</td>
<td><strong>Initials:</strong> O.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job title:</strong> Regulatory Affairs Advisor</td>
<td><strong>Job title:</strong> Spokesperson / Press Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joined EWEA in:</strong> 2013</td>
<td><strong>Joined EWEA in:</strong> 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of interview:</strong> Wednesday 11 March, 2015</td>
<td><strong>Date of interview:</strong> Monday 9 March, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aim of the interviews was to collect personal statements and viewpoints from the employees and draw parallels between these statements, in order to find a common reasoning behind EWEA’s communication strategy. To achieve this and to ensure the validity of the data collected, each of the four employees were presented with the results of the association’s argumentation pattern (member-checking cf. Creswell, 2007) (See Appendix B). This was also done to explore their conscious motivation for using these arguments and thus make the employees reflect over their choice of strategy. Secondly, the interviews aimed at exploring how less frequently deployed arguments were perceived by the employees. Therefore, the interviews took the form of a discussion where the interviewer alternated between inquiring about the choice of communication strategy and inquiring about alternative choices. E.g. “what if an alternative argument had been used?” The interviews were conducted as semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions (See Appendix C) to allow for some structure, but still a high degree of flexibility and responsive interaction (Sykes, 1991). This allowed cer-
tain areas to be explored further if relevant. An hour was set aside for each inter-
view.

To arrive at a collective reasoning from the employees’ individual statements, the employees were taken through the same questions to find patterns of shared thoughts. A large degree of control over the course of the interview is not guaranteed in semi-structured interviews. Therefore, interviewer directly asked questions perceived to be of key relevance for the purpose of drawing parallels between statements in cases where an interviewee failed to answer. Despite breaking the natural flow of the conversation, this was done to ensure the outcome of the interviews. Three test-interviews were conducted with employees from a topic-related organisation (the Danish Wind Industry Association), to validate the chosen interview method and test the interview questions.

4.5 DATA CODING

A conventional thematic content analysis was chosen to code the written external communication (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). The texts were carefully read to identify arguments promoting wind energy. By reviewing the data in relation to the macro-discourses in Chapter 2, the discourse themes in Table 5 were identified as representable categories. These were found to capture the discourse themes contained in EWEA’s communication. In the same manner, each discourse theme was appointed to either a neoliberal or an alternative macro-discourse (Table 5). Discourse themes ascribed to a neoliberal macro-discourse were themes describing the economic benefits and qualities of wind energy. Discourse themes that placed importance on social/environmental factors in relation to climate change or the unjustified benefits for carbon-heavy industries qualified within an alternative macro-discourse. In this connection, the discourse theme ‘Job creation’ requires additional elaboration. ‘Job creation’ is perceived to qualify both within an alternative and a neoliberal discourse, depending on the context in which it is communicated: Social or economic. As EWEA was found to address job creation in relation to economic growth rather than societal welfare, the discourse theme was ascribed to a neoliberal macro-discourse.
TABLE 5: DISCOURSE THEMES & MACRO-DISCOURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCOURSE THEMES</th>
<th>MACRO-DISCOURSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of energy</td>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment opportunities</td>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import disadvantages</td>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export benefits</td>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU leadership &amp; competitiveness</td>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic benefits</td>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public support &amp; involvement</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-emission, renewable technology</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies for fossil fuels</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2 reduction</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change / environment</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgency / speed</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen needs</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health issues</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following this method, the arguments were coded according to the words or phrases identified within them and subsequently ascribed to a discourse themes and a macro-discourse (Table 6). The coding was not limited to exact words. Rather, the meaning of the word or phrase qualified it. For example, the meaning of the expressions “expanding the economy” and “increasing profits” both qualify within the discourse theme “Economic growth” (See Table 6).

TABLE 6: EXAMPLES OF DATA CODING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARGUMENT</th>
<th>CODED THEME</th>
<th>DISCOURSE THEME</th>
<th>MACRO-DISCOURSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I have no doubt that the wind industry has the potential to revitalise Europe’s ailing economy”</td>
<td>Revitalise Europe’s economy</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>Neoliberal discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The immense wind resource cannot be depleted; wind farms can be built quickly; they emit no climate destabilising carbon”</td>
<td>Cannot be depleted, emit no carbon</td>
<td>Zero emission, renewable technology</td>
<td>Alternative discourse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When a text contained more than one discourse theme, the three main themes were selected and included in the data collection. See Appendix D for a
full overview of the coding. To increase validity a holistic appreciation of the text was used to determine these three themes. Themes mentioned in the headline and in the beginning of the text took precedence over themes mentioned later in body of the text. The coding has not been checked for inter/intra-coder reliability. However, based on the explicit rules for categorising the data, the coding is judged to be considerably reliable.

The final step of the data analysis involved extracting relevant meaning from the interviews in order to explore why EWEA favoured certain arguments over others. The interviews were transcribed and read several times, before the quotes drawing lines of parallel thought between the employees were selected. Since the discourse themes identified in the thematic content analysis were used in the discussions with the employees (See Appendix B), these guided the selection of quotes from the interviews. For an example of a transcribed interview, please see Appendix E.
5. RESULTS

This chapter will begin with a descriptive account of the findings from the thematic content analysis. Then the association’s reasons for deploying certain arguments more frequently than others in its strategic communication are described. From a descriptive level, the chapter will move to an analytical level and analyse the EWEA’s communication strategy from the systems theory perspective of Niklas Luhmann. In the analysis, EWEA is observed in relation to its environment and an account of which conditions this sets for the association’s communication is provided. The chapter ends by elucidating a set of communicative paradoxes hidden in EWEA’s strategic communication and the form of communication these paradoxes make possible.

5.1 DISCOURSE THEMES & MACRO-DISCOURSE TENDENCIES

Through a thematic content analysis of EWEA’s external written communication, the following discourse themes were identified. The discourse themes ‘Job creation’, ‘Economic growth’, ‘Cost of Energy’, ‘Energy security & independence’, and ‘EU leadership & competitiveness’ were the arguments EWEA used the most to promote with energy in the EU climate and energy debate from 2013 to 2014. The least deployed arguments where those falling within the discourse themes ‘Climate change & Environment’, ‘Need for urgency’, ‘Increase welfare’, and ‘Health issues’.
Generally, the employees were not surprised when presented with the findings of the content analysis displayed in Figure 1. O.J. commented that the most frequently used themes were the subjects that the wind industry was currently criticised for. The media was named as the main source of this criticism. O.J. explained that EWEA sought to tailor its communication to the media agenda. The frequencies of the arguments found in Figure 1 thus reflects the media agenda of the EU as the association observes it. The aim was to position EWEA as a participant in and a commentator of the news, rather than an agenda-setter. The media was thus identified as a target group for the association’s strategic communication – however not its primary target group.

In line with this, I.P. observed how politicians often featured in the media when announcing industrial and economic policies, but rarely when announcing energy policies. When politicians discussed renewable energy in the media, it was often in relation to the costs of renewables and their reliance on government support. In this connection, the association’s communication strategy was described as a move to position wind energy as an economic ‘must have’, ra-
ther than a niche technology and a green option. This required wind energy to be communicated in economic terms.

The content analysis shows that EWEA primarily communicates within a neoliberal discourse (Figure 2). With 80% of the discourse themes falling within this discourse, the association is observed to favour arguments of economic character. EWEA was subsequently found to largely exclude environmental and social arguments for wind energy from its communication. In this way, EWEA was found to reproduce neoliberal discourse parameters rather than alternative ones in its communication.

**FIGURE 2: MICRO-DISCOURSES**

The analysis of the external communication also shows that the association deploys five main discourse themes in its communication (Figure 3). In the following five sections, the chapter will concentrate on these top arguments for wind energy to explore how the association understands and talks about these themes.
5.1.1 JOB CREATION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

The analysis shows a clear tendency of the association to use ‘Economic growth’ and ‘Job creation’ as its main arguments for wind energy. A quarter of the registered arguments qualified within these two discourse themes (Figure 3). In the interviews with the employees, ‘Job creation’ and ‘Economic growth’ were often linked to one another. The themes are, therefore, described jointly in this section.

It was explained that ‘Job creation and ‘Economic growth’ were seem as the key performance indicators the success of any politicians was measured against in the EU. Especially, ‘Economic growth’ was emphasised in this context.

“It’s a key performance indicator for the economies. We can discuss whether the GDP is a flawed measure to indicate whether a society is progressing or not, but that is the measure that we have today and that is the measure that politicians are being rated against. That is the measure that macroeconomics and the general public understands as a positive indicator of growth.” (I.P.)

As previously explained, growth has over time manifested itself as an important indicator of success in the neoliberal discourse (Antonio, 2013). EWEA is here
found to actively reproduce this perception of success in its communication. Growth is seen as the natural goal any industry aims for.

“It is a very natural desire of an industry, of a business. You are being driven by your success by the number of installations, the number of wind turbines that you sell, by the number of components that you manufacture, the number of persons whose demand that you cover. Any indicator of a healthy industry will show a certain degree of growth.” (I.P.)

The categories of ‘Job creation’ and ‘Economic growth’ were further viewed as arguments that would position wind energy as indispensable to society. These were observed to be more important for society than climate and environmental issues. Climate and environmental qualities were only observed to be ‘nice to have’.

“Anything related to an ethical solution, green, sustainable, is nice to have – it is not need to have. So, what we need is economic growth and job creation – we need industrial policy... What we are trying to do is that we position wind energy as indispensable – must have – rather than nice to have... It is nice to have, but I have no money and I have no job, so I don’t want to see it... I think it is important that the industry is seen as an accepted player only if it brings benefits that society can see.” (I.P.)

To be seen as an accepted player, the employees observed it a necessity that EWEA was seen as an industrial organisation creating economic growth and jobs in the EU. The employees explained that EWEA strived to formulate industrial policies, because these were the arguments politicians listened to. Actors presenting industrial policies were observed to be seen as serious and beneficial actor in the EU. In this connection, the association made a clear distinction between industrial organisations and NGOs in its communication.

“You should be an industrial organisation – not an NGO that is only arguing for reducing emissions. It is in the industries interest of Europe and globally if countries start to reduce their emissions. We are an industry, we should talk industry-
talk and the advantage of using industrial communication is that you connect more easily with more conservative politicians or more conservative policymakers.” (J.M.)

While an industry organisation was observed to communicate using economic arguments, NGOs were observed to communicate using environmental arguments. In addition, environmental arguments were not seen as persuasive arguments when communicating to political sceptics of green technologies.

“...yes we are a renewable technology, it is environmentally friendly, peace and love... We want to move away from that kind of NGO’e language – that kind of Greenpeace language that you see – and much more onto the economics of wind power and why it makes sense for those doubters – those people that don’t like the idea of renewable technologies.” (O.J.)

5.1.1.1 WHAT POLITICIANS WANT TO HEAR

In the interviews, it was explained that one of the main reasons for the association to favour Job creation and Economic growth was because its primary target group was EU Politicians.

“We are an industry that depends on politician’s decisions. At the moment, as we are, we are not a self-standing industry. We depend on someone else to make the decision to keep supporting us and if that person is going to decide on something, we need to make sure that our argument is in line with that decision.” (I.P.)

The political support the employees referred to was on one hand governmental subsidies on member state-level and infrastructure development funds on EU-level. On the other hand, the industry was dependent on CO₂ and renewable energy targets, which were seen to paved the way for investments in renewable energy. Being dependent on support mechanisms was observed to make the wind industry especially vulnerable to the political environment. There were, therefore, big incentives for the association to be successful with its communication strategy. An important part of the strategy was to know what EU politicians cared
about. Here, the employees unanimously agreed on two topics: ‘Job creation’ and ‘Economic growth’.

“...when you are talking to policymakers the two things that they care about the most are economic growth and job creation. How many jobs are you going to create for your electorate and how much economic growth are you going to spread. What you need to get re-elected most of the time is economic growth and new jobs... That is ultimately what politicians care about.” (O.J.)

The communication strategy of the association was explained as a natural, human action to direct ones communication to the interests of the person one was talking to.

“You cannot come across to someone as an industry person if you do not show interest of what the other person has an interest in... It is, I think, a very natural human and by far more natural politically that is you want to ride a boat – well then you ride a boat with that person.” (I.P.)

More fundamentally this was described as being able to speak the same language as the association’s target group.

“You have to speak a language that triggers something in them. So, you need in your tool set before you go to a meeting stuff that will trigger that interest of that person and in the tool set you need arguments related to job creation, economic growth and sometimes energy security.” (J.M.)

In this way, the strategy was described as an attempt to conform to the political environment in which EWEA was operating.

“Why do we focus these arguments in Brussels? Well, that is because our target audience is concerned about this, so we modify our messages according to these target audiences...” (I.P.)
P.T. explained that if politicians has been interested in other subjects than ‘Job creation’ and ‘Economic growth’, then the arguments the association deployed would change accordingly.

“You have to adjust to the political reality that is the nature of the job. If everyone were talking about birds for example – you are killing a lot of birds – then we would have studies on birds and we would do press releases on birds, but this is not really the case.”

A reason for the political interest in ‘Job creation’ and ‘Economic growth’ was broadly ascribed to the tendency of the EU to focus mostly on business interests.

“I think Europe is largely about business... Look at all the energy frameworks they are all linked to business. If we talk about ETS for example that is a business framework. It is an intervention in the market...” (J.M.)

Another reason for the politicians’ interest in these themes was observed as a reaction the financial crisis. In relation to this, members of the European Parliament were seen to be mostly concerned with creating progress in the member states. They were found to listen to argument about how industries could contribute to economic recovery and jobs there.

“You really just have to look at what is going on last year. On a wider political perspective, we have had stagnant economic growth, we have had poor growth in many countries and especially in southern, eastern Europe. It has been the case for the past few years and both of these refer to economic growth and job creation.”(O.J.)

However, this argument was also observed to work in the member states that relied on fossil fuel industries for jobs and growth like Poland and the Czech Republic. The key was here to argue that other jobs and growth in other sectors would be created by investing in wind energy. Alternative arguments about the social and environmental benefits of wind energy were on the other hand deemed unpersuasive.
“...if there is going to be a reason, it has to really be an economic one, not just environmentally saying we need to decarbonize our energy system. You need an economic reason to do it.” (O.J.)

In fact, environmental arguments were often seen as an unserious. These types of arguments politicians could not use to explain their political achievements to their voters. Therefore, these arguments were wasted on most politicians.

“You don’t go to your voters when you need to get re-elected and say: ‘yea, you know, during the last 5 years, I have protected birds’. Then I would say ‘okay yes, well, I have lost my job and my neighbour has lost his job and my wife has lost her job – and you have protected birds! Seriously, and you want me to vote for you?’” (J.M.)

Both on an EU and on a national-level, the reason for environmental arguments to appear unpersuasive was ascribed to the composition of the political parties and interests in the EU institutions.

“Who do we target? Those who can make a difference for our industry, and to be honest the Greens are not making a difference for our industry. EWEA is not going to impact voters’ behaviour and make them vote on Greens... Which are the powerful players in Europe? It is the Social-Democrats, it is the Conservatives, Christian Democrats and some Liberals. So, you have to speak the language that they speak.” (J.M.)

From this, it is observed how J.M. observes the Green parties to be the only ones that alternative environmental arguments would work on.

5.1.1.2 A POLITICAL SHORT-TERM OUTLOOK
The timeframe EU politicians operate within was observed to be another important parameter for the choice of EWEA’s communication strategy.
“Who is going to be the great politician that delivered growth, stability and prosperity to the country? Maybe in the long run they will be remembered for bringing the Polish Energiewende in place, but do they really care if they are not in power in 10 years’ time?” (J.M.)

It was collectively observed that the politicians’ outlook was only about 5 years. Therefore, an important task for the association was to explain that the wind industry could also create jobs and growth here and now.

“We were talking about how many extra jobs a 30% target could create compared to a 27% target. We also talked about how much more growth it could create compared to a 27% target, so these are kind of our two... We had to show why it was important at EU level and member state level and even at local level” (O.J.)

This short-term outlook was perceived to be a barrier for the association, as energy infrastructure projects and their investment horizon was much longer than 5 years.

Their short-term interest is to keep voters in their constituency happy. The day that they are elected into the European Parliament, they already think about winning the seat again in 5 years’ time, so they don’t look 20 – 30 years’ ahead...”

A 20 – 30 years’ timeframe was seen as the required outlook for actors working with energy policies. The fact that most politicians did not share this long-term outlook was ascribed to them being ill informed. That politicians frequently rotated between different political policy areas during their career was seen to contribute to this.

“...when you are a politician you may serve 5 years as a Minister of Health and the next 5 years you serve as a Minister of Economy and then probably you are in charge of the pension system and then probably you are part of the transport system. How on earth are you going to be able to understand so many different sys-
tems that the society works around in such a short time span? You can’t! So, they are ill informed in many of the decisions that they are making.” (I.P.)

In the collected data, the presence of an alternative discourse was observed to a minimum. E.g. no employee saw economic growth as incompatible with climate change. On the contrary, J.O. commented that the most important consequence of climate change would be damages to economic growth. It was not considered that economic growth could be used as an argument to postpone investments in renewable energy. The association’s micro-discourse remain strongly focused on arguing for the long-term prospects of green jobs and growth. From this, it can be concluded that EWEA observes growth as the main driver for decision-making in the EU and thus presents wind energy as a growth opportunity.

Against the backdrop of the neoliberal macro-discourse described in the Background chapter, it is further concluded that the association actively and consciously tailors its micro-discourse to these macro-discourse processes.

5.1.2 COST OF ENERGY

Next to Economic growth and Job Creation, Cost of Energy was found to be the third most frequently theme deployed by the association. The employees explained the reason for this as a reaction to the ‘political atmosphere’:

“Last year, we did a hell of a lot of work on this aspect – Cost of Energy – electricity prices, energy prices... Because the political atmosphere and the environment in the member states was all about energy prices, competitiveness, how this is affecting us ...” (I.P.)

The association’s aim was to correct what was seen as a broad political misperception of the costs of wind energy.

“...renewables and wind in particular have been accused on both sides of driving up power prices for end consumers... This is why, almost one fourth of our public messaging has been on that... heavy industries that are extremely well organised and vocal, they are making a very strong case and we have to push back.” (P.T.)
As the quote indicates, carbon-heavy industries were seen to reinforce this misperception. These were observed to be successful in portraying renewable energy as an expensive source of energy. Fossil fuels were in example observed to be communicated as a less expensive energy source and thus better for EU’s global competitiveness.

“...the energy intensive industry has been successful in putting forward a compelling narrative that lower prices in the US and elsewhere has made industries over there more competitive than in Europe... Cost of Energy is important, because of competitiveness...” (J.M.)

The association did not only experience this in the political environment of Brussels, it observed wind energy to be portray as an expensive source of energy globally.

“There is a public perception out there that renewables are very expensive and actually they are not... It is as expensive to produce electricity from onshore wind, as it is from coal, but because the technology is still new, relatively speaking, and there is still much more room for cost reduction in terms of the materials you use and standardisation. There isn’t that room for cost reduction in coal.” (O.J.)

An element of the association’s communication strategy therefore entailed to communicate wind energy as a more competitive source of energy than fossil fuels. This was done by factoring in the environmental and social consequences of using fossil fuels.

“You then have what we call externalities, that is external costs of climate change, human toxicity, energy resource depletion, which is a bill that the taxpayer is picking up, but you don’t see it on your electricity bill, you see it elsewhere, but because you don’t make the association... So, we make the argument that coal is actually incredibly expensive, because you pick up the environmental impact of using that technology.” (O.J.)
In this way, EWEA’s arguments for wind energy ultimately became a question of money, i.e. the costs associated with producing electricity from wind.

“So, what we say is ‘invest now and it will be cheaper than simply just investing and rushing through it in 10 years’ time. It is cheaper to invest in renewables now, rather than to invest in fossil fuels and realise that you have to further down the road phase out those fossil fuels and invest in renewable energy anyway.’” (O.J.)

5.1.3 ENERGY SECURITY & INDEPENDENCE

EWEA observed the disadvantages associated with import of energy from outside the EU as another area of interest for politicians. Politicians were observed to regard the EU as vulnerable in terms of insecure energy supply and unpredictable energy prices. The conflict between Ukraine and Russia was seen as an opportunity to promote wind energy in terms of energy security. The conflict was seen to highlight the necessity for the EU to gain control over its energy resources. This made the association combine the discourse themes of ‘Energy security’ and ‘Import disadvantages’. Creating a positive link between wind energy and domestic energy production was observed as a winning argument. Wind energy was communicated as a way to ‘get off the Russian tap’. Despite the positive association in communicating wind energy as a means to ensure energy security in the EU, EWEA also observed how the argument sometimes met scepticism. Mostly, this related to the fluctuations in energy output associated with renewable energy. The employees observed how politicians placed importance on countries’ abilities to manage and control energy output. These observations were found to be similar to the ones described the Background chapter on neoliberalism.

“Okay, we decide not to buy any gas and we power our economies with just wind – then they will say – what if there is no wind?” (J.M.)

In this way, EWEA was observed to tailor its arguments to the neoliberal discourse parameters of independence and security, which was previously described as a common tendency of climate groups.
In the Background chapter, an alternative way of viewing securitisation was described. Securitisation was here seen to hinder rather than foster investments in renewable energy. It was criticised for directing the focus of governments to immediate and small-scale actions (Hayes & Knox-Hayes, 2014). Securitisation was seen to impede the collective actions required to tackle climate change. In this perspective, energy security was also observed to become an issue of access and affordability (Elkind, 2009). Again, EWEA was not observed to consider any of these alternative parameters in its discourse. Rather, the association was observed to pay special attention to the issue of affordability. This was earlier discussed in relation to Cost of Energy in section 5.1.2.

“It is about offering a realistic alternative to what we currently have... cost effective, affordable, secure and sustainable source of energy... that can provide all the things that fossil fuels provide, but a much more renewable and cleaner alternative.” (O.J.)

5.1.4 INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITIES
To accommodate the fluctuations in energy production, J.M. explained that in the medium to long term, wind energy required vast investments in smart, flexible grids, cross-border interconnections, and storage facilities. The association was here found to address these investments in terms of how governments could create the right conditions for private company to investment in these infrastructure areas.

“We also communicate to policymakers that if you have stable frameworks, if you provide the right legislative environment, you will see investments come into your country in renewable energy.” (O.J.)

None of the employees was found to address the problems associated with the privatisation described in the Background chapter. Here, it was discussed that private companies historically have not driven the development of renewable energy. Historic advancements in renewable energy were ascribed to state-driven investments. The active role of governments was argued to be far more important for
the development of renewable energy than private investors (David Hall et al, 2013). This seemingly inhibiting market trend of privatising large infrastructure areas was not observed to be an observation the association shared.

5.2 EWEA AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

When the thesis marks EWEA as the subject of interest for its observations in a systems theoretical perspective, it makes these observations possible by distinguishing EWEA as a system from its environment. This distinction is the very reason the association can emerge as an observable actor. It has been described how EWEA, through its employees, were given the possibility to observe its own arguments and reflect over these in the interviews. This has allowed observations of how EWEA observes its own observations. Within a systems theoretical perspective, this is made possible by the association splitting itself in two with one part observing and another part being observed. In this way, EWEA makes a re-entry in its observation.

In looking at observing observers through the distinction of system/environment, reality is always constructed as either system or environment. Through these observations, it can, therefore, be observed how EWEA constructs its environment. For EWEA, its environment consists predominantly of political actors at both EU and member state level.

The aim of the association is ultimately to influence this group of political actors participating in the EU climate and energy debate. As previously described, the association therefore aims to ensure that it speaks the same language as this target group, and that the association’s arguments are in line with their political interests. To construct persuasive arguments the association must consider
what its environment regards as persuasive. What is important to these political actors therefore becomes important for EWEA too. This places the success criteria for persuasive communication outside the association’s control with the environment appearing as the definer of these success criteria. In the previous sections, it was described how EWEA observes its environment to place importance on economic parameters. In this way, EWEA observes its environment to construct economic arguments as more important than environmental arguments.

“The first and most important thing is that we need to activate our economy, and then we can think about taking care of Mother Earth. It is not the other way around. It is not – let us care about the environment and then let us think about how we grow.” (I.P.)

Accordingly, EWEA observes its environment to construct economic arguments as persuasive and environmental arguments as unpersuasive. In response to this, the association constructs successful arguments as economic and unsuccessful arguments as environmental in its aim to construct persuasive communication. In this way, the association indicates economic arguments as influential and environmental arguments as uninfluential.

5.3 CONDITIONS FOR COMMUNICATION

The reason EWEA observes persuasive communication in this way is due to the distinction EWEA makes between itself and its environment. By indicating its environment as primarily consisting of political actors, it distinguishes this environment from other possible environments (the public, NGOs, the media etc.). It is observed, how EWEA observes other possible environments differently than its own environment. An example is how the association observes the public to value different arguments than public actors.

“There is a bit of disconnect between policymakers and the public particularly in Europe. Poland actually did a survey last year, broadly in favour of a renewables target and a greater penetration of wind power in their country... there is certain-
ly a disconnect between what happens on the policy side and what the public is asking for in many member states – not all of them – but in many.” (O.J.)

In this way, the association observes public actors to value environmental arguments to a greater extent than political actors. Yet, as the public is not observed by the association to be part of its environment, environmental arguments are observed not to be important.

“It is fantastic being publicly accepted and we want the people to endorse the technology and to back us up, but when it comes down to lobbying and influencing the heart and the tough cookies are the ones that are making the decisions.” (I.P.)

Another aspect that is observed to allow for this form of distinction is the association’s observation of industry actors as persuasive actors in the EU climate and energy debate. The association is found to observe industry actors as communicating economic arguments. This it distinguishes from NGOs that are observed to communicate using environmental arguments. In making this distinction between industry and NGO, EWEA is observed to positioning itself as different from a green technology and a NGO.

“We are a wind energy trade association. We represent an industry, which is affected by political decisions... we don’t represent the good hearts of saving mother earth...” (I.P.)

5.4 PARADOXICAL COMMUNICATION

Through the distinction system/environment, the reason for EWEA to communicate within a neoliberal discourse is elucidated. EWEA communicates within this discourse not because the association itself defines this as persuasive communication, but because its environment defines it as such.

“For good or for bad, we are a young industry that depends on the policy and the political discourses that are available – especially in Brussels.” (I.P.)
Here, it can be observed how EWEA constructs itself in relation to its environment in a distinction between which aspect of its communication it controls and which are controlled by its environment. Persuasive arguments were controlled by the association’s environment, which set the criteria for successful communication. This forms a paradox. If the association’s environment controls the successfulness of the association’s communication, the association must view itself as having no control over the outcome of its communication strategy. How can the association then define its success parameters? EWEA must to some extent observe itself as controlling its own successful communication. Yet, with some success parameters remaining outside the control of the association. To communicatively dissolve this paradox EWEA is observed to make a re-entry in its communication. In this way, the association constructs a degree of control over its uncontrollable communication.

EWEA is observed to construct this joined-space of ‘controllable uncontrollable success criteria’ in order to allow itself to define the success criteria for its communication strategy. As EWEA’s environment sets economic arguments as a criterion for successful communication, the joint-space allows the association to include arguments not defined by its environment as successful communication. This becomes relevant, as the association does not observe economic arguments as completely separate from environmental arguments.

“We should link them. CO₂ reduction, fighting climate change will bring you economic growth, will bring you investment opportunities, will bring you job creation. I think an industry sector as wind energy... we are in an environmental perspective, but we are an industry, so we should link them.” (J.M.)
“We have to be on both legs, so I don’t see the arguments as competing against one another. They are complimentary... We corporate and meet on a regular basis with our friends from WWF, Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth, we exchange messages, we exchange strategies etc., but at the same time we are identified by the decision-makers as industry and that is great.” (P.T.)

Economic and environmental arguments are observed as mutually beneficial. So, while environmental arguments are observed as unpersuasive in terms of successful communication towards its target group, a desire to combine these with the qualities that environmental arguments bring is also observed. Again, this forms a paradox in the association’s communication. While the association seeks to distinguish itself from unpersuasive, unsuccessful environmental arguments, it also strives to maintain its image as an environmental actor. In order to communicate environmental arguments, EWEA makes a re-entry in its argumentation by copying the distinction economic/environmental on the un-marked side of the distinction.

This can be observed as a communicative shift from a clear distinction between economic arguments and environmental arguments to a dissolution of the difference. Through this dissolution the association can communicate economic arguments as environmental arguments. Examples of this form of communication are expressions like ‘sustainable growth’, ‘green growth’, ‘green jobs’ and ‘Levilised Cost of Energy’. Here, the economic parameters of growth, jobs and costs are constructed as environmental. In this way, the association constructs economic arguments as environmental arguments in order to maintain its environmental profile. Accordingly, it can be observed how EWEA observes itself not to make purely economic arguments nor purely environmental arguments. This allows the association to construct environmental arguments as persuasive, even though its environment does not construct them as such.
5.5 POSSIBLE FORMS OF COMMUNICATION

It was previously observed how EWEA predominately marks a neoliberal discourse in its communication. In this way, the association makes a distinction between a neoliberal discourse to which it seeks to accommodate, and other alternative discourses from which it distinguishes itself.

The way the association marks the neoliberal discourse in its observations can be seen by how EWEA constructs neoliberal discourse parameters as parameters for credible arguments. In order to be perceived as a credible actor in the debate, EWEA’s arguments must accommodate neoliberal discourse parameters.

“Wind energy is a billion euro – dollar – industry. We are one of the big boys now in the energy mix and we have to start acting like it, which means that we have to start presenting credible arguments based on how can wind energy boost economic growth” (O.J.)

Based on these observations of the association’s observations, it appears that the climate and energy debate is conditioned for a special form of communication characterised by indicating economic arguments. In this manner, the association observes how credible arguments are constructed as economic. Credible actors are then those marking such economic parameters in their communication e.g. costs, prices, growth, import, export, competitiveness, leadership etc. Possible forms of communication are then those sponsored by a neoliberal discourse. Neoliberalism becomes the primary definer of what EWEA can observe as credible arguments in the climate and energy debate. Thus, what can be said and how it can be said is defined by neoliberal parameters.

While EWEA observes its environment to place importance on arguments defined within the parameters of a neoliberal discourse, other alternative
discourses have also been described. These alternative discourses criticise neoliberalism in relation to climate change. Especially, the parameters of economic growth, centralisation, and privatisation have been criticised, as these are seen to inhibit the transition to a fossil free society. These alternative discourses thus diverge from the otherwise dominating neoliberal discourse surrounding the EU climate and energy debate. By reproducing these dominating neoliberal discourse parameters, EWEA becomes part of ensuring the hegemony of neoliberal discourses in the EU climate and energy debate.
6. DISCUSSION

Following the data presentation and analysis, the results will be discussed in this chapter. The chapter will focus on the limitations that the distinctions, EWEA makes in its communication, foster. The chapter ends with a discussion of what consequences these limitations have for the association’s long-term communication strategy.

6.1 COMMUNICATIVE LIMITATIONS

The Results chapter described the discursive approach of EWEA and the ways in which the association observes itself in relation to its environment. It was explained how the association observed its environment to place important on economic parameters. Convincing arguments for wind energy in the EU climate and energy debate thus had to be constructed as economic arguments. Therefore, economic arguments were constructed as constituting persuasive communication. In this way, possible forms of communication came to belong to a neoliberal discourse. In order for EWEA to produce convincing arguments, the association accommodated its communication strategy to the parameters of neoliberalism.

EWEA was also seen to observe its environment to devalue environmental arguments. Environmental arguments were thus observed to be unconvincing forms of communication in the climate and energy debate. Accordingly, environmental arguments did not form persuasive communication. EWEA associated environmental arguments with the communication of NGOs. It was perceived as the form of communication an organisation would communicate to the general public. As the aim of EWEA’s communication strategy was ultimately to influence its environment of political stakeholders, environmental arguments were in this way constructed as uninfluential. If the association should hope to be successful in persuading its environment, environmental arguments would not achieve this. In sum, the association can be observed to observe environmental arguments
as unconvincing, thus forming the basis for uninfluential and unsuccessful com-
munication.

Observing EWEA’s communication through a systems theory per-
spective, it becomes clear how EWEA naturally becomes unable to mark envi-
rmental arguments in its communication. Marking environmental arguments
would have consequences for the success of its communication strategy. The as-
association would here fail to live up to the parameters set for successful communi-
cation in the discourse. From this is follows, that EWEA limits its arguments to
economic arguments. Although it may seek to construct ‘environmental economic’
arguments, its argumentation remains economic in its nature. It thus excludes
alternative, non-economic ways of communicating about wind energy.

This exclusion of environmental arguments was previously described
as a way for the association to be perceived as a credible actor in the EU climate
and energy debate. Credibility was related to economic arguments, thus marking a
credible actor as an actor using economic arguments. From the distinctions made
in the communication, it can be observed how EWEA observes environmental ar-
guments as incredible. The association thus becomes unable to communicat
about wind energy in environmental terms if it wants to be perceived as a credible
actor.

Following this line of observation, the reason for un-marking envi-
rronmental arguments ultimately becomes a matter of how credible actors are con-
structed in the discourse. If an actor is not marked in the economic space in the
discourse, the actor is consequently marked as someone not to be taken seriously.
This does not mean that actors marking environmental arguments in the climate
and energy debate are completely excluded from participation. It rather means that
these actors are marked as less serious compared to actors marking economic arguments in the debate. Participation is thus made easier for actors constructing their arguments as economic. EWEA can participate as a serious actor presenting professional arguments about wind energy in a credible manner, as long as the association does not communicate about wind energy in environmental terms.

6.2 CONSEQUENCES OF DISTINCTION

In the short term, the strategy to tailor its communication to the prevailing discourse of neoliberalism appears beneficial for the association. EWEA is here observed to successfully promote wind energy within the parameters set up for persuasive communication in the EU climate and energy debate. It achieves its aim of producing convincing arguments and being perceived as a serious actor in the debate. However, in the long term this strategy could inhibit the association’s goals.

As previously discussed early industrial society started out as decentralised due to the natural dispersion of water resources for hydropower generation. Industrial capitalism changed this, as labour, energy, and factories required centralisation to allow for control over production and resources. In fact, this is the exact mind-set EWEA ultimately aims to change.

“It is more in peoples mind; it is in the way that we plan society...the way that we should create a growing, developing society. If I am a politician... I would say ‘what I want is a city, where all the people live in the outskirts and they come, they work, they generate profits and they go back to the suburbs... I have a power plant there... and a port here... I ship my goods and everything is centralised. This is the paradigm of a politician of how a society should work, but with renewables, this needs to change.” (I.P.)

As was true for hydropower already in the early 19th century, the same is true for wind energy today. The natural sources that are utilised to generate renewable energy is depended on the fluctuations of nature. Some places have naturally better conditions for generating renewable energy than others. Thus, the idea of centralisation imbedded in capitalistic and neoliberalist thinking inhibits a full
rollout of renewable energy. By conforming and actively taking part in reproducing the discourse of neoliberalism, EWEA contributes rather than disputing the notion of centralisation. Consequently, EWEA ends up reproducing the very perception of renewable energy that it ultimately seeks to dispute: The perception that energy resources should be centralised, constant, and controllable. These values, which found fossil fuels to be a superior source of energy, thus remain undisputed by EWEA. As a consequence, they persist to be the parameters against which renewable energy is evaluated in the societal macro-discourse. This distinction also means that what could be the most important quality of wind energy in a climate debate – its climatic and environmental benefits – is rendered insufficient.

Previously, it was discussed how renewable energy sources require large investments in new energy infrastructure like smart, flexible electricity grids, energy storage facilities, and cross-border transmission networks. These changes are needed in order to accommodate decentralised and variable renewable energy production. History has shown how government funds and community initiatives have driven the advancements in renewable energy. Private investors have on the other hand not. From this, it follows that the need to invest large sums of public money in new energy infrastructure must be collectively acknowledge and widely supported by the public. In order for these projects to succeed, it has to make sense for ordinary taxpayers that government money is spent on these projects. This is needed in order for politicians to measure their success against these parameters and for them to make these projects a political priority. As previously described, to allow for these investments to happen, a paradigmatically shift in the way modern societies are perceived and structured is required. A key aspect of this is to allow a society-wide debate to form in which the current societal status quo can be questioned. Based on these observations, it is proposed that EWEA is not contributing to produce a discourse space in which this form of societal change can happen. By reproducing a discourse in which privatisation and centralisation are valued parameters, EWEA is observed to advocate for keeping the status-quo, rather than advocating for change.

From this, it can be observed how EWEA appears to be blind to the long-term consequences of its communication strategy. To explain the formation
of this blind spot one must view EWEA’s communication in relation to the historic development of the macro-discourse. Here, a continuous reproduction of the distinction Economic / Environmental throughout the history of modern industrialisation is seen to have created a space in the discourse where it has become impossible to talk about climate change in environmental terms. In this way, actors participating in the debate end up talking about the economy and not about the environment. In the end, climate issues become economic issues that need to be solved through economic measures. It can here be seen as a paradox that actors promoting environmental solutions in the EU climate and energy debate cannot address climate issues in environmental/climatic terms. This paradox was also observed by the association:

“When we go and we preach about this paradigmatic change they don’t see it. It is on one hand frustrating and on the other hand, it is funny. You know, that people cannot see beyond what they have been used to and what they have grown with in experiences.”(I.P.)

Another thing is that actors marked within the ‘environmental’ space in the discourse are marked as unserious and unprofessional. It thus excludes these actors from influencing the climate and energy debate. This form of exclusion is seen to hinder a democratic debate on climate and energy. It limits the political alternatives and socio-ecological futures to choose from, and it contributes to keeping the status quo in place. As a result, these processes ultimately prevent change from happening. In the end, the long-term communicative consequences of EWEA’s communication strategy can be illustrated the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberalism</td>
<td>Alternative ↔ Privatisation</td>
<td>Government ↔ Centralisation</td>
<td>Decentralisation ↔ Status-quo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of the data presented, this research proposes that EWEA becomes an advocator for maintaining the societal status-quo by deliberately not posing a threat to the economic order of society. Following this, the thesis suggests that
EWEA traps itself in its own strategy and ultimately damages the very business it aims to grow.
Climate change science states that CO₂ emissions must be reduced drastically in order to preserve the earth and its resource on which civilisation is depended. The necessary actions required to reduce these CO₂ emissions rest with the political actors elected to govern these changes in society.

In the Background chapter, it was described how the advance of fossil fuels is closely connected to the industrialisation of modern society. During these decades, capitalism and later neoliberalism gained momentum. An understanding of society in terms of privatisation, centralisation, control over resources, and economic growth developed. The ideas of capitalism and neoliberalism are still influential today and dominate the discourse surrounding the EU climate and energy debate. Alternative viewpoints were also introduced in this chapter. These discourses advocated for change in the way society is understood, criticising the ideas of neoliberalism. It was explained how a societal-wide rollout of renewable energy requires structural changes in line with the ideas put forward by alternative discourses. These count government-led investments in energy infrastructure and a perceptual shift in understanding energy production as a decentralised and variable process.

Through a systems theory perspective, the communication strategy of the industry association, EWEA, was analysed. It was observed how EWEA constructed itself in relation to its environment, and in this way marked political actors as the primary target group for its communication. These actors were seen to value economic arguments like Job creation, Economic growth, Cost of Energy, Energy security & independence, and Investment opportunities. The reason being that society was observed to measure their political achievements against these economic parameters. Therefore, convincing arguments for wind energy had to
accommodate these parameters. In this way, the association was found to predomi-
nately mark economic arguments in its communication where possible forms of
communication came to belong to a neoliberal discourse. In marking a neoliberal
discourse in its strategic communication and thus taking part in reproducing this
discourse in the EU 2030 climate and energy debate, EWEA’s communication
strategy was observed to be successful.

The findings exposed a distinction between economic and environ-
mental arguments in EWEA’s communication strategy. As EWEA’s target group
was not observed to value environmental arguments, these were not marked as
convincing arguments. Nevertheless, EWEA saw environmental and economic
arguments as compatible. Through the re-entry of the distinction economic / envi-
ronmental, it therefore created a space in its discourse where environmental argu-
ments could be communicated in economic terms. Examples of this form of
communication were ‘sustainable growth’, ‘green jobs’, and ‘Levilised Cost of
Energy’. The analysis further highlighted that actors marking environmental argu-
ments in the EU climate and energy debate were marked as unprofessional ac-
tors in the discourse. It was therefore observed to be a necessity for the associa-
tion to communicate environmental arguments in an economic space in the dis-
course to be perceived as a serious actor in the debate. In this way, it was shown
how EWEA became unable to mark pure environmental arguments in its commu-
nication.

The distinctions EWEA made in its communication was observed to
make it blind to the limitations of its own discourse and the consequences of
marking a neoliberal discourse space. EWEA was found to trap itself in its own
communication strategy in three ways. Firstly, it was suggested that EWEA con-
tributed to a discourse in which fossil fuels remained a superior source of energy.
The bearing parameters for comparing fossil fuels and renewable energy remained
their ability to produce jobs and economic growth as centralised and cheaply as
possible. The important environmental benefits of wind energy in a combined
climate and energy perspective was thus rendered unimportant. Secondly, it was
proposed that EWEA contributed rather than disputed the ideas of centralisation, privatisation, control over recourses, and economic growth by reproducing a ne-
oliber discourse. In leaving these ideas undisputed, the association was found to blindly contribute to the very barriers it ultimately sought to overcome. It was suggested that this would make it difficult for the association to defend the societal changes needed to enable a societal-wide rollout of wind energy. Thirdly, the data showed EWEA to take part in excluding alternative discourses from the EU climate and energy debate. Thus, it was proposed that the association appeared as an advocator for the societal status-quo, rather than an advocator for change. In the end, these communicative consequences can be seen as an explaining factor as to why EU politicians are not rushing to close down fossil fuel plants or provide sufficient incentives for a rapid transition into renewable energy. When renewable energy actors are not advocating for change, why should politicians?

7.1 FURTHER RESEARCH

An inherent conservatism in the strategic communication of EWEA can be detected in this thesis. In order to be strategic, the association was found to reproduce the prevailing discourse of neoliberalism in the climate and energy debate. In doing so, it contributed to the very barriers it sought to overcome. It supported the status-quo, rather than advocating for change. The association thus trapped itself in its own strategy, forming a strategic communication trap. Similar to claims put forward by researchers like Bruce Berger (2005), the communication strategy of EWEA appears to serve capitalism well. In relation to this, Berger has questioned whether strategic communication or public relations “can serve stakeholders and society as well inside or outside the dominant coalition” (p. 6). It is, therefore, suggested that further researcher in the area of excluded discourses and actors in the climate and energy debate explore whether strategic communication can in fact also serve to create societal change.
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APPENDIX A: CONSENT FORM

This Consent Form is for employees of the European Wind Energy Association invited to participate in the following research project:

Name of Researcher

Name of Organisation

Name of Project

This Consent Form has three parts:
- Information Section (to share the purpose of the study with you)
- Certificate of Consent (for signatory purposes upon participation)
- Informed Consent Confirmation (to confirm the freely consent of the participant)

You will be given a copy of the full Consent Form

Part I: Information Section

I, Maja Østergaard, graduate student at Lund University, am writing my Master Thesis on the strategic public affairs communication of the European Wind Energy Association. Please ask me at any point prior to, during or after the interview if you have any doubts or questions related to the Consent Form or the research in general.

This research will involve your participation in an interview that will take 1 hour.
**Research Purpose**
This research attempts to explore the seemingly difficulty of promoting a climate agenda in the EU with reference to the public affairs communication of the European Wind Energy Association.

**Participant Selection**
You have been invited to take part in this research, because it is estimated that your experience with the public affairs communication of the European Wind Energy Association any time between 2013 and 2014 can contribute to the understanding and knowledge of the strategy deployed by the association to promote wind energy.

**Procedures**
The interview will be recorded for documentation purposes, but you will not be identified by name in the recording and thus remain anonymous. All information you choose to share during the interview is confidential. Information shared by you is only used for academic purposes, and no one else except me will have access to it.

**Voluntary Participation**
Participation is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw your participation at any time.

You may be asked to share sensitive or confidential information, and should you feel uncomfortable talking about a topic during the interview, you do not have to answer the question. You do not have to give me any reason for not responding to a question, or for refusing to take part in the interview.

There will be no direct benefit to you in your participation, but it is likely to help me better understand how the European Wind Energy Association can improve its strategic public affairs communication on wind energy towards COP21 in Paris.

**Part II: Certificate of Consent**

*I have been invited to participate in research about the strategic public affairs communication of the European Wind Energy Association in relation to the EU climate and energy debate.*

*I have read the foregoing information, or it has been read to me. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the study and my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I consent my voluntary participation in this study.*

________________________
Print Name of Participant

________________________
Signature of Participant

________________________
Date of Interview
### Part III: Informed Consent Confirmation

*I have accurately provided information to the participant and answered the questions the participant had prior to the interview. I confirm that the participant has consented to the interview freely.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Name of Researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

APPENDIX B: GRAPHS USED IN INTERVIEWS

ARGUMENTS FOR WIND ENERGY: EWEA’S COMMUNICATION PATTERN
**EWEA: TOP 5 COMMUNICATION PATTERNS**

- **Neoliberal**: 80%
- **Alternative**: 20%

**TWO TYPES OF ARGUMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Creation</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Security &amp; Independence</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Growth</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Opportunities</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Disadvantages</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Leadership &amp; Competitiveness</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proven Zero-Emission, Renewable</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Support</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies for Fossil Fuels</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export Benefits</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2 Reduction</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change &amp; Environment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Urgency</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Welfare</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Issues</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


ARGUMENTS FOR WIND ENERGY: GROUP 1

- JOB CREATION: 41
- ECONOMIC GROWTH: 41
- COST OF ENERGY: 34
- ENERGY SECURITY & INDEPENDENCE: 34
- INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITIES: 17
- IMPORT DISADVANTAGES: 13
- EU LEADERSHIP & COMPETITIVENESS: 13
- EXPORT BENEFITS: 9

ARGUMENTS FOR WIND ENERGY: GROUP 2

- PROVEN ZERO-EMISSION, RENEWABLE TECHNOLOGY: 12
- PUBLIC SUPPORT: 11
- SUBSIDIES FOR FOSSIL FUELS: 9
- CO2 REDUCTIONS: 8
- CLIMATE CHANGE & ENVIRONMENT: 5
- NEED FOR URGENCY: 4
- INCREASE WELFARE: 1
- HEALTH ISSUES: 1
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW GUIDE

**Arguments for wind energy: EWEA’s communication pattern**
*I have looked at all your publications during the last two years and it appears there is a pattern…*

- Can you tell me why EWEA favours these arguments?
  - If relevant: What do you mean by people e.g. politicians or the people in society?
  - If relevant: Are the politicians not interested in the things that people in society is interested in?
- How do you use the arguments / in which situations do you use them?

**EWEA: Top 5 communication patterns**
*If we look at the top 5 arguments...*

- Would you have guessed these would be the arguments EWEA mostly use to promote wind energy?
- Would you say that you use these arguments consciously? Why?
- What do you think EWEA hopes to gain from using these arguments?
  - If relevant: If you were to sum up, what would you say is the motivation for using these arguments?
  - If relevant: Looking forward should these remain the top 5 arguments for wind energy?

**Two types of arguments**
*To me it looks like there is a pattern in the arguments – if we divide the arguments into two groups, then these are the two groups we get:*

- Do you see a difference in the argument structure of the two indicated groups?
  - If relevant: Which difference do you see?
- Do you agree that the arguments can be divided in two groups like this?

**Arguments for wind energy: Group 1**

- What are the strengths of the arguments in group 1?
- Why are these strengths?
- What are the weaknesses of the arguments in group 1?
- Why are these weaknesses?

**Arguments for wind energy: Group 2**

- What are the strengths of the arguments in group 2?
- Why are these strengths?
- What are the weaknesses of the arguments in group 2?
- Why are these weaknesses?
**EWEA communication patterns and paradigms**

*If we move on to talk about climate change...*

- Do you think that people increasingly think about a world in which we get rid of fossil fuels?
  - If relevant: Do you think the EU institutions and politicians see it the same way?
  - If relevant: Which role does wind energy play in the climate debate?
- What is your view on climate changes and global warming e.g. the 2-degree limit, rising water level?
- What is the importance of job creation, exports, energy security and growth if the impact of global warming come true?
  - If relevant: Aren’t these things ultimately pointless if the predictions come true?
  - If relevant: Do you still think these top 5 arguments should be used to promote wind energy?
## APPENDIX D: CODING OVERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macro-discourse</th>
<th>Discourse theme</th>
<th>Coded word/phrase</th>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Headline</th>
<th>Spokesperson</th>
<th>Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td>“I want to turn the crisis facing the wind industry today into an opportunity to show how wind energy could contribute to jobs, exports and green growth”</td>
<td>EWEA 2013 to start on an optimistic note</td>
<td>Thomas Becker</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Export benefits</td>
<td>exports</td>
<td></td>
<td>Euroland can be role model for renewable energy at United Nations Climate Change Conference in Paris 2015</td>
<td>Thomas Becker</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>green growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>EU leadership &amp; competitiveness</td>
<td>lead</td>
<td>&quot;Now, Europe has an opportunity to take the lead&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>energy independence</td>
<td>&quot;Part of the answer to Europe's energy independence, of how to spur economic growth, create jobs and protect the climate lies in the wind industry”</td>
<td>Europe can be role model for renewable energy at United Nations Climate Change Conference in Paris 2015</td>
<td>Thomas Becker</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>economic growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>growth</td>
<td>&quot;Investing in wind energy makes absolute economic sense&quot;</td>
<td>Governments are endangering European jobs and growth</td>
<td>Christian Kjaer</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td>&quot;Creates jobs and economic growth in Europe. 238,000 people worked in EU wind energy in 2010”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>costs of energy</td>
<td>&quot;Cost of French nuclear would rise to €90/MWh – more expensive than onshore wind power”</td>
<td>French wind power covers record 10 percent of demand</td>
<td>Zoe Casey</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>growth</td>
<td>&quot;This is a rate far higher than the growth of GDP itself, making wind energy a catalyst for Belgium’s economic recovery&quot;</td>
<td>Belgian economic recovery powered by wind</td>
<td>Sarah Azau</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td>&quot;National wind energy jobs have increased by 74% while the overall employment rate has gone up by just 3.7% (a figure 20 times lower) since 2007&quot;</td>
<td>France to invest €3.5 billion in offshore wind energy</td>
<td>Phillipa Jones</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td>&quot;The projects will create 10,000 industrial jobs&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Public support</td>
<td>in favour</td>
<td>&quot;French people were in favour of the installation of wind turbines and 53% thought that out of all renewable energies, the wind sector should be made the priority compared to 43% the year before&quot;</td>
<td>French favour renewables, but perceive high costs</td>
<td>Zoe Casey</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Public support</td>
<td>in favour</td>
<td>&quot;Nine in ten people in France are in favour of renewable energy...largely because of their clean and non-polluting image&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>more expensive</td>
<td>&quot;Onshore wind is already competitive with traditional fossil fuels. Offshore wind meanwhile is more expensive than fossil fuels – although the cost is falling – and considerably cheaper than nuclear&quot;</td>
<td>Why is wind energy controversial despite favourable public opinion?</td>
<td>Zoe Casey</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Public support</td>
<td>public remain supportive</td>
<td>&quot;In the UK, while the majority of the public remain supportive of wind energy, it remains controversial and the issue is increasingly combative on the national political stage&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>threaten the profitability</td>
<td>&quot;When the sun shines and the wind blows more electricity is produced than needed meaning that renewable electricity is available at prices that threaten the profitability of coal&quot;</td>
<td>Belgian and German electricity systems keep lights on despite nuclear turn-off</td>
<td>Zoe Casey</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td>&quot;Around 2,000 jobs could be created every year up to 2050 in Wales, and 2.7 billion euro injected into the Welsh economy could receive 2.7 billion euro&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoe Casey</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>euro injected into the economy</td>
<td>Welsh economy, if the Welsh government target for 2,000 MW of onshore wind capacity by 2025 is met’</td>
<td>boost with onshore wind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Import disadvantages</td>
<td>fossil fuel imports</td>
<td>“Today, EU citizens are spending half a billion Euros more each day on fossil fuel imports than they were three years ago”</td>
<td>Fossil fuel subsidies are &quot;public enemy number one&quot; – IEA Chief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Subsidies for fossil fuels</td>
<td>Fossil fuel subsidies</td>
<td>“Fossil fuel subsidies – which amounted to half a trillion US Dollars worldwide in 2011 – are effectively an incentive to pollute and as such are “public enemy number one to sustainable energy development”</td>
<td>Irish Energy Minister calls for clarity on fuel subsidies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Subsidies for fossil fuels</td>
<td>subsidies for coal, oil, gas and nuclear</td>
<td>“The European Commission needs to provide data to compare subsidies for renewables with the ‘far less transparent’ subsidies for coal, oil, gas and nuclear”</td>
<td>EWEA Blog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>parity with other electricity-generating technologies</td>
<td>“Onshore wind will achieve parity with other electricity-generating technologies feeding into the grid in Europe by 2015, followed by offshore in 2022/2023”</td>
<td>Wind will be cheapest electricity generating technology by 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>cheaper</td>
<td>“The fact that wind power is now cheaper than coal and gas in a country with some of the world’s best fossil fuel resources shows that clean energy is a game changer which promises to turn the economics of power systems on its head”</td>
<td>Electricity from Australian wind farms is cheaper than new coal and new gas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>growth</td>
<td>“The newspaper also said Cameron told an audience in Mumbai that emissions free green technologies like wind power are economic growth items”</td>
<td>British PM tells India that wind power is a green growth industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>costs</td>
<td>“Both EWEA and GWEC, the Global Wind Energy Council, agree that “onshore wind power is competitive once all the costs that affect traditional energy sources – like fuel and CO2 costs, and the effects on environment and health – are factored in”</td>
<td>Technological advances are improving wind power’s competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Need for urgency</td>
<td>up and running within the space of</td>
<td>“A wind farm once consented can be up and running within the space of six months to one year”</td>
<td>UK government needs “plan B on nuclear” – Guardian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>competitive with coal and gas</td>
<td>“Today, onshore wind power is already competitive with new coal and gas power generation, and cheaper than nuclear power”</td>
<td>EWEA Blog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Proven zero-emission, renewable technology</td>
<td>cannot be depleted, no climate destabilising carbon</td>
<td>“The immense wind resource cannot be depleted; wind farms can be built quickly; they emit no climate destabilising carbon”</td>
<td>China’s wind energy sector generates more electricity than nuclear power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Need for urgency</td>
<td>built quickly</td>
<td>“The report says meeting the EU’s climate change and energy targets by 2020 would generate up to five million jobs”</td>
<td>Europe needs a strong 2030 renewable energy target – WWF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td>“Maximising indigenous power sources that could deliver cheaper and more secure energy”</td>
<td>EWEA Blog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>cheaper</td>
<td>“US wind energy is now more economic than nuclear power”</td>
<td>US wind energy is now more economic than nuclear power – Bloomberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>“The emissions-free electricity-generating technology”</td>
<td>EWEA Blog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Proven zero-emission, renewable technology</td>
<td>emissions-free</td>
<td>“What this shows is that wind is a stable and reliable source of power generation on the scale we need, when we need it the most”</td>
<td>Wind powers over 10% of UK electricity needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Proven zero-emission, renewable technology</td>
<td>stable and reliable</td>
<td>“The news on gas serves as a timely reminder of the vulnerability of supply”</td>
<td>Christian Kjaer Blog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Need for urgency</td>
<td>when we need it</td>
<td>“We have arrived at a point where onshore wind has proven itself to be very cost-competitive, and has the</td>
<td>EWEA Blog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>cost-competitive</td>
<td>“Maximising indigenous power sources that could deliver cheaper and more secure energy”</td>
<td>EWEA Blog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Need for urgency</td>
<td>scale up very rapidly</td>
<td>“The news on gas serves as a timely reminder of the vulnerability of supply”</td>
<td>Christian Kjaer Blog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neoliberal</th>
<th>Energy security &amp; independence</th>
<th>exposure to carbon and fuel price</th>
<th>biggest advantage in that it can scale up very rapidly and reduce investor exposure to carbon and fuel prices”</th>
<th>Dramatic changes in wind industry over last two years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>cost householders</td>
<td>“Ed Davey, UK Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change, has said that onshore and offshore wind power together cost householders only £18 a year in total”</td>
<td>Wind power costs UK consumer just 18 pounds a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Subsidies for fossil fuels</td>
<td>worldwide subsidies to fossil fuels</td>
<td>“The report estimates that worldwide subsidies to fossil fuels total $1.9 trillion [€1.5 trillion] – the equivalent to 2.7% of global GDP, or 8% of government revenues”</td>
<td>EWEA Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Public support</td>
<td>Americans want</td>
<td>“71 per cent of Americans want to see more wind power development”</td>
<td>71 per cent of Americans want to see more wind power development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>accelerate its economic growth</td>
<td>“The United States has a great opportunity to accelerate its economic growth over the next several years by emphasising and fully using its enormous energy riches to produce domestic energy”</td>
<td>EWEA Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>cost more</td>
<td>“Fossil fuel power sources cost more than renewables in Germany”</td>
<td>Fossil fuel power sources cost more than renewables in Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Public support</td>
<td>Europeans think</td>
<td>“70% of Europeans think renewables should be prioritised”</td>
<td>70% of Europeans think renewables “should be prioritised”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>cost the same</td>
<td>“The same report found that renewables will cost the same as conventional fuels (including gas) in many parts of the world in the very near term”</td>
<td>Future of shale gas challenging, cost of renewables falling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>most cost-competitive</td>
<td>“One of the most cost-competitive renewable energy sources”</td>
<td>Wind energy is bright light in an otherwise grim report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>energy security</td>
<td>“All of the fundamentals which have driven wind power to date are still in place: energy security, price stability,</td>
<td>Wind power growth expected to slow in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neoliberal</th>
<th>Economic growth</th>
<th>local economic development</th>
<th>local economic development, climate change mitigation and local air and water pollution issues”</th>
<th>2013, but recovery predicted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>costs are falling</td>
<td>“Wind energy costs are falling and some companies involved in wind are seeing arise in profits, according to evidence which has appeared in the world’s media this month”</td>
<td>Cost of renewable energy is falling, reports say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Subsidies for fossil fuels</td>
<td>subsidising fossil fuels</td>
<td>“By subsidising fossil fuels, governments are stealing money from the pockets of the poor, who would get money otherwise for schools and hospitals”</td>
<td>IEA Chief Economist: governments “stealing money from the poor”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Health issues</td>
<td>make us sick</td>
<td>“The study — ‘The Unpaid Health Bill: How coal power plants make us sick’ — also found that EU-wide impacts amount to more than 18,200 premature deaths, about 8,500 new cases of chronic bronchitis, and over four million lost working days each year”</td>
<td>Coal’s hidden health costs: 40 billion euros a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>cost-competitiveness</td>
<td>“It sounds a little old fashioned when BusinessEurope claims that fighting climate change is not compatible with cost-competitiveness and security of supply”</td>
<td>EWEA CEO: BusinessEurope “on another planet” on energy policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>security of supply</td>
<td>“The main problem of the energy situation today in Europe is the massive subsidies – still in 2013 – going to fossil fuels and nuclear”</td>
<td>Thomas Becker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Subsidies for fossil fuels</td>
<td>massive subsidies</td>
<td>“I have no doubt that the wind industry has the potential to revitalise Europe’s ailing economy”</td>
<td>Wind energy will help Europe’s economy set sail again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>revitalize the economy</td>
<td>“I have no doubt that the wind industry has the potential to revitalise Europe’s ailing economy”</td>
<td>Thomas Becker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Public support</td>
<td>Austrians favour</td>
<td>“Seventy seven percent of Austrians favour wind power”</td>
<td>Seventy seven percent of Austrians favour wind power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Subsidies for fossil fuels</td>
<td>governments are giving</td>
<td>“And yet governments are giving $6 to polluting fossil fuels for every $1 dollar that goes to clean renewables”</td>
<td>Tell a G8 leader to switch from fossil fuels to renewable energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>European economy</td>
<td></td>
<td>EWEA Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>improving energy security</td>
<td>“Highlighted the importance of renewables in transforming the European economy, improving energy security and reducing greenhouse gas emissions”</td>
<td>French and German ministers call for 2030 renewable energy targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>CO2 reduction</td>
<td>reducing greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rising energy dependency endangers Europe’s economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>energy dependence</td>
<td>“We must transform our energy system and reduce our expensive and polluting energy dependence. Wind power is one of the best answers to this necessary transformation”</td>
<td>Thomas Becker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>Polish economy</td>
<td>“Benefits for the Polish economy and development determinants”</td>
<td>Polish offshore wind energy worth €17.5 billion by 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td>“The sector could potentially create 31.8 thousand new jobs from 2012-2025”</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>CO2 reduction</td>
<td>pollution</td>
<td>“Will cut pollution from fossil fuels for the long-term and significantly reduce our dependency on imported fuels – like wind power”</td>
<td>UK should back EU-wide renewable energy target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>reduce our dependency</td>
<td>“Wind energy alone contributed 32 billion euro to the EU economy in 2010 and employs well over 200,000 people in Europe. Europe is a net exporter of wind energy technology”</td>
<td>Cutting renewables support to increase competitiveness is nonsense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>contributed to the EU economy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wind energy and other renewables to power 25% of world within 5 years – IEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>employs</td>
<td></td>
<td>British Prime Minister celebrates the world’s largest offshore wind farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Export benefits</td>
<td>exporter of wind energy technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>EWEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>costs continue to fall</td>
<td>“As their costs continue to fall, renewable power sources are increasingly standing on their own merits versus new fossil-fuel generation”</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Proven zero-emission, renewable technology</td>
<td>can build large-scale</td>
<td>“London Array shows you can build large-scale renewable energy projects right here in Britain”</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Investment opportunities</td>
<td>clear investment climate</td>
<td>“The UK has one of the clearest investment climates globally”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>CO2 reduction</td>
<td>save carbon dioxide emissions</td>
<td>“The wind farm is expected to save 900,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions annually”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td>“Offshore wind is a new industry that creates jobs, reduces fossil fuel imports and in which Europe is a world leader with huge export opportunities”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Import disadvantages</td>
<td>import</td>
<td>Media reports on offshore boost in 2013 but heeds EWEA’s warning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Export benefits</td>
<td>exports</td>
<td>Justin Wilkes Blog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Proven zero-emission, renewable technology</td>
<td>clean</td>
<td>Wind power one of cleanest energy sources over lifetime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td>“There will be over 300,000 jobs in offshore wind power”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Public support</td>
<td>British public wants</td>
<td>British public wants wind energy – but government has different plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Investment opportunities</td>
<td>massive uncertainty</td>
<td>U.S. government says ‘consistent policy’ key to wind energy growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Public support</td>
<td>UK citizens support</td>
<td>“More than two-thirds of UK citizens support building more wind farms in their immediate areas”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>people working</td>
<td>“The number of people working in the UK wind industry has risen to 9,900 up from 6,600 by 2010 – a climb of 70% – new research shows”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>domestic energy supplies</td>
<td>Wind power could provide up to 18% of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

83
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>CO2 reduction</th>
<th>reduces greenhouse gas emissions</th>
<th>“It increases domestic energy supplies, reduces greenhouse gas emissions, and replaces coal-fired and nuclear generation”</th>
<th>global electricity demand by 2050</th>
<th>EWEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>CO2 reduction</td>
<td>Emission-free</td>
<td>“Emission-free wind power is one of those green renewable energy sources that is already working to reduce greenhouse gasses”</td>
<td>UN conference overlooks the rising power of wind and other renewables</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>cost reduction</td>
<td>“The offshore wind industry will be various ways that cost reduction can be realised across both the cost of technology and the cost of capital”</td>
<td>EU offshore wind has a bright future, EWEA conference track chairs agree</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Investment opportunities</td>
<td>certainty for investors</td>
<td>“We need stable, long-term frameworks and legal certainty for investors because energy is a long-term business.”</td>
<td>Future of Europe’s energy discussed by industry leaders at 2030 EuropeBusiness press conference</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>price for electricity dropped</td>
<td>“Meanwhile, wind power has also been saving Spaniards money: in 2013 the day on which wind provided its highest levels of coverage of the power demand (2 February 2013), the market price for electricity dropped to 7.69 euro per Megawatt hour”</td>
<td>Wind energy is Spain’s number one electricity provider</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>vulnerability</td>
<td>“The situation in Crimea is a wake-up call for all of us…it demonstrates the vulnerability of our fossil fuel supply”</td>
<td>EWEA 2014: the event round-up</td>
<td>Andrew Garrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Import disadvantages</td>
<td>not imported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Proven zero-emission, renewable technology</td>
<td>not run out</td>
<td>“Let us invest in wind and renewables – European energy sources which do not have to be imported, which will not run out, in industries in which Europe leads the world”</td>
<td>Ninety percent of Europeans want 2030 renewable energy target, EC poll shows</td>
<td>Thomas Becker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>EU leadership &amp; competitiveness</td>
<td>Europe leads the world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neoliberal</th>
<th>Energy security &amp; independence</th>
<th>turn off the tap</th>
<th>“Putin cannot turn off the wind energy tap”</th>
<th>IEA executive director: “We welcome a renewables target for 2030”</th>
<th>Andrew Garrad</th>
<th>Blog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Public support</td>
<td>Britons would prefer</td>
<td>“Three times as many Britons would prefer to live close to a wind farm than to a fracking site, making the government’s plan to stop new onshore wind farm projects look even more illogical”</td>
<td>IPCC: fossil fuels out, renewables in to tackle global warming</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Public support</td>
<td>French people see</td>
<td>“Some 64% of French people see wind energy as a solution”</td>
<td>France: wind energy solution in energy transition</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Subsidies for fossil fuels</td>
<td>many more subsidies</td>
<td>“Yet fossil fuels historically and currently have many more subsidies”</td>
<td>“Subsidies to renewables are the most transparent and visible”</td>
<td>Thomas Becker</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Investment opportunities</td>
<td>investment is essential</td>
<td>“Investment in renewables is essential and ultimately inevitable”</td>
<td>Europe can be role model for renewable energy at United Nations Climate Change Conference in Paris 2015</td>
<td>Thomas Becker</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>energy independence</td>
<td>“Part of the answer to Europe’s energy independence”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>spur economic growth</td>
<td>“How to spur economic growth”</td>
<td>80% of Brits support renewable energy</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Public support</td>
<td>respondents supported</td>
<td>“70% of respondents supported onshore wind energy”</td>
<td>80% of Brits support renewable energy</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>price</td>
<td>“Price of cutting power sector emissions hits $44 trillion”</td>
<td>Price of cutting power sector emissions hits $44 trillion</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Import disadvantages</td>
<td>avoid import costs</td>
<td>“Wind energy avoided €9.6 billion in fuel import costs in the same year”</td>
<td>“Boost energy independence with higher renewables targets”, associations tell Barroso</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>CO2 reduction</td>
<td>reducing carbon emissions</td>
<td>“Wind power is already reducing carbon emissions”</td>
<td>Millions of workers call for climate action</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>creating sustainable jobs</td>
<td>“Creating thousands of sustainable jobs”</td>
<td>Large international gathering attends EWEA’s summer reception</td>
<td>Andrew Garrad</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>security of energy supply</td>
<td>“We are all concerned about security of energy supply in wind power we have a good answer”</td>
<td>Business Statement for Binding Renewable Energy Target in 2030 Framework</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>boost economic growth</td>
<td>“Chance to boost economic growth and create new jobs while securing environmental protection”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>create new jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Climate change &amp; Environment</td>
<td>environmental protection</td>
<td>“Driving investments and growth in the wind power sector”</td>
<td>European wind industry letter ahead of Spring European Council discussions 2030 climate and energy framework</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Investment opportunities</td>
<td>driving investments</td>
<td>“Driving investments and growth in the wind power sector”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>jobs created</td>
<td>“More than 250,000 jobs have been created in the wind energy sector”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>reduce costs</td>
<td>“Confidence necessary to reduce the costs of developing renewable energy”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Proven zero-emission, renewable technology</td>
<td>zero carbon</td>
<td>“Zero carbon wind energy”</td>
<td>UK: Ireland wind power deal is model for Europe</td>
<td>Justin Wilkes</td>
<td>Press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>create more jobs</td>
<td>“Creating even more jobs if governments gave greater policy certainty to investors, and resolved grid connection problems”</td>
<td>EU offshore wind energy sector posts solid 2012</td>
<td>Justin Wilkes</td>
<td>Press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>driver for growth</td>
<td>“The wind industry can be a driver for growth, for jobs and exports but not if government policies drive away investors”</td>
<td>EU wind industry faces tough challenge - and politicians should not make it worse</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
<td>Press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>driver for jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Export benefits</td>
<td>driver for exports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>reduce dependency</td>
<td>“Wind energy in Central and Eastern Europe, including Turkey, will substantially reduce the fossil fuel dependency of the power sectors”</td>
<td>Wind power for 9 million households in</td>
<td>Christian Kjaer</td>
<td>Press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Investment opportunities</td>
<td>investors will withdraw</td>
<td>“Investors and banks will withdraw unless governments put in place long-term renewable energy policies”</td>
<td>Eastern Europe by 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>provide jobs</td>
<td>“Continue to provide jobs and revenue in today’s tough economic climate”</td>
<td>EU wind industry skills shortage: over 5,000 more workers needed per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>provide revenue</td>
<td>“The European wind industry is delivering the benefits of wind energy in the most affordable way”</td>
<td>From financial crisis and austerity to the uncertainty crisis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>affordable</td>
<td>“The European wind industry generates exports worth €8.8bn”</td>
<td>EWEA Press release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Export benefits</td>
<td>generate exports</td>
<td>“The European wind industry is delivering the benefits of wind energy in the most affordable way”</td>
<td>EWEA Press release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>creating growth</td>
<td>“The European offshore wind energy sector to plan investments based on a mapped use of sea space, creating growth and jobs in the maritime sector”</td>
<td>Proposed EU sea planning law will boost investor certainty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>creating jobs</td>
<td>“The Parliament has once again recognised what a strong renewables industry, driven by ambitious targets, can do for Europe’s economy, jobs, energy security and the climate”</td>
<td>European Parliament votes yes to 2030 renewable energy target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>economy</td>
<td>“The Parliament has once again recognised what a strong renewables industry, driven by ambitious targets, can do for Europe’s economy, jobs, energy security and the climate”</td>
<td>European Parliament votes yes to 2030 renewable energy target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td>“The Parliament has once again recognised what a strong renewables industry, driven by ambitious targets, can do for Europe’s economy, jobs, energy security and the climate”</td>
<td>European Parliament votes yes to 2030 renewable energy target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>energy security</td>
<td>“The Parliament has once again recognised what a strong renewables industry, driven by ambitious targets, can do for Europe’s economy, jobs, energy security and the climate”</td>
<td>European Parliament votes yes to 2030 renewable energy target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Import disadvantages</td>
<td>import</td>
<td>“This would allow Europe to replace fossil fuel imports with a thriving European wind energy industry generating large amounts of zero emissions renewable power and technology exports”</td>
<td>EU Commission's 2030 energy policy needs binding renewables target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Proven zero-emission, renewable technology</td>
<td>zeroemissions renewable power</td>
<td>“This would allow Europe to replace fossil fuel imports with a thriving European wind energy industry generating large amounts of zero emissions renewable power and technology exports”</td>
<td>EU Commission's 2030 energy policy needs binding renewables target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Export benefits</td>
<td>technology exports</td>
<td>“In contrast, wind energy requires no fuel: in 2010 avoided fossil fuel costs from wind power alone were 5.71 billion Euros in the EU; this is estimated to grow to 25.3 billion Euros by 2020. Investments made in wind</td>
<td>EWEA Press release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Proven zero-emission, renewable technology</td>
<td>requires no fuel</td>
<td>“In contrast, wind energy requires no fuel: in 2010 avoided fossil fuel costs from wind power alone were 5.71 billion Euros in the EU; this is estimated to grow to 25.3 billion Euros by 2020. Investments made in wind</td>
<td>EWEA Press release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Import disadvantages</td>
<td>avoided fossil fuel costs</td>
<td>“energy are investments made in Europe, rather than in fossil fuel exporting nations”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Investment opportunities</td>
<td>Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>reduce power prices</td>
<td>“Deploying TWENTIES technologies could reduce power prices in the German system by 2.2%, marginal electricity prices by up to 0.4% and cut carbon emissions by 3.5% by putting wind turbines together with other power generation in a virtual power plant”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>CO2 reduction</td>
<td>cut carbon emissions</td>
<td>More wind power and cheaper electricity possible on existing EU networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>create jobs</td>
<td>EU offshore wind installation grows in first half 2013 - but warning signs evident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Import disadvantages</td>
<td>reduce imports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Export benefits</td>
<td>huge exports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Proven zero-emission, renewable technology</td>
<td>renewable electricity</td>
<td>“Offshore wind in Europe could be providing 145 million households with renewable electricity and employing 318,000 people by 2030, while providing energy security”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>employing</td>
<td>Offshore wind in deep waters opens up massive power potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>provide energy security</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>green jobs</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>revenue</td>
<td>Wind energy associations gather to call for a 2030 renewables target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>lowest costs</td>
<td>Thomas Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Proven zero-emission, renewable technology</td>
<td>clean renewable energy</td>
<td>“If the offshore sector is to meet its massive clean renewable energy production and job creation potential”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>job creation potential</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neoliberal</th>
<th>Cost of Energy</th>
<th>price for offshore wind</th>
<th>“Comparing a price for offshore wind in the UK in 2018 (£135/MWh) which lasts 15 years to a different price for nuclear in 2023 (£92.50) which lasts 35 years is comparing apples to oranges”</th>
<th>Clarity needed in skewed energy subsidies debate</th>
<th>Thomas Becker</th>
<th>Press release</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Subsidies for fossil fuels</td>
<td>more public money</td>
<td>“The European Commission is overly focused on renewable energy support mechanisms, while fossil fuels and nuclear continue to get far more public money”</td>
<td>EU Commission; fossil fuel and nuclear subsidies distort market</td>
<td>Justin Wilkes</td>
<td>Press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>EU leadership &amp; competitiveness</td>
<td>help competitiveness</td>
<td>“They said this would reduce costs, help Europe’s competitiveness, bring down energy and electricity bills, and help remove the need for renewable energy support in future”</td>
<td>Want to boost the economy today; Set a binding 2030 target, wind industry tells ministers</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
<td>Press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>bring down energy and electricity bills</td>
<td>“What's blocking the investment is the uncertainty caused by changing regulatory frameworks”</td>
<td>Financiers able to invest EUR123 billion in offshore wind</td>
<td>Thomas Becker</td>
<td>Press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Investment opportunities</td>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>“By undermining investment stability, governments are putting green growth, jobs and a world-leading European industry at risk”</td>
<td>Member States block UK threat to 20% renewables target</td>
<td>Pierre Tardieu</td>
<td>Press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>green growth</td>
<td>“This would have undermined the green growth, jobs and energy security wind energy and other renewables bring”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pierre Tardieu</td>
<td>Press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>energy security</td>
<td>“The EEG investigation risks undermining the wind industry in Germany by destabilising investors, and putting at risk the jobs, energy security”</td>
<td>EU State aid guidelines and investigations risk undermining EU competition and energy policy</td>
<td>Pierre Tardieu</td>
<td>Press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>more jobs</td>
<td>“Over 560,000 more jobs, 500 billion euro in fossil fuel import savings, and lower energy costs for energy intensive industries”</td>
<td>European Parliament committees vote yes to 2030 renewables target</td>
<td>Stephane Bourgeois</td>
<td>Press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Import disadvantages</td>
<td>Fossil fuel imports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>lower costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>EU leadership &amp; competitiveness</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>“EU Commission turns its back on jobs, leadership and energy security”</td>
<td>EU Commission turns its back on jobs, leadership and energy security</td>
<td>Thomas Becker</td>
<td>Press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>energy security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>economic growth</td>
<td>green growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>EU leadership &amp; competitiveness</td>
<td>technology leadership</td>
<td>“Europe will develop its massive offshore wind potential for green growth, jobs, industrialisation, technological leadership and CO2 reductions”</td>
<td>Record offshore figures conceal slow-down in new projects</td>
<td>Justin Wilkes</td>
<td>Press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Investment opportunities</td>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>“Destabilised legislative frameworks for wind energy have undermined investments, and put green growth, jobs and energy security at risk”</td>
<td>Wind growth slows in 2013</td>
<td>Justin Wilkes</td>
<td>Press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>green growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Import disadvantages</td>
<td>more jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>saving in imports</td>
<td>“An ambitious renewables target can provide 570,000 more jobs, 500 billion euro in fossil fuel import savings, and lower energy costs for energy intensive industries”</td>
<td>European Parliament slams Commission on 2030 renewables target</td>
<td>Stephane Bourgeois</td>
<td>Press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>boost green growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td>“An ambitious renewable energy target will boost green growth, creating 570,000 more jobs and saving 260 billion euro in fossil fuel imports compared to a greenhouse gas (GHG) only approach”</td>
<td>CEOs call on EU Heads of State; Boost green growth with an ambitious 2030 renewables target</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
<td>Press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Import disadvantages</td>
<td>saving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal Economic growth</td>
<td>boosting business and green growth</td>
<td>“An essential condition for boosting business and green growth is an ambitious and binding 2030 renewables target”</td>
<td>IEA chief; Europe risks losing its position as a renewable energy leader</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
<td>Press release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal Economic growth</td>
<td>green growth</td>
<td>&quot;Energy and environment ministers must support a binding renewable energy target of no less than 30% for 2030 as the best way to promote green growth, jobs and industrial leadership when they meet today and tomorrow&quot;</td>
<td>EU environment and energy ministers must promote green growth</td>
<td>Thomas Becker</td>
<td>Press release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal Job creation</td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td>“Ambitious targets are the only way of ensuring green growth in leading European industries such as the wind power sector continues”</td>
<td>Energy secretary to tell EU governments act now to preserve green growth</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
<td>Press release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal EU leadership &amp; competitiveness</td>
<td>industrial leadership</td>
<td>“Wind energy also allows countries to become less dependent on fossil fuels”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal Economic growth</td>
<td>green growth</td>
<td>“Would create 568,000 more jobs”</td>
<td>IEA executive director; We welcome a renewables target for 2030</td>
<td>Andrew Garrad</td>
<td>Press release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>turn off tap</td>
<td>“Putin cannot turn off the wind energy tap”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal Cost of Energy</td>
<td>cost efficient way</td>
<td>&quot;An ambitious target, binding on Member States, is the most cost efficient way to realise our goal of 100 percent renewables in the long term. Not to mention boosting a sector which provides 250,000 people with work in Europe&quot;</td>
<td>Companies unite to call for an ambitious 2030 renewables target</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
<td>Press release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal Economic growth</td>
<td>boosting a sector</td>
<td>“Reducing capital costs, particularly in offshore wind, must be an industry priority over the coming years”</td>
<td>Cost reduction is one of the biggest challenges facing wind sector, says Allianz renewables chief</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
<td>Press release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal Job creation</td>
<td>250,000 people with work</td>
<td>“By investing in Sweden, the Internet giant is trying to make its data centres carbon neutral”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal Cost of Energy</td>
<td>reducing capital costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal Investment opportunities</td>
<td>investing in Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Subsidies for fossil fuels</td>
<td>a level playing field for wind</td>
<td>&quot;Nuclear, coal, oil, gas all receive subsidies (in the U.S.)&quot; he said, &quot;(we need) a level playing field for wind&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>Europe's reliance</td>
<td>“A 30% renewables target for 2030 would cut Europe's reliance on gas import by almost three times as much as the European Commission's proposal for 27%”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Import disadvantages</td>
<td>Fossil fuel imports</td>
<td>“At least 30%” would allow Europe to significantly scale back its fossil fuel imports, including from Russia”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>green growth</td>
<td>“This would spur green growth”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>geopolitical turmoil</td>
<td>“The European economy is exposed to volatile fossil fuel prices and insecure fossil fuel imports, especially in these days of geopolitical turmoil at our borders. It must confront climate change. It is facing international competition in sectors of strategic importance for Europe’s growth”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Climate change &amp; Environment</td>
<td>must confront climate change</td>
<td>“The European economy is exposed to volatile fossil fuel prices and insecure fossil fuel imports, especially in these days of geopolitical turmoil at our borders. It must confront climate change. It is facing international competition in sectors of strategic importance for Europe’s growth”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>EU leadership &amp; competitiveness</td>
<td>acing international competition</td>
<td>“I think the situation in the Ukraine is proving a sobering experience for policymakers over the frailty of Europe's energy security”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>the frailty of Europe's energy security</td>
<td>&quot;I think the situation in the Ukraine is proving a sobering experience for policymakers over the frailty of Europe's energy security”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>create 568,000 more jobs</td>
<td>“A 30% renewables target would reduce gas imports by almost three times more than the 27% target put forward by the European Commission in January, create 568,000 more jobs, save EUR260 billion extra in fossil fuel imports”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Import disadvantages</td>
<td>save EUR260 billion extra in fossil fuel imports</td>
<td>“A 30% renewables target would reduce gas imports by almost three times more than the 27% target put forward by the European Commission in January, create 568,000 more jobs, save EUR260 billion extra in fossil fuel imports”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Europe can reduce gas imports by 26% with higher 2030 renewable energy target |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| EWEA | Press release |

| Want a competitive Europe; Embrace renewables |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| EWEA | Press release |

<p>| Confidence boost for Europe's renewable energy industry as Heads of State show support |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Thomas Becker | Press release |
| Neoliberal | Energy security &amp; independence | strives towards true energy security and independence | &quot;It is imperative that we make the switch over to renewables, particularly wind, sooner rather than later. Heads of State can start down that road by setting an ambitious 2030 renewables target that strives towards true energy security and independence&quot; | European Commission downplays renewables as key part of the solution in flawed energy security report | Justin Wilkes | Press release |
| Neoliberal | EU leadership &amp; competitiveness | competitiveness | &quot;offshore wind energy plays its role in meeting the EU’s competitiveness, security, renewable and climate objectives&quot; | 4.9 GW of new offshore wind capacity under construction in Europe | EWEA | Press release |
| Neoliberal | Energy security &amp; independence | security | “This will mean investments of up to 124 billion euro in wind farms across the EU, creating over 100,000 additional jobs in the wind industry” | Europe’s installed wind capacity will increase 64% by 2020 | EWEA | Press release |
| Alternative | Climate change &amp; Environment | climate objectives | “Europe's Heads of State need to agree in October on a binding 30% renewables target if real progress is going to be made to improve Europe's energy security, competitiveness and climate objectives” | IEA questions impact of a non-binding renewable energy target for Europe | EWEA | Press release |
| Neoliberal | Investment opportunities | investments | “The announcement of Vice President designate Bratusek, with responsibility for energy union, shows a commitment by the Juncker presidency to make strides toward a single electricity market that places renewable energies, such as wind power, at the heart of European energy security” | EWEA calls on new Commissioner-designates to take the reins on Europe's energy future | Thomas Becker | Press release |
| Neoliberal | Job creation | 100,000 additional job | &quot;The announcement of Vice President designate Bratusek, with responsibility for energy union, shows a commitment by the Juncker presidency to make strides toward a single electricity market that places renewable energies, such as wind power, at the heart of European energy security” | EWEA calls on new Commissioner-designates to take the reins on Europe's energy future | Thomas Becker | Press release |
| Neoliberal | Energy security &amp; independence | improve Europe's energy security | &quot;This report highlights the true cost of Europe's dependence on fossil fuels&quot; | Onshore wind cheaper than coal, gas and | Justin Wilkes | Press release |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neoliberal</th>
<th>Cost of Energy</th>
<th>alarming cost of coal</th>
<th>“Not only does the Commission's report show the alarming cost of coal but it also presents onshore wind as both cheaper and more environmentally friendly”</th>
<th>nuclear, according to European Commission report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Proven zero-emission, renewable technology</td>
<td>environmentally friendly</td>
<td>“The European Council's decision to set an EU binding target of 27% showed a lack of ambition to improve Europe's energy security”</td>
<td>Heads of State miss the chance to back renewable energy in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>improve Europe's energy security</td>
<td>“The 27% target is disappointing and is contrary to the incoming Commission's plans to make Europe the world leader in renewables”</td>
<td>Thomas Becker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>EU leadership &amp; competitiveness</td>
<td>make Europe the world leader</td>
<td>&quot;A governance structure will send a signal that Europe is open for business on renewables and will contribute to the region's competitiveness”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>EU leadership &amp; competitiveness</td>
<td>contribute to the region's competitiveness</td>
<td>&quot;A governance structure will send a signal that Europe is open for business on renewables and will contribute to the region's competitiveness”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>spur economic growth</td>
<td>“That will spur economic growth in remote areas and increase the standard of living for millions of people who are yet to switch their lights on”</td>
<td>Price up carbon and make solid pledges on renewables in early 2015, says wind industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Increase welfare</td>
<td>increase the standard of living</td>
<td>&quot;National action plans that will attract investors into the renewable energy market”</td>
<td>EWEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Investment opportunities</td>
<td>attract investors</td>
<td>&quot;National action plans that will attract investors into the renewable energy market”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>facilitate security of supply</td>
<td>&quot;It will hinder rather than facilitate security of supply and further wind power integration in the European network”</td>
<td>EWEA and EPIA main concerns and proposals for solutions on ENTSO-E Network Code for Requirements for Grid Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Energy security &amp; independence</td>
<td>maintaining security of supply</td>
<td>&quot;Maintaining security of supply and facilitating the integration of renewable electricity”</td>
<td>Open letter EWEA-EPIA letter to ENTSO-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neoliberal</th>
<th>Export benefits</th>
<th>ripple effect in export markets</th>
<th>&quot;Rules with dubious if any benefit will thus have a ripple effect in export markets for European technology&quot;</th>
<th>E on the Network Code on Requirements for Generators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>low marginal costs</td>
<td>&quot;Wind energy has a low marginal cost (zero fuel costs)&quot;</td>
<td>EWEA response to EC public consultation on generation adequacy capacity mechanisms and the internal market in electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>low marginal costs</td>
<td>&quot;Electricity produced by wind has very low marginal costs which make it to be dispatched before many conventional generators along the merit order curve&quot;</td>
<td>EWEA position on priority dispatch of wind power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>affordability</td>
<td>&quot;Well-functioning electricity markets are instrumental in improving the integration, competitiveness and affordability of wind energy&quot;</td>
<td>EWEA response on ACER public consultation on European Energy Regulation_A bridge to 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>economic recovery</td>
<td>“Wind energy will be in the forefront of economic recovery”</td>
<td>Wind Directions_April 2013_Volume 32_number 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>created thousands of jobs</td>
<td>&quot;Wind energy has created thousands of jobs in Europe - employing almost 240,000 people&quot;</td>
<td>EWEA Magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>most affordable way</td>
<td>&quot;The European wind industry is delivering the benefits of wind energy in the most affordable way. The industry is investing to bring down the cost of wind energy&quot;</td>
<td>Wind Directions_February 2013_Volume 32_number 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Investment opportunities</td>
<td>bring massive investments</td>
<td>&quot;Promoting wind power creates high quality jobs brings in massive investments, develops R&amp;D programs that help export European products, and reduces toxic greenhouse gas emissions caused by burning fossil fuels&quot;</td>
<td>EWEA Magazine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Alternative  | Climate change & Environment | low carbon future | "Numerous studies over the past several years have pointed out that wind power and other renewables have
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neoliberal</th>
<th>economic growth</th>
<th>vibrant economy</th>
<th>the potential to help lead the world to a low- or no-carbon&quot; future later this century as well as driving a vibrant new green economy”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>number of people working</td>
<td>&quot;The number of people working in the UK wind industry has risen to 9,900 up from 6,600 by 2010 – a climb of 70% – new research shows”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Import disadvantages</td>
<td>avoid fossil fuel imports</td>
<td>&quot;Wind energy in Europe provides 250,000 jobs, contributes over €32 billion to the EU’s economy a year, and avoids nearly €6 billion in fossil fuel imports”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>cost-saving potential</td>
<td>&quot;Since the technology is still relatively young, considerable cost-saving potential can still be realised”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Import disadvantages</td>
<td>money can be saved</td>
<td>&quot;More wind energy can come onto the network and money can be saved, without even having to add new grid lines”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Import disadvantages</td>
<td>avoid fuel imports</td>
<td>&quot;Today, wind energy avoids 5.71 billion euro in fuel imports”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Investment opportunities</td>
<td>Invest</td>
<td>&quot;When they invest in wind farms they get a certain return over a certain period of time”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>EU leadership &amp; competitiveness</td>
<td>technology leadership</td>
<td>&quot;Maintain Europe’s technology leadership in onshore and offshore wind power”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>competitive energy source</td>
<td>&quot;Make onshore wind the most competitive energy source by 2020, with offshore following by 2030”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Investment opportunities</td>
<td>stimulate investments</td>
<td>&quot;The adoption of the EU law nevertheless stimulated investments in renewables, particularly wind energy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>booming industry</td>
<td>&quot;Offshore wind plays a key role in the maritime economy. It is an emerging and booming industry, ready to renew the industrial fabric of our regions&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>boost economic growth</td>
<td>&quot;It will also help to boost economic growth and create hundreds of thousands of jobs&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td>&quot;The EU can meet its greenhouse gas reduction commitments 80-95% by 2050 in the most cost-efficient way&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td>&quot;In 2012, 250,000 jobs in Europe&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>cost-effective</td>
<td>&quot;New offshore network capacity that interconnects national networks allows local surpluses of wind power to be used elsewhere, reserve power to be held, and potentially cheap, zero carbon power to be used instead of more expensive higher-carbon fossil fuel plants&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Investment opportunities</td>
<td>continue to invest</td>
<td>&quot;Despite the challenging funding requirements, both traditional and new investors seem optimistic and willing to continue to invest in offshore wind&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Import disadvantages</td>
<td>imported fuel</td>
<td>&quot;Replacing energy generation from fossil fuels with wind energy would reduce both dependency on domestic and imported fuel – lowering the fuel import bill - and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Export benefits</td>
<td>Export worldwide</td>
<td>&quot;Export worldwide: protect Europe from energy imports at changing prices&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Cost of Energy</td>
<td>cost</td>
<td>&quot;The 387 mn m³ of water use avoided by wind energy would avoid a cost of 743 mn euro&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E: TRANSCRIPT
EXAMPLE (O.J.)

Interviewer – bold font
Interviewee – normal font

I have been going through all EWEA’s communication over the past two years and this is the argument pattern that I found…

[Mobile phone rings] Give me a second [Interviewee takes phone call, lasting 5 minutes]…. Sorry about that…

… so, these are EWEA arguments for wind energy, and I was wondering why it is like this?

So, what have you got here?

Do you know why you guys favour these types of arguments?

Well, job creation is quite important, because when you are talking to policymakers the two things that they care about the most are economic growth and job creation. How many jobs are you going to create for your electorate, and how much economic growth are you going to spread. What you need to get re-elected most of the time is economic growth and new jobs. These are the things that matter the most to the public. So, for us to communicate with policymakers from a lobby, advocacy, point of view we have sort of taken that take… [Mobile rings again] … I am sorry… Well, okay I will put this on silent now… Are you recording this?

Yes

Oh okay, so from that perspective we can communicate with policymakers and explain to them why [Mobile starts to vibrate] wind energy is so important for the European economy. The other point is that it really centres around some of the things that we have been…

These two you mean? [Pointing towards the bars of ‘Job creation’ and ‘Economic growth’ on the graph]

These two [nodding affirmatively]… I kind of… I suppose these are the things we have been focusing on over the past year, which has been 2030 and the need for a 30%
renewables target by 2030. Rather than a 27% target, which was what we got in the end, which was non-binding, binding at EU level.

**Is that a failure then?**

It is not a failure, yeah… [laughing]… We have to be honest, it was not what we were shooting for, and we say it is ‘business as usual’. It could have been much more ambitious.

**Business as usual?**

They had the potential to be much more ambitious, and if Europe wants to continue its leadership as a renewable energy hub and a renewable energy world leader. As Juncker is now saying, he wants to make Europe the number one in renewables. If the commission and the European institutions are really serious about doing that, they need to come forward with ambitious targets.

**And that is where you go in and you say, ‘if you want to do that, if you want to create jobs’…**

Yeah. So, at the start of last year, we were really communicating hard on 2030, because October was the decision from the European Council. So we had a big kind of build-up to that, where we were talking about how many extra jobs a 30% target could create compared to a 27% target. We also talked about how much more growth it could create compared to a 27% target, so these are kind of our two… yeah, overarching themes. Also, because we were not just communicating with European policymakers, we were communicating with heads of state and domestic politicians, so you need to tell them… A lot of the time the topics we work on are very Brussels-centric. They don’t really apply to people outside of Brussels. Lets say, the general public outside of Brussels doesn’t really feel the impact of what is going on this, and it is very little knowledge of the institutions…

**So, you are mostly just communicating to policymakers…**

Right. On this particular case, we had to show why it was important at EU level and member state level and even at local level …

**Okay and that was those two…** [Pointing towards the bars of ‘Job creation’ and ‘Economic growth’ on the graph] what could we call them… categories that were the most important ones for… like it could cover all of them?

It is something everyone cares about.

**Everyone cares about?**

At whatever level of politics that they are at, and that is even applicable to the public and the people that ultimately put these people in office.
The people understand job creation and economic growth?
Right, yeah…

So, how do you use them – in which context would you go about saying these things to people?

Well, we do press releases. Do you mean from a press perspective or from the advocacy side?

Both of them.

Okay, from a press perspective we go through traditional channels, press releases, interviews, reactive and proactive media engagement. We get on Twitter, it is a great way to sell your message. I think we have one of the largest Twitter followings in Brussels in terms of a lobby group, we have I think 18,500, which is not Leonardo DiCaprio, but it is big…

For just being an industry?

Right, for being an industry association that is a big following.

So, how have you done that? Have you requested friendships?

No, we have just been very active, and we do things now like Twitter chats and Twitter debates. So, we did one recently on the Energy Union. Basically, we invite policy-makers to kind of join in and we set off a debate with five questions over the course of an hour… I guess you know how Tweet Chat works?

Yes

Of course! But it is a good way, because the people that we would normally go out and lobby at the parliament or at the commission they are all on Twitter. So, it is a good way for us to get involved with them and reach them, and that relationship is a least initiated and then you can approach them afterwards and more formally say: “Well, thank you very much for engaging with us, you see it was a very fruitful discussion. We would like to come and talk to you a bit more about these ideas.” It is a much more subtle way of penetrating the policy side than simply going to them and cold calling, basically.

If we then take your top 5 arguments, it is not a surprise to you that these are in your top 5 [points at the names of the sections on the pie chart]?

Well, yeah. You really just have to look at what is going on last year. On a wider political perspective, we have had stagnant economic growth. We have had poor growth in many countries and especially in southern, eastern Europe. It has been the case for the past few years and both of these refer to economic growth and job creation.

Is economic growth an important argument, when you talk about an energy source that is renewable?
Well, it is at a time when Europe is struggling to keep pace with the rest of the global economy and in terms of what industries we have that we can export. What do we have that we are actually unique in at the moment? Renewable technology is one of them. We are certainly the greenest continent on the planet. You know, in a world where China is undercutting everything that we do and India the same, and then you have the oil and shale gas explosion in the US where they are now enjoying cheap energy. We have to look at how we can play to our strengths now, and in renewable technology we are actually a global leader. You might argue that Europe is kind of... they call it a fair ground... it is almost like a... something from the historic age...

A fair ground?

Yeah, that we kind of... we attract tourists, we have the kind of history, but we don’t have the industry anymore.

So ‘fair’ in that way – like a carnival?

Yeah, we are kind of old news as far as the economy is concerned.

We are behind?

Yeah, we are lacking behind. So, economic growth... Of course, you have the Europe debt crisis since 2008, 2009 as well. Everyone has been struggling under the weight of austerity. So, we are looking for export opportunities. We are looking for economic growth – and how do we do that? We have to come up with something unique, something that only Europe can do.

So, they are all related in a way?

Yeah, those two [points towards the sections displaying the categories Economic growth and Job creation] – and that [points towards the section displaying Cost of Energy] would draw in investments as well from the outside world, from the likes of China and …

Come put money in Europe?

Yeah, and also, they want to be able to imitate the products that Europe is making as well, so you actually have huge growth in wind energy in China at the moment. I mean, they are like a powerhouse for renewable energy. We always talk about how they are such a polluting country, but they will overtake Europe this year in terms of installed wind capacity.

And then, there is something about Russia I think [Pointing towards the Energy security/independence category on the pie chart]...

Russia and Ukraine, so that is the other big story we have got. Can I write on this? [indicating at the paper with the pie chart on the table]
Okay, Eurozone debt crisis [writes ‘Eurozone debt crisis’ next to the Economic growth category on the pie chart]. This is something that we have been working on in our communication strategy, because I have always been saying… So, I used to be a journalist, before I came here… and we need to tailor our approach to what is going on in the news. So, EWEA is a commentator, EWEA is not an agenda-setter. We are a lobby group. Journalists get very suspicious of lobby groups, because they know that they always come to them with an agenda. So, what you need to do is to make sure that you apply your messages to what is actually happening in the world, rather than just saying wind energy is great, please report that on wind energy. No one wants to listen to that, it is bullshit. So, Eurozone debt crisis. We have got [writing ‘Parliamentary elections’ next to the Economic growth category in the pie chart]. Sorry, this is European Parliament elections [adding ‘EP’ in front of previous note of Parliamentary elections]. So, we have had MEPs going out and lobbying and this gives us a sense that they have to go to their electorates this year, or last year, and make a case as to why they should be elected. So, we show them and example of where they can go to their electorates with a message about economic growth and job creation, and that they should go to their electorates and say, we should invest in renewable energy.

...because it creates…?

Jobs… That is ultimately what politicians care about.

So, you use this very consciously actually, these five categories?

Yeah, I think if you look behind the themes, there is a reason why these come up. So, investment opportunities… You need money to come in essentially… We also communicate to policymakers that if you have stable frameworks, if you provide the right legislative environment, you will see investments come into your country in renewable energy, but, you have to come up with the right support schemes. You have to making the right noises towards renewable energy, otherwise you frighten off investors [writing ‘support mechanisms’ next to the Investment opportunities category in the pie chart]. Everyone wants investments to come into their country of course. So, this is really about stable frameworks [writing ‘Stable frameworks’ next to the Investment opportunities category in the pie chart], attracting investments… in renewables… RES… [writes ‘attracting investment in RES’ next to the Investment opportunities category in the pie chart]. So, a lot of the time, we talk about countries that might be anti-renewables… it’s not cool to call them anti-renewables…. But yeah, they have a deeply ingrained culture that is centred around another industry.

Like Poland?

I mean, if you are talking about Poland. You are talking about a country that has lived of coal for hundreds of year. Not only that, there are towns that are built around coal mines. There are families that have generations of coal miners, so they are very proud of
that industry. So, you are really not just changing the legislation, you are actually changing the culture of people and their mind set and that is an even bigger challenge. But yeah, you want to see investment opportunities… And this one, as you said, is about the Ukraine story [points towards ‘Energy security & independence’ and writes ‘Ukraine’ next to the ‘Energy security & independence’ category on the pie chart]. Russia dependence on gas [writes ‘Russian gas’ next to the ‘Energy security & independence’ category on the pie chart]…

The whole Ukraine-Russia crisis come along…

Yeah, it really highlighted, why Europe needs to be investing in its indigenous resources [writes ‘indigenous resource’ next to the ‘Energy security & independence’ category on the pie chart] and that is primarily renewable energy.

What about that one [points towards the ‘Cost of Energy’ category on the pie chart], why is that important?

Because we are still – certainly offshore wind – quite reliant on stable frameworks and support mechanisms, and when you say support mechanisms, you are basically saying subsidies.

Why is that so important to communicate to politicians?

Because politicians… look… because this…

Comes down to the bill they have to pay?

Right, so if you can produce coal much cheaper, then you can produce electricity much cheaper, than you can from offshore wind. Then, basically, it is going to be cheaper for your electorates. They are going to pay less on their electricity bill. We make a different kind of argument, and I will go into that in a second. We say that onshore wind is now cost competitive with coal and gas and nuclear, which it is. Based purely on the cost of energy that is, we call it the Levelised Cost of Energy, that is producing electricity across the lifetime of a power plant or whatever. However, we do receive… looking purely at subsidies, that is, state support directly given to a technology. Offshore wind quite clearly receives more. However, You then have what we call externalities, that is external costs of climate change, human toxicity, energy resource depletion, which is a bill that the taxpayer is picking up, but you don’t see it on your electricity bill, you see it elsewhere, but because you don’t make the association… So, we make the argument that coal is actually incredibly expensive, because you pick up the environmental impact of using that technology.

So, it is another way of calculating that? [points towards ‘Cost of Energy’ category on the pie chart].

Yeah, I have a subsidy report that I can show you… Maybe we can have a chat about it at some point… [writes ‘subsidies report’ next to ‘Cost of Energy’ category on the pie chart].
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So, that is in fact very important as well? [points towards ‘Cost of Energy’].

Yeah, if you look at the news you will only see politician talking about how expensive renewable technologies are, and wind and solar are through the roof, and that they are completely reliant on government support, which is not necessarily the case, because coal and gas and nuclear are equally reliant on subsidies. The difference being that offshore wind has been around since 1991, while coal has been around since the end of the 19th century. Nuclear has been around in the UK since the 1950s, and they are still receiving huge amounts of subsidies. In 2012, coal and onshore wind received the same amount in direct subsidies from the government across the EU – 10 billion each. Coal is still being subsidised after a 150 years and the technology has little room for cost reduction, because it is so mature, because it has been around for so long. You can’t strip any more costs out. Onshore wind, okay, actually now we have reached cost competitiveness. The technology still has much further to develop. So, it is as expensive to produce electricity from onshore wind, as it is from coal, but because the technology is still new, relatively speaking, and there is still much more room for cost reduction in terms of the materials you use and standardisation. There isn’t that room for cost reduction in coal. This is as cheap as it is going to get, and in fact, if you are going to make it cleaner – I hate that term – ‘clean coal’. If you want to make it more environmentally friendly, it is going to get even more expensive, because now you have decarbonisation targets from the EU – that is going to make it more expensive for coal. You have CCS, which is an incredibly, incredibly expensive technology to install, not even that, but you need to make sure that the plant is sufficient, so therefore, it puts up the cost of actually producing that electricity. So, it is not just installing the technology, it is other elements… I am just trying to explain why it is such a big deal for us, because, as you say, it is another topic that we communicate to policymakers.

It is rather heavy this Cost of Energy term?

Yeah, but there is a public perception out there that renewables are very expensive and actually they are not.

So, the motivation here - behind all of these topics - is that to follow the news and try to insert the wind argument?

In October last year, we had the European Commission [writes ‘October EC’ next to ‘Cost of Energy’ category on the pie chart] subsidies report, which was basically the first time we saw all technologies places side by side and how much they cost. So, this was a big deal for us, because it had a really big outreach, and we did a great media job – if I do say so myself. We basically showed… We had headlines out that showed that… saying that onshore wind is competitive, onshore wind is cheaper than coal and gas, because of the way that we calculated it and the way that we staged it up and the way that we sold the story. So, it was a really original way of doing it. But it is all framing it, rather than being sort of on the nose and saying to journalists, don’t worry we are cheap. Here, we could actually have the data at that point to really show that and we didn’t have the data from EWEA. This was a report saying this, it was an European Commission independent study. No lobby in there. Purely fact based, independent. You
can’t argue with that. So, your credibility comes from the independent voice. Really, it is a case of tailoring what we do to the news agenda in both Brussels and the outside.

If I am looking through this, I am seeing two types of arguments…

Okay…

Do you want to have a look?

Hmm…..

Then we have the blue ones…

What are the light blue ones?

They form a group… and then we have the darker ones…

And the darker blue ones are?

They form another type of group…

What groups are these?

Well, to me it seem like these ones are somewhat economic [indicating the dark blue bars on the graph]

Hm…

Export… Benefits… Import… Competitiveness… Investments…

These are much more environmental! [Indicating the light blue bars on the graph]

… and then there may be the environmental ones…

Yeah, and you might even go as far as to say that these are the subjects that you would target policymakers with [circles the dark blue bars on the graph and writes ‘policymakers’] and these are the subjects that you would target the public with [circles the light blue bars on the graph and writes ‘public’]. The public cares about the environment! Do the politicians care about the environment? Or do they just care about what it can do for the economy and how they get re-elected? That is a very cynical way of looking at it, but…

That is the question… Do you agree with this way of grouping them into two types of arguments?

Yeah, you got… That is actually an economic one isn’t it [circling ‘Subsidies for fossil fuels’].
Well, it is not really on top of the agenda?

Subsidies for fossil fuels? Nah, you are right

It is perhaps an alternative way of looking at it…?

… they have done a very good job of supressing that…

So, I have coloured it light blue…

But you have lots of stories coming out now ahead of the climate deal at the end of the year… the climate negotiations in the…. In Paris…

The COP?

Yes, the COP… You are starting to see a lot more of these stories come out about subsidies for fossil fuels…

That is good?

Yeah, certainly… Yeah… [writes ‘economic’ at the top end of the graph next to ‘policymakers’ by the dark blue bars and ‘environmental’ at the bottom of the graph next to ‘public’ by the light blue bars]… Sorry, my handwriting is appalling… Okay, yeah, it is interesting that you have broken them down in this way, they are certainly themed in that sense.

So, let’s talk some more about these groups. You have your group 1 and your group 2 here. What are the strengths of these ones? [Tabs at the paper with the graph displaying Group 1 arguments for wind energy]

… the strengths?

Yeah, what are the strengths of these arguments? To frame wind energy in this way?

… the strength of the arguments… So,.. Give me an… Tell me exactly what you are thinking about…

How would you benefit from using these?

These arguments?

Yeah, in relation to wind energy…

Well, they are all the subjects that we are currently criticised for, I would say… Cost of Energy… And they are the subjects where we can make our case…

Like export…?
Well, there are export benefits that are going to generate growth… You got energy security, basically, reducing our reliance on oil sheiks outside of Europe… from countries that we have no control over and therefore we have no control over the price or what our consumers are going to pay for their energy. We import 53% of our energy, I think, that is a huge amount, and then you have countries in the Baltics, and actually I think Finland as well, that are 100% reliant on gas from Russia.

**What do you get from using these?**

I don’t understand where…

**If I take away the term wind energy, could these have been used for only wind power, or can it be used for other industries as well? Is it unique to wind energy?**

No, no, no… you can make this case for anything really, apart from possibly Cost of Energy…

**So, why are these strong arguments for wind energy?**

Why, for the reason that I just outlined…

**Because this is what policymakers care about?**

Because this is what policymakers care about!

… but, they are also what wind has been criticised for…?

Yeah, we have this energy security issue, but you also have security of supply and renewables are variable … and there is one word that we hate – intermittent – they are variable. So, you need to… yeah, you need to show how wind energy can provide for the whole of Europe and not just when the wind is blowing and when the sun is shining. Actually if you open up the borders and increase interconnection you will be able to… if the wind is blowing in Spain, you can transfer it to… But, in terms of what you are asking, I think you can say that they are quite easily applied to the fossil fuel industry as well.

**Why are they so good for the wind energy then?**

Well, I think they are the issues that are currently on the agenda from us. They are the issues, they are the questions that we need to provide answers to if we are going to be a credible source of energy now and in the future.

**It is about credibility?**

It is about credibility, yeah, and it is about offering a realistic alternative to what we currently have.
What do you mean by realistic?

Well, a cost effective, affordable, secure, and sustainable source of energy…

That can?

That can provide all the things that fossil fuels provide, but as a much more renewable and cleaner alternative.

What would you say the weakness is then?

The weakness?

Of these types of argument… if we have just talked about the strengths and the benefits… what would be the downfall?

[Long pause]

Can something else get you your energy security than wind energy?

Well, I suppose the weakness would be in having to acknowledge that in the short to medium term we will need other players in the energy mix. Renewables cannot do it on their own at the moment. Until you have that interconnection and until you can roll out storage on a commercial scale, you are going to need the likes of gas… and you are probably… you are probably going to need other forms of technology. You may even argue that you need nuclear. And you certainly… Well, many countries will keep their nuclear power plants online… Coal of course is a different matter. You don’t need coal as far as we are concerned.

Germany does for the moment apparently?

Germany is seeing a little bit of a coal renaissance, because they are facing out their nuclear plants, so they have to pick up the slack…

While scaling up on their wind?

Yeah, so they are scaling up on renewables, there is some slack there when you start to decommission nuclear plants, and again, it is an incredible expensive process, so therefore you use more coal.

So, the weakness is that wind is not there yet?

It is, but there are a number of other factors that are… wind can do everything… wind can basically meet the user electricity needs, but it won’t do it fully, it won’t do it to a 100%, unless we have commercial-scale storage, so that we can actually start storing electricity. Unless member states actually open up their borders and create a single, internal energy market and we actually have a full on energy union or an interconnection between member states to a very high percentage, and that you can
transfer electricity across borders easily, rather than having 28 silos that produce their own energy. If we really are a single market, energy should be part of that, which is an expensive process as well.

Let’s talk about this one then, these are all the light blue ones. I am going to ask you the same questions…

What is ‘urgency’?

That means that it can be scaled up fast…

Flexibility…

It can be built right here, right now… It doesn’t take 10 years to build a wind farm, it does that with a nuclear power plant.

Yeah… It can take longer… Ehm… Okay…

Proven zero-emission, renewable technology, public support and involvement, subsidies for fossil fuels, CO₂ reductions… It is about the climate, it is about that it can be done here and now, if you just want to do it. Then there is something about that it is also good for people in the world, and then that the citizens actually want this…

Okay…

So, what is the…

So, what I am answering now is basically?

Why are these here [pointing at the ‘economic’, group 1, arguments, at the top of the first graph displaying ‘Arguments for wind energy: EWEA’s communication pattern’] and why are these there [pointing at the ‘environmental’, group 2, arguments, at the bottom of the first graph displaying ‘Arguments for wind energy: EWEA’s communication pattern’]. How come these are not on top of the agenda?

So, you have basically gone through and stripped these out from our communications or…?

Yeah, do you remember, it is the same arguments as before… They are down here [Points at the bottom of the first graph displaying ‘Arguments for wind energy: EWEA’s communication pattern’]. For this one, we have just divided the arguments into the two groups.

Ehm…

You see, they are the light blue ones [Points at the bottom of the third graph displaying ‘Two types of arguments’].
They are the light blue ones…?

**Yeah, they are the light blue ones.**
I think these ones are much more public facing issues and, as I said, much more environmental. Ehm… Citizens needs, health issues… You know, sometimes we get questions about… You know from a positive perspective you can say that wind energy decarbonises the power sector, therefore your air is cleaner, that is healthier for you. On the other hand, people make the argument that wind turbines have infrasound issues, low frequency sound, that keep people awake and cause insomnia and affect the menstrual cycle of minks [laugher]… Yeah, that is fucking badness… So, these things, yeah… these are the… What you are getting into here in a number of ways, and one thing we have to be careful when we do communicate on these sort of issues is being dragged into a sensationalist debate in kind of media that doesn’t present the facts and a proper narrative, really. So, I guess you have the tabloids… You know, the tabloids in the UK, they are not going to start talking about Levelised Cost of Electricity. They are going to say ‘do wind turbines make you sick?’ It is going to be that level of debate.

**Remember that this is your arguments…**

Well, we say that they don’t make you more healthy, but they have much more of a… they are much healthier for you…

**Right, they don’t give you cancer…**

Right, well, yeah… We wouldn’t say that, but yeah, they don’t ehm… You are not basically breathing in particulate matter, so all poor air from a coal-pound in your back garden. And what would you rather have in your back garden, because the other thing is, you say… citizens needs perhaps… Okay, yes, they don’t cause any health issues, but they are ugly, they are an eyesore. Would you rather have a nuclear power plant in your back garden, or would you rather have a wind turbine? I know which one I would rather see.

**What if that one was over here** [Points at the ‘Proven zero-emission, renewable technology’ category on the graph] **What if this one was your top argument?**

Well, one of the things that we have done as well in terms of our communication is… Wind energy is a billion euro – dollar – industry. We are one of the big boys now in the energy mix and we have to start acting like it, which means that we have to start presenting credible arguments based on how can wind energy boost economic growth? How can it create jobs? Yes, yes we are a renewable technology, it is environmentally friendly, peace and love… We want to move away from that kind of NGO’e language – that kind of Greenpeace language that you see – and much more onto the economics of wind power and why it makes sense for those doubters – those people that don’t like the idea of renewable technologies – why there is actually an economic case for doing this – why there is an industrial case. That we are actually economically viable – and not just viable, but more competitive than some of the energy sources that we have had in the past and that we do have now. With these sort of arguments [Points at the environmental arguments], we are preaching to the converted. We are going to people
who support wind energy and love wind energy and everyone knows that it is zero-emission.

**Do these people over here know it?** [Points towards the environmental arguments on the ‘Arguments for wind energy: Group 2’ graph]

They do, but actually, they make the alternative argument that of course we use steel in our turbines… that we… that you have to source… I don’t know… Magnesium or whatever, some kind of rare earth metal to actually put into the turbines …

**So how sustainable is it…**

Yeah, exactly… Are we actually sustainable? Well, the fact is that when you are producing a wind turbine, you are using a lot less raw materials… Concrete, we use concrete in our substructures in offshore wind… Well, okay, well… There are other industries that use far more materials than we do. So, to say zero- emissions, yeah sometimes we steer away from that one as well, because that can lead to criticism.

**It looks like people really support wind energy…?**

I think people, yeah… I think from the public. There is a bit of disconnect between policymakers and the public particularly in Europe. Poland actually did a survey last year, broadly in favour of a renewables target and a greater penetration of wind power in their country.

**How come that is not a top story then? It sounds like a good thing to say…**

Because we are an industry lobby group and we target policy, we don’t target the public. That is one thing that we used to do, when we were an NGO. We had Global Wind Day and we had these other initiatives that were public facing campaigns, but much more than that. We are about focusing on what policymakers are doing at EU level. That is our core business.

**So, the policymakers they don’t really care about what the people say?**

You have to ask them that… No, I mean I am not going to make that assumption, but there is certainly a disconnect between what happens on the policy side and what the public is asking for in many member states – not all of them – but in many.

**Do you have a role in educating the politicians?**

Yeah, absolutely, that is what you can make as a… that is what you could call lobbying essentially, but ehm…

**So, they need to be educated in this way?** [Points towards the economic arguments on the ‘Arguments for wind energy: Group 1’ graph]

They need to be presented with an argument with facts!
… That they know themselves?

Not necessarily. This is an industry that we work in every day. This is not something that they deal with on a day to day basis, therefore we need to come to them, and when we present our arguments, they need to be fact based. They need to be credible, they need to include independent sources, and it needs to stand everything side by side. You can’t just come in and say, well wind energy is this. You need to come in and say, ‘this is wind energy in relation to coal, in relation to gas, in relation to the energy mix that is in your country right now. This is how it can benefit your country’. We work with the national associations to do that. We work with our industry members. It is a collaborative effort.

Do you think politicians more and more see a world where we are free of fossil fuels?

Certainly in Europe, yeah. I think as we go towards these decarbonisation targets, as we move towards 2050, and this kind of roadmap we have got for decarbonisation, I think 80% or something like that. You are going to have to see a shift in the way that we think.

Which way are we going to think then?

Well, I mean… We… Basically, subsidies for coal are going to be phased out after 2017-2018. So, if you want to reach your decarbonisation targets, you are going to see a drastic change in the energy mix – and that means renewables. A significant penetration in renewables. Then you have a climate, the climate talks on a global scale now, where we are talking about keeping the temperature below 2 degrees…

Do you believe in that?

The 2-degree warming?

Yes, what do you think will happen?

Huh?

What do you think will happen?

I don’t know what will happen if… I don’t know…

Do you think about it?

Yeah, I think it would damage the economic growth. I think we would see a major well… This is my personal opinion… I think we would see serious damage to economic growth… You would see droughts and starvation in places like Africa and the Middle East. You would see serious damage done to the ecosystems in some of those countries that have great sways of jungle…
If all of that comes true, does it then matter that we have economic growth, or Cost of Energy…?

No, we need economic growth! We just need to go about it in the right way. If you start investing in fossil fuels today with the decarbonisation targets, ultimately, you are going to phase out those plants or it will become much more expensive to run them. So, why invest in fossil fuels now? Well, we don’t have strict enough targets and we don’t have any governance in place for member states other than the 2020 targets to make sure that they reach those targets. So, what we say is ‘invest now and it will be cheaper than simply just investing and rushing through it in 10 years’ time. It is cheaper to invest in renewables now, rather than to invest in fossil fuels and realise that you have to, further down the road, phase out those fossil fuels and invest in renewable energy anyway. Because as we see governance going more towards these technologies, there is an increased awareness of decarbonisation and of environmental issues of climate change. Ultimately, I think further down the road you are seeing drastic action taken. It is interesting, because in the years running up to these kind of big COP meetings, you see the likes of the Rockefeller divesting from fossil fuels. The Norwegian Sovereign Wealth Fund that are basically saying, well when we get our money back, we are not going to invest it back into fossil fuels even though it all comes from oil and gas anyway. At least they then say, we are not going to invest… You see the likes of E.ON., a huge utility, one of the most polluting utilities in the world, splitting off its business and putting all its nuclear and fossil fuels into one side and its trading platforms, and then having a completely separate renewables business that they are focused on.

Is that because of the money benefit?

Yeah, I mean in Germany it has become more expensive due to wholesale electricity prices to actually produce electricity from gas and coal… and of course, you have a very favourable environment, because of the Energiewende for the proliferation of renewables. They have a Feed-in-Tariffs there, investors have the visibility to go in and put money into renewables.

But do you think that, if you take Denmark as an example, that Denmark developed all these favourable legislation frameworks for renewable energy because they believed there was business in it?

Yeah, they wouldn’t have done it, if they did not believe in the long-term vision or that it was economically viable. You also have to realise that the support mechanisms are there for everyone, not just for one technology, not just for renewables, not just solar and wind. It is there for everyone and it always has been. You also have to look at the direct history of support. These coal and nuclear assets used to be opened up by the state, so the state assumed all the risks. You don’t get that with renewables today. It is all private money. So, you need some kind of government safety-net there, which is either a Feed-in-tariff or a certificate system … It is necessary, but it is necessary for all, not just for one.
If we should call this group economic [Points towards the ‘Arguments for wind energy: Group 1’ graph] and this group environmental [Points towards the ‘Arguments for wind energy: Group 2’ graph], it seems like the economic arguments always wind over the environment. Why is that?

Because I think there is more concern here [Points towards the economic arguments on the ‘Arguments for wind energy: Group 1’ graph] from policymakers across the board about the economic issues.

What about the 2 degrees and the world…?

Yeah, but that is not in a 5 year term, where you need to get re-elected. It is funny, because energy policies is one of those places where you need to think 15 – 20 years into the future, and actually a lot of politicians don’t think that far ahead. Therefore, it is very difficult to get the deal that you want, because you have to convince them that there is a reason to do that, and if there is going to be a reason, it has to really be an economic one, not just environmentally saying we need to decarbonize our energy system. You need an economic reason to do it.

Do you think that is why the 27% renewable energy target…

Well, 30% was a natural step, wasn’t it? If you have a 20% target for 2020…

That was what they promised…

30% for 2030 is logical. So, why go for 27%? It doesn’t make any sense, really.

No. Do you think it comes down to those 5 years that they are in office, and that they can’t seem to look further ahead than that?

I think it is an element of it.

Do you see other elements?

I guess there are all sorts of arguments that can make as to why you would go for a 30% target over a 27%. They obviously think it is ambitious. You could also make the case that they don’t go to 30%, because they want to go an exceed that. So, when they have done that, they can say ‘well, we went above and beyond’. It is a politically motivated argument. We don’t set a 30% target, because we might not reach it. But, if we set a 27% target, we know that we are going to get there, and when we do reach that 27%, we can go to the world, ‘well, look at that fantastic job we did’.

They sound very cynical these politicians…

Maybe I just sound very cynical… maybe it is just me.