

Identity as the “art of government”

A critical study of the governmentalities expressed in the EU
Energy Strategy 2020

Abstract

The concept of governmentality and the concept of banal nationalism are applied in the study to critically analyze how a European identity is articulated and legitimized within the energy policy presented by the European Commission. Furthermore, the articulated identity is related to the construction of insecurity. In the analyzed material the identity of the EU is portrayed *as* an effective and integrated internal market. Member states with a foremost national market and outdated infrastructure are presented as *less* European, and are, along with agents in the international energy market, presented as “the other” and portrayed as a threat towards the European energy security and the EU. The rationality implicit in the analyzed material imply that the EU is an agent separated from its members and furthermore, that the EU could address the *objective* needs of its members, and hence also identify threats towards the energy security.

Key Words: Governmentality, The European Commission, Energy security, The European energy policy, Identity, Insecurity

List of contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Material and disposition	2
2	Theoretical framework.....	4
2.1	Governmentality	4
2.1.1	Foucault, power, genealogy and discourse.....	6
2.1.2	Critical reflection on the concept of governmentality.....	6
2.2	Banal nationalism	7
2.3	Identity and the EU	9
3	Methodological framework.....	11
3.1	Operationalization and emphasizing "encounters"	11
3.2	Governmentality and deixis of banal nationalism.....	12
4	Introduction to energy security and the energy policy of the EU	14
5	Analysis.....	16
5.1	Governmentality and the EU energy strategy	16
5.2	Deixis of banal nationalism and the EU energy strategy	21
6	Conclusion	23
7	References.....	25

1 Introduction

Today when reading about the European Union (EU) in newspapers, scientific articles or publications it is often assumed that we know what is meant by “Europe”. Europe is presented and identified as something that has objective needs, which must be addressed (Walters & Haar, 2005:2). For instance, the long-lasting discussion about the democratic deficit in the EU has resulted in several responses from the institutions in the EU. The notion of a common “political identity” for the members in the EU has been discussed as an approach to legitimize the work (and to some extent, even the existence) of the union. Additionally, symbols like the flag and the anthem, usually connected with the nation state, have been introduced to promote a feeling of belonging to the European Community. Consequently, when talking about Europe as an agent with needs, it is assumed that “we know where and what Europe is” (Walters & Haar, 2005:2ff, 19,65ff, Fornäs, 2012: 1f).

Meanwhile, the notion of security and security studies has been extended and it exist a wide range of definitions in addition to the traditional perspective on security studies, defined by Walt as “the study of the threat, use and control over military force” (1991: 212). For instance, feminist and poststructuralist theorist, and the concept of human security have further broadened the meaning of security (Baylis, 2011:234ff, Stripple, 2012: 182f). Moreover, the significance and influence of identity in constructing insecurity are today acknowledged and Weldes et al argue that identity and insecurity are “produced in a mutually constitutive process”. Our identity does not only tell us who “we” are but also who “we” are not, hence it could become a source of insecurity if the difference is transformed to “otherness” (1999: 11ff). Identity like insecurity is socially constructed, yet they could become naturalized and regarded as common sense. The assumption of what and where Europe is, as well as insecurity, is constructed in discourses where certain forms of “knowledge” are regarded as “true” (Weldes et al, 1999:17f, Walters & Haar, 2005:2). For instance, within the EU, international mobility has been constructed as a threat towards security, and migration has undergone a securitization process with strict regulations of immigration and closely guarded borders as a consequence (Walters & Haar, 2005:98. Léonard, 2010:231f). Within the EU, immigration have become the “the other” and the securitization of immigration and the notion of “Schengenland” with closely guarded external borders, has presented security as closely associated with the defense of a certain territory and its borders. In this sense, the EU is “becoming territorial” (Walters & Haar 2005:107).

As well as immigration and border controls, the topics of energy and climate change are today regarded as threats towards peace and security, and the concept of energy security has risen to the top of the political agenda within the EU. The

issue of energy security is by the European Commission presupposed to require governance at supranational level. Some scholars even argue that the energy policy along with climate change and environmental questions have undergone a securitization process (Maltby, 2013:435f, Scott, 2008:495f, Scott, 2012:220f). Consequently, the energy policy of the EU and its relation to identity and insecurity is one of many discourses which the extended notion of security has generated.

The notion of energy security and the European energy policy are at the top of the political agenda and are considered as issues which needs to be governed at a supranational level. This notion raises the question, who is to be governed to address the needs of “Europe”? The governing referred to is not about regulations, treaties or traditional “power over”, but rather the attempt to shape the identity of a subject (Paterson & Stripple, 2010: 359). This is the art of government, which is in the centre of the analysis.

Consequently, identity and insecurity, as well as, territory and the discussion of EU becoming territorial, are closely connected in the discourse of migration and possibly could this also be the case in the discourse of energy security. Accordingly, the aim of the essay is to critically analyze the governing expressed in the energy strategy paper 2020, publicized by the European Commission, to analyze what kind of politics and presumptions regarding identity is embedded in the notion of Europe, expressed by the European Commission, and how it is related to insecurity. The research question is:

How is the European identity articulated and legitimized within the energy policy presented by the European Commission?

To answer the research question of choice I apply the theoretical and methodological approach of governmentality, initially introduced by Michael Foucault and additionally, the notion of banal nationalism developed by Michael Billig. The concept of banal nationalism is applied as an “encounter” towards the concept of governmentality and will further help answer the research question.

1.1 Material and disposition

The material analyzed in the essay is a strategy paper published by the European Commission in 2011 called, “Energy 2020- a strategy for competitive, sustainable and secure energy”. The European Commission explains that the strategy paper serves as a framework for the energy policy in the EU and “defines the energy priorities for the next ten years” (Europe 20 initiative- Energy 2020). It is a vision, a claim and an expectation of how the energy policy will be constituted in 2020. Due to the chosen methodological and theoretical approach the material does not

have to comprise carried out reforms or anything alike, instead the material should represent a certain way of governing, knowledge or “truth” (Kalm, 2008: 86).

To analyze the governmentalities expressed in the energy strategy paper, the second chapter presents the theoretical framework and explains how the concepts of governmentality and banal nationalism are applied in the study. Furthermore, the chapter explains how the notion of identity is interpreted in the analysis and how it is related to the EU. The third chapter presents the methodological framework and explains the operationalization of the theories applied in the study. Chapter four give an introduction to the notion of energy security and the energy policy of the EU which provide a base for the analysis in the fifth chapter, where the concept of governmentality and banal nationalism is applied to the analysed material. The main focus of the analysis lies at the concept of governmentality and banal nationalism is employed as an “encounter”, which is further explained in the methodological section. The sixth, and final, chapter concludes the findings of the study.

2 Theoretical framework

Although the concept of governmentality will function both as theoretical and methodological framework of the analysis, this chapter will explain the theoretical standpoints and key concepts of governmentality, whilst the methodological section includes further operationalization of the concept and a clarification of how it will be used in the forthcoming analysis. In this section are the concept of governmentality and the theory of banal nationalism discussed, and finally is the definition of identity and how identity is related to the EU presented. The meaning of identity is somewhat contested but as well as the concept of governmentality, identity is based on a social constructive perspective in the forthcoming analysis. The concept of governmentality and the theory of banal nationalism are mutually applied since the approaches seek to draw attention to what hardly seem noticeable and questioning what appears to be “natural”. Furthermore, the concepts are both useful analytical tools to analyze identity and additionally, what is meant by “Europe”.

2.1 Governmentality

The concept of governmentality was introduced by Michael Foucault in 1978 during a lecture at Collège de France in Paris. At the time of Foucault’s death in 1984 the concept of governmentality was still highly experimental and since then the notion of governmentality has been further developed by scholars in a wide range of disciplines (Gordon, 1991:1f. Nilsson, 2008:134, Walters, 2012: 1f,49). Consequently, in this essay Foucault’s thoughts about governmentality are extended by material of several scholars in the area of governmentality studies, such as Mitchell Dean and William Walters.

The relation between Foucault, power and discourse, and the emergence of governmentality is discussed under the next headline, but first the concept of governmentality explained.

Governmentality is a neologism of “government and “mentality”. Government is defined as “the conduct of conduct”; an activity which attempt to change and shape our behavior through specific techniques, norms and knowledge. Mentalities imply that our thinking is immersed in knowledge, opinions, our language and so forth, and therefore often is taken for granted as something “natural”. Additionally, thinking is not an individual activity but rather a collective activity (Dean, 2010: 18ff, Walters, 2012: 10f, Lövbrand & Stripple, 2013:1).

Governmentality is a critical perspective which seeks “deneutralize” what appears to be “natural” and “true”. Furthermore, governmentality studies seek to “reveal the particular politics that might be embedded” in statements and assumptions (Walters, 2012:3, Rose & O’Malley & Valverde, 2006:101). The way we think about governing often originate from knowledge in the shape of different forms of expertise, theories and such; for example, in liberal societies this expertise often originates from the area of economics (Dean, 2010:25). Governance is not limited to the sphere of the state, it occurs when individuals or groups try to form human conduct. To study power should not be narrowed down to focus only on the repressive forms of power such as threat about violence, instead studies should focus on the “dull” forms of power in the daily life. It is important to recognize that analyses of governmentality acknowledge the possibility of resistance and that it presumes some degrees of freedom for the actors involved (Dean, 2010:16f, Murray Li, 2007: 17f, Rose & O’Malley & Valverde, 2006: 99f, Walters, 2012:11f).

To analyze governmentalities is to study our “regime of practices”; hence it is to analyze “[...] how thought operates within our organized ways of doing things” (Dean, 2010:27). Governing is operating through certain rationalizations and practices, studying governmentalities is to study the techniques which governs us and through which we govern ourselves and others. Studying governmentalities is to seek the answers to questions such as, who is governed? Why and according to what logics? (Dean, 2010:28f, Rose & O’Malley & Valverde, 2006: 84f). The term rationalities concern the knowledge which influence and are reproduced through the governing. Authorities must employ “[...] forms of knowledge and know-how, and must adopt visions and objectives of what they seek to achieve” (Dean, 2010:42f). Foucault regarded power to be something rational but only considering they means by which it was practiced (Nilsson, 2008:87). Furthermore, practices of government always include an opinion about the object that is governed; therefore analysis of governmentalities should question what kind of identity that is assumed and what transformation of identity the practices of government seek to achieve (Walters, 2012: 57f, Lövbrand & Stripple, 2013:3, Nilsson, 2008:129).

The concept of governmentality should not be regarded as an “automatic framework” or a fully developed political theory, instead it should be seen as a flexible analytical tool which could be applied together with a wide range of different theories and methods. The concept of governmentality should be regarded as an “ongoing conceptualization” which encourages creativity (Walter, 2012: 42ff,111, Rose & O’Malley & Valverde, 2006: 101). In the forthcoming analysis the concept of governmentality are regarded as a toolbox where certain aspects of the concept will be prioritized and applied along with the theory of banal nationalism, this is explained in the methodological section.

2.1.1 Foucault, power, genealogy and discourse

The concept of governmentality originates from Foucault's analysis of power and how it affects the society and individuals (Nilsson, 2008: 134). Consequently, to acquire a depended understanding of the concept, it needs to be related to Foucault and his discussions about power, knowledge and discourse. According to Foucault, power is something productive; it forms knowledge, pleasure and discourse."It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body, much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression" (Foucault, 1980: 119). Governmentality studies was developed from Foucault's concept of discourse analysis and particularly the notion of genealogy; one approach in the field of discourse analysis which concentrate particularly on power and knowledge. The meaning of discourse differ somewhat depending on which analytical field it is related to but since this thesis emanates from the thoughts of Foucault his definition of discourse is applied (Dean, 2000: 52ff, Winther Jørgensen & Philips, 2000:7, 19f). Foucault defined discourse as the practice which generates a certain expression (Bergström & Boréus, 2005: 309). This definition is similar to Bergström and Boréus definition of discourse as an implicit rule which legitimizes a specific sort of knowledge (2005: 309). What is considered as "truth", "natural" or as "knowledge" is produced within discourses, truth cannot be separated from power and every society has its "regime of truth"; discourses which clarify what is considered to be true or false (Foucault, 1980: 118f, 131). Foucault illustrate how studies of governmentalities can clarify how the state defines and reproduces what is considered to be public opposed to private (1991:103). Genealogy come to pose governmentality studies during a time when liberalism shaped many communities in western Europe and both Foucault and more recent scholar have often applied the concept of governmentality to describe liberalism as an art of government (Dean, 2000:52f, Walters, 2012: 16, 30, Nilsson, 2008:). Moreover, Foucault's notion of genealogy is a critic against how history often is portrayed and imply that different sorts of events and ideas shape what we consider to be history, it does not exist a "starting point" for specific events, either is it possible to determine the exact origin for customs or ideas (Nilsson, 2008: 71f). This view is similar to certain points in the theory of banal nationalism (explained in the next section), particularly "invented permanencies"; factors created in a particular context but which appear to be "natural" and unquestionable, like they always have existed.

2.1.2 Critical reflection on the concept of governmentality

Is important to acknowledge that the knowledge produced in this essay, as well as knowledge produced in other discourses, is productive and therefore mutually construct and reflect what is considered as reality. Discourse analysis is characterized of relativism; notions about the world only have relative and subjective value, it does not exist an absolute truth of how the world is constituted, hence it could be problematic to justify why this particular research is

relevant to others. Furthermore, relativism is often regarded as the opposite towards objectivity (Jørgensen & Philips, 2011: 116, 175f). To answer the objections linked to relativism I emphasize reflexivity, hence I attempt to apply the elementary principles of the theories applied in the essay on my own research practice. How to best achieve reflexivity is widely discussed but Harding introduce the idea of “strong objectivity” which is achieved by “strong reflexivity”, as a way of meeting the requirements of a more precise and intersubjective analysis. Modern science is often characterized by “weak objectivity” hence knowledge is often presented as objective and as if it has no context. To achieve reflexivity it is important to discuss the context wherefrom the analysis and knowledge is produced (Jørgensen & Philips, 2011: 202ff). Foucault’s notion of governmentality is highly contextualized and the problematizations of the art of government is most often grounded in the experience of the West and more particularly within Europe. The concept has been accused of Eurocentrism from, for example, postcolonial scholars. This is a highly relevant and just critic, but it is also important to acknowledge that merely applying the concept of governmentality on contexts outside Europe also would imply a form of Eurocentrism. Nevertheless, the contextualization could also be positive; Walters even argue that the contextualization is one of its strengths since the concept enable for analysis of particular places during particular circumstances (2012:69f). Since Europe and the EU is the objective for the analysis, the concept of governmentality operates as an already contextualized analytic tool which enables a closer analysis of my chosen area of study. Critics against the concept of governmentality often argue that the concept ignore the role of resistance and present a “top- down view of the world”. As explained in the sections above, government is presented as the conduct of conduct. This definition entails agents who can act; agents are for example required to act according to a certain expertise or according to a presupposed identity. Regimes of government do not determine identities, they promote and encourage particular identities and certain way of behaving. Furthermore, Foucault acknowledged the possibility of counter- conducts performed by agents who seek another form of conduct. Consequently, to govern is to “act on our own or others’ capacities for action” (Dean, 2010: 21ff, 43). Furthermore, as discussed in the former section, power is a productive network, something diffuse and pervasive which exist in the whole societal body, hence governance should be recognize to entail networks between different agents and programmes. Studies of governmentality could therefore easily be applied on different agents and forms of power and it’s not limited to analyzing the traditional centers of power (Walters, 2012:145).

2.2 Banal nationalism

Michael Billig introduced the theory of banal nationalism in the book “Banal Nationalism”, publicized 1995, as a contrast towards the notion of nationalism as

something extremist, passionate and as the property of “others”, not “us”. The theory of banal nationalism explains how the concept of national identities constantly is reproduced through thinking, habits and our assumptions. The processes and language have become “invented permanencies”; they are products of a specific historical context and discourse which have shaped the contemporary common sense and therefore appears to be “natural” (Billig, 1995: 7f, 16ff). Billig draws on the term “imagined communities” first developed by Benedict Anderson and the term “interpretive communities” first developed by Edward Said to explain that national identity is something which is daily lived and deeply embedded in the routines of our daily life. Therefore the irrationality of nationalism often is projected on “others” and “our” nationalism appears as patriotism which instead is seen as something positive and perhaps necessary (Billig, 1995:38, 55,69ff). In Billigs view, nationalism does not equate with the language of blood-myths or primordial ties, instead Billig focus on the banal expressions, the routine words which remind us about whom we are and where we are. The crucial words of banal nationalism are often words such as “we”, “the” and “here”, which clarify what or who is included in “the homeland” or “the people” (1995:93f, 2009:349f). These words are called “deixis” and will be explained further in the methodology section. These banal expressions are a way of making the homeland “homely”. The expression “the borders” or “the home”, simultaneously presume and renew that the relevant context is within the boundaries of “the borders” or “the home”. The use of homeland- making phrases along with certain conduct and discourse does consequently not only produce but also reproduce the construction of “the homeland” (Billig, 1995: 108f).

It is important to point out that Billig does not consider nations to be homogenous neither does the public in nations have homogenous views. Even though Billig mostly focus the forms of banal nationalism which is spread “top-down”, such as statements from politicians or symbols such as the national flag, he does not regard the national public as a homogenous or passive audience, there is nothing in the theory of banal nationalism that oppose that ordinary people take part in the making of a national identity (Billig, 2009: 347ff). On the contrary, symbols such as the flag are not sufficient to maintain our assumptions about national identity, “these assumptions have to be flagged discursively” through the simple and routine words of banal nationalism (Billig, 1995: 93).

In the upcoming analysis, the theory of banal nationalism are related to the European Union, which at first sight could appear to be contradictory, after all the union is considered to be a organization which in the long run could be eroding the very notion of statehood. Nevertheless these arguments are often based upon perspectives like cosmopolitanism, which are conducted within the same discourse as nationalism, which take nationhood for granted. As Billig explains “the argument is conducted within, and not against, nationalism (1995: 87). Furthermore, the debate about the nature and the future of the European Union, for example concerning whether the union should or should not be moving towards an more federal approach in its structure and governing, is based on the notion of nationhood (Billig, 1995: 141). Billig argue that the federalist approach only transfer the notion of nationhood to a wider unit of states and that the anti-

federalist approach determines the membership based on existing nations and national boundaries, the discussion is, as mentioned above, taken place within the discourse of nationalism. Either, the European Union will be considered to be a "homeland itself" or as a "homeland of homelands" (1995: 87, 141f).

2.3 Identity and the EU

It exist a wide range of different research areas regarding European integration and European identity, in addition to constructivism, for instance studies based on institutionalism and deliberative arguments (Checkel & Katzenstein, 2011:8f, Buonanno & Nugent, 2011:1ff). My intention is not to account for this entire litterateur but rather to describe how the notion of identity is interpreted in this essay and how it is related to the EU.

The meaning of identity is often diffuse and somewhat contested (see for example Joireman, 2003) but the essay is build upon the assumption of identity as something imbedded in thinking and the language of our daily life. Identity is a form of talking and therefore a form of life, "it is a short- hand description for ways of talking about the self and community" (Billig, 1995: 8,60). Meanings of identity are not final or unchangeable, it does not exist a "real" or "true" me. Identities are instead "performatively constituted", hence identities can change over time and it is possible to have mutually identities. Processes of representation such as narratives help to define our conception of the world and to form our identity. Our identity does not only tell us who "we" are but also who "we" are not, hence it could become a source of insecurity if the difference is transformed to "otherness". Further through a process of normalization "we" often assume "ourselves" as the standard which may result in outgroups and ingroups (Billig, 1995: 78ff, Weldes et al, 2009: 11ff, Barlebo Wenneberg, 2000:27).

The EU might not only constrain the members' interests through regulations, treaties or traditional "power over" but also in the way they define their identities; a membership in the EU influence the way in which agents se themselves but also how they are regarded by others (Paterson & Stripple, 2010: 359, Risse, 2009: 148). The notion of a common "political identity", a citizenship for the members in the EU and symbols like the flag and the anthem is introduced to foster a group- identity within the EU and to promote a feeling of belonging to the European Community, just like a national identity (Walters & Haar, 2005:2ff, 19,65ff, Risse, 2009: 151f). Walters and Haar argue that the notion of Schengenland is closely connected with the construction of the European identity. Schengenland refers to the area of countries (mostly within the EU) which have abolished their internal border controls on behalf of reinforced external borders. Within the EU and Schengenland, immigration has been framed as a security issue when it instead could have been constructed as, for instance, a human rights issue (2005: 95ff). The subject has been constructed as a security issue according to the hegemonic knowledge and expertise in the discourse about migration and

its regime of truth. Through constructing immigration as a security threat the common European identity has obtained “the other” to emphasize what “Europe” is and what it is not. Additionally, if migration had been constructed as a human rights issue according to a cosmopolitan perspective it had been harder to uphold a common European identity towards “the other” (Walters & Haar 2005: 95ff). Identity and insecurity is hence closely linked within the discourse of immigration, and in the analysis I discuss if identity is portrayed in a similar way in the area of energy policy.

3 Methodological framework

As explained in the theoretical framework, the concept of governmentality is regarded as a toolbox where certain aspects of the concept will be prioritized and applied along with the theory of banal nationalism. In this section the two dimensions needed to operationalize and apply the concept of governmentality will be presented, along with the methodological framework of the theory of banal nationalism.

3.1 Operationalization and emphasizing "encounters"

Mitchell Dean's conceptualization of governmentality is used to operationalize the concept. The conceptualization was published in "Governmentality, Power and Rule in Modern Society". Due to the aim and due to the research question of the thesis, two of the four dimensions presented by Dean are employed in the analysis. I am aware of the potential challenges that can occur when applying a narrowed down version of the conceptualization but I refer to the position discussed in the theoretical framework; the concept of governmentality should not be regarded as an "automatic framework" or a fully developed theory, instead the concept should be considered as a flexible analytical tool which encourages creativity (Walter, 2012: 3, 42,111, Rose & O'Malley & Valverde, 2006: 10). Furthermore, Walters discuss the negative aspects and the risk of contributing to the "normalization" of the concept if regarding it as an automatic framework. As an alternative Walters emphasize on "encounters"; the concept of governmentality ought to be considered as a dynamic tool which should encourage and induce us to modify existing concepts (2012:5,143). Moreover, it could conceivably be counterproductive to merely systematize and standardize a concept which originally was considered highly experimental by Foucault.

Studies of governmentalities differ from many other social sciences as it does not seek to establish what the world is "actually" made of, it does not seek to establish any causal explanations or variables of how the society works (Walters, 2012: 3, 58). In the thesis the methodological framework of banal nationalism are used as an "encounter", I combine the two methodological frameworks presented in the concepts of governmentality and banal nationalism to operationalize these concepts and to construct a useful analytical tool, and hence contributes to some extent to modify the concept of governmentality.

3.2 Governmentality and deixis of banal nationalism

To study governmentality is to prioritize “how” questions. Studies of governmentality do not seek to explain or describe the routines of government. As mentioned in the theoretical framework, it is a critical perspective which aspires to question what appears to be “natural” or “true”. (Dean, 2010: 39, Walters, 2012: 20, 58). This does not imply that “anything goes” and studies of governmentality should aspire to “formulate and consistently employ a specific set of questions that follow on from this concern with how regimes of practices of government operate” (Dean, 2010: 33). In the forthcoming analysis two questions developed from two different dimensions (presented further down in this section) are applied to the material.

The first step in an analysis of government is to identify “problematizations”, these occur when ways of governing and conducting affairs are put into question and made to appear problematic. Problematizations are socially constructed and emphasized through particular techniques such as certain forms of knowledge and the language. Additionally, in each case when problematizations are made measures such as policy recommendations are taken (Dean, 2010:38f, Walters, 2012:21, 57, Paterson & Stripple, 2010: 346).

The next step is to analyze the problematizations according to two particular dimensions, the “rationalities of government” and the “formation of identities”. The former dimension implies that government should be regarded as a rational activity. Rationalities involve the knowledge which direct government, and the knowledge which are reproduced through the governing. Consequently, the aim is to analyze what kind of knowledge which is employed in the governing (Dean, 2010:42f, Paterson & Stripple,2010:346). Further, according to Dean government has a “programmatic character”, implying that governmentality studies focus on the attempts to reform and organize what occurs within regimes of practices (2010: 43). To analyze the material according to the rationalities of government, the following question will be applied to the material: *According to which thought and logic is the governing performed?*

The second dimension concerns which individual and collective identities the governing operates through and what form of conduct that is expected from the agents. It is important to acknowledge that the regimes of government only promote and foster certain forms of subjectivity and do not determine any form of subject or identification (Dean, 2010: 43f). Additionally and as explained in the theoretical section, practices of governing always include an opinion about the object that is governed (Walters, 2012: 57f, Lövbrand & Stripple, 2013:3, Nilsson, 2008:129). To analyze the material according to the formation of identity, the following question will be applied to the material: *Which identity is presupposed and what kind of transformation does the governing seek?*

Michael Billig's methodological framework focus on the routine words which remind us about who we are and where we are. “Deixis” is a linguistic term which “has to do with the ways which sentences are anchored to certain aspects of their contexts of utterance” (Billig, 1995:106). To understand the full meaning of

deictic words in a political discourse we most often need information about the context. “We” could refer to a wide range of different meanings, such as a political party or a nation. The crucial words are often routine words such as “we”, “the” and “here”, which for instance clarify what or who is included in “the homeland” or “the people” (1995:93f). Through the use of deixis the meaning of “home” is made invisible and “we” are unconsciously reminded about whom “we” are and “where” we are, since the home is presented as the context. When talking about “the economy” or “the borders” we automatically understands what is meant (Billig, 1995:107f, 144f). As Billig further explains “what is “ours” is presented as if it were the objective world: *the* is so concrete, so objective, so uncontroversial” (1995:109). This is a form of “homeland- making”, a way of speaking which daily and habitually define “our” identity. Moreover, the homeland making phrases identify “us” and “them” by identifying *the* borders, *the* economy and such (Billig, 1995: 109, 114f).

The methodological frameworks of governmentality and banal nationalism thus differ in their methodological approach. Compared to the approach of banal nationalism, governmentality is applied to the material in a somewhat more general procedure since the two particular dimensions and questions are applied to the whole text. The methodological approach of banal nationalism is instead more centered to particular words in the material. The frameworks complement each other and together construct a very useful analytical tool for my particular area of study. Consequently, to answer the research question the dimensions and the concept of deixis are mutually applied to the identified problematizations in the studied material, although the main focus of the analysis is on the concept of governmentality.

4 Introduction to energy security and the energy policy of the EU

Since it is not necessary with regard to the aim of the essay, the purpose is not to describe in detail the concept of energy security or the energy policy of the EU, neither to give a detailed chronologic historical background of the area. This section should serve as an introduction to the areas of energy security and the energy policy in the EU, and illustrate how these issues are related to each other, and additionally, how they are related to the art of governing.

The meaning of energy security is often diffuse and it exist a wide range of definitions. Furthermore the concept is often used to justify a diverse range of policy goals. However, since the EU is the center for the forthcoming analysis the definition employed is the same as the one presented by the European Commission (responsible for “the energy strategy for Europe”). Energy security is defined as: “*uninterrupted physical availability of energy products on the market at an affordable price for all consumers*” (Sovacool (red.), 2011: 4, Winzer, 2012: 36). The definition presented by the Commission focus on security of energy supply, which today is the main objective of the union’s energy policy. In a time when the import of energy is increasing the union considered it to be of great importance to guarantee a reliable and consistent supply of energy. At present more than 50 percent of the energy supply is imported and in year 2030 this number is estimated to have risen up to 65 percent of the energy supply (Winzer, 2012: 36, Maltby, 2013: 437).

Energy is a highly politicized concept which can be referred to from several different perspectives. The economic view prioritizes the consumer and regard energy security as minimizing the costs of energy and to guarantee freedom of choice for both consumers and producers. The political view regard energy security as an element of the national security and focus on the location of energy resources and the stability in producing and consuming countries. Global threats towards energy security might be geopolitics and war, energy such as oil and gas are often use to gain political ends, as for instance, the dispute between Russia and Ukraine, discussed further down in this section. Furthermore, energy is a common factor in wars and civil wars, simply consider the war in Iraq and the civil wars in Angola and Uganda. Local threats towards energy security might be energy poverty; globally 1.6 billion people are lacking access to energy for cooking and so forth. Energy security hence intersects with other societal issues such as social justice, climate change and international security, the close connection between energy policies and human security is also discussed (Sovacool, 2011:6ff).

The notion of secure energy supply was a cornerstone in the European political agenda during the foundation of the Coal and Steel Community in 1952.

With time the energy policy became neglected and no longer prioritized within the EU. This changed drastically in the beginning of the twenty-first century, and in year 2006 the issue of energy security was placed at the top of the political agenda when the dispute between Russia and Ukraine led to a shortage of energy supply within the EU. The issue rose again in 2009 when an even more serious gas disruption occurred, once more caused by a dispute between Russia (Gazprom) and Ukraine (Naftogaz). The disruption lasted from January 1st to January 21st, during this time all Russian gas flows were cut short for a total of 13 days. At the time 80 percent of the imported gas from Russia was transported through Ukraine and the disruption resulted in the most serious gas disruption in the history of the EU (The European Commission, 2009:2ff, Maltby, 2012:438, Birchfield & Duffield, 2011:5). After the crisis the European Commission called for a more collective and consistent policy concerning the secure supply of energy (de Jong & Schunz, 2012:172f).

The treaty of Lisbon which entered into force in 2009 discusses the overall objectives of the energy policy in the EU, which characterizes a secure energy supply and a common energy policy. The treaty contains incentives to strengthen the relation between the members in the union and also the expectation of a more coherent and effective energy strategy towards external agents. Furthermore, the union was given legal basis to act upon energy matters (EU: Treaty of Lisbon, Carvalho, 2012:20f, de Jong & Schunz, 2012:165ff). However, at the same time as the European Commission advocates further Europeanization in the area of energy policy and of key dimensions concerning energy security, the notion of geopolitical realism related to energy security has made a comeback in the EU member states. Governments are for instance foremost backing energy companies from their own countries which the Commission has been hesitant to take measures against (Youngs, 2011: 41f, 51). Maltby argues that the European Commission has framed the issue of energy policy and the import dependency as a problem which requires a higher degree of supranational governance to be solved. The energy policy has been socially constructed as a joint problem which affects all of the members in the union and hence needs an EU-level solution. The European Commission is thus influencing the actor's "interpretation and response to events". The policy change could for instance be pushed by "expertise and knowledgebase authority" (2013:437, 441). This is precisely the art of governing which is in centre for the analysis. The governing which intends to shape our behavior or identity through norms and knowledge, often originated from knowledge mediated by experts and authorities in different policy areas.

5 Analysis

“Energy is the life and blood of our society”(4) ”The EU cannot afford to fail in its energy ambitions”(6) “Europe has to act before the window of opportunity closes. Time is short” (23)

The quotations above is taken from the analyzed material; the strategy paper “Energy 2020- a strategy for competitive, sustainable and secure energy”, published by the European Commission. The quotes illustrate how energy is presented as an issue which could lead to insecurity within the EU if not the right measures is taken. Since it is not the aim of the essay I will not further discuss the connection to a securitization process, instead these statements support the notion of energy and energy security as a prioritized issue within the EU, as was explained in the introduction. To answer the research question, I first analyze the problematizations identified in the material, according to the two dimensions presented in the methodological section. The next step is to analyze the recurring deixis in the material and how they cohere with and could influence the identity presented in the material.

5.1 Governmentality and the EU energy strategy

Two themes are problematized by the European Commission in the strategy paper “Energy 2020- a strategy for competitive, sustainable and secure energy”. The first is identified as: *A fragmented and ineffective internal market as a threat towards energy security*. The Commission problematizes the current conduct by asserting that national rules, regulations and an ineffective energy infrastructure negatively affect the supply of energy. Guaranteeing security of supply, in a context of national borders and regulations, is presented as a vast challenge. The challenge increases with an ineffective energy infrastructure within member states, as well as the outdated infrastructure in future member states. These issues are mutually considered to negatively affect the security of supply and hence the energy security and the vulnerability of the EU. The subsequent statements highlight the notions of the problematization:

“Fragmented markets not only undermine security of supply, but also limit the benefits which energy market competition can bring” (6)

“Companies have grown beyond national borders but their development is still hampered by a host of different national rules and practices. There are still many barriers to open and fair competition.” (5)

“Without a proper infrastructure across Europe, comparable to the means of transport and other strategic sectors such as telecommunications or transport, the market will however never deliver on its promises. Further efforts need to be made to upgrade energy infrastructure, particularly in Member States that joined as of 2004 and in less developed regions.”(12- 13)

“Forthcoming enlargements of the EU will make this challenge even greater as the Union takes in countries with outdated infrastructure and less competitive energy economies” (4)

The second problematization is identified as: *International energy affairs as a threat towards energy security*. The Commission problematize the current conduct by asserting that Europe has much less influence on the international energy market than its economic weight and energy use would indicate. The increased competition for energy resources, and the increased need for energy from developing countries could hamper the European import and security of supply and hence the energy security within Europe, if not suitable measures are taken. Furthermore, energy security is given high priority and is presented as closely associated with other policy areas towards external agents such as foreign and security priorities. The regime of practices regarding the problematization is thus linked towards the political view on energy which regards energy security as an element of the national security. The subsequent statements highlight the notions of the problematization:

“Global energy markets are becoming tighter, with developing Asian countries and the Middle East accounting for most of the growth in global demand. As the world’s largest energy importer, the EU is likely to be more vulnerable to supply risks as a result.” (6)

“Rising energy prices and increasing dependency on energy imports jeopardize our security and competitiveness” (1)

“Finally, we should exploit our geopolitical strength. The EU has the world’s largest regional energy market- 500 million people- and accounts for one-fifth of the world’s energy use” (1)

“Energy security is closely intertwined with EU foreign and security priorities” (21)

The two problematizations presume the notion of an objectively definable interest for “Europe” which can be identified by an authority, in this case the European Commission and especially the Directorate- General for Energy. The strategy

paper is characterized by this rationality of government which the subsequent statements highlight:

“The Commission will propose to introduce a permitting scheme applying to projects of “European interests [...]” (14)

“[...] the EU could be much stronger and effective if it took charge of its common interest and ambition.” (6)

“The EU must now formalize the principle whereby Member States act for the benefit of the EU as a whole in bilateral energy relations with key partners in global discussion” (21)

“[...] among all Member states, reflecting the EU interest and ensuring the security of the EU:s internal market.” (21)

Since the notion of a “European interest” has become the rationality of government which the energy strategy is based upon, projects aiming to promote “European interests” are encouraged by the Commission:

“In addition, ways of positively rewarding, through enhanced access to public fund regions and member states that constructively engage and succeed in facilitating the timely construction of projects of European interest will be explored.” (14)

Furthermore, the “European interest” entails a liberal perspective on the market and the economic structure. Since the relation between a liberal economic policy and the energy policy of the EU is not my prioritized area of study I only consider it and do not develop it further. Walters and Haar states that the idea of the European common market is underpinned by a neoliberal perspective and that the society and governing in western European countries have gone through a process of marketization (2005: 26f, 63). The regime of practices is hence influenced by a neoliberal perspective and the preferred energy policy of the EU is closely linked towards an economic view on energy.

In the first problematization the presupposed identity is closely related to a well- functioning single market. When affirming how a fragmented market undermines energy security as well as hinder the benefits from an energy market competition, the following is stated:

“The time has come for energy policy to become truly European” (6)

As the subsequent notion illustrate, a well- functioning market *is* Europe. This mean that agents without a well- functioning market, such as “Member States that joined as of 2004 and [...] less developed regions”, and, “countries with outdated infrastructure and less competitive energy economies” (quoted in two of the statements above) are considered to be *less* European. According to the energy

strategy paper more than a membership in the EU is required to be considered truly European, hence it tells the concerned agents not only who they are but also who they are not (so far). Through the rationality of government a certain identity is promoted, and the notion of a Pan-European identity is presented as desirable.

In the second problematization Europe is presented as an example and as a presumed leader in the international energy market but who is being challenged by external agents. To reach its full potential, the strategy paper states that the Member States have to act together and speak with one voice.

“Europe’s lead is being challenged. The independent 2010 Renewable Energy Attractiveness index now cites the US and China as the best investment opportunities for renewable energy” (6)

“Europe has some of the world’s most successful renewable energy companies and research institutions- we must keep this leadership position and avoid being overtaken by our competitors”. (1)

The strategy paper stress the EU:s role as an example, not only towards agents outside the EU but also towards its own member states. The identity presupposed additionally requires unity between the members who are assumed to speak with one voice towards external agents.

“The quality of National Energy Efficiency Action Plans, developed by the member states since 2008, is disappointing, leaving vast potential untapped” (5)

“The EU is the level at which energy policy should be developed” (6)

“[...] the EU:s external energy policy must ensure effective solidarity, responsibility and transparency among all Member States.” (21)

According to the rationality of government applied in the two problematizations, *Europe* and the *EU* are mutually applied in the strategy paper, and Europe is considered as an agent with needs which an authority could identify and address, hence it is possible to know “where and what Europe is”. (Walters & Haar, 2005:2ff). As Maltby argues the energy policy has been presented as an important issue which requires supranational governance and according to the rationality of government applied in the strategy paper, the EU and in this case the European Commission is presented as an agent who could identify the needs of “Europe” and hence present suitable policies regarding security of supply and regarding energy security in the future (2013:437, 441). The rationality of government also enable for the Commission to identify possible threats against the security of supply; the agents who are presented as not fully European with for instance outdated infrastructure as well as threats from the international energy market. Furthermore, the EU is, to some extent, presented as an agent who is separated from the member states and therefore could identify the “objective” and “true” needs regarding the energy policy within the EU. The EU:s role as an example towards external agents as well as member states within the EU further illustrate how the EU is presented as separated from its members, and particularly towards

those who are not considered “truly European”. Since the EU and Europe is applied alternately in the strategy paper the EU has accomplished “identity hegemony” in Europe and the EU has “successfully occupied the social space of what it means to be European” (Risse, 2009: 154). The rationality of governing applied considers it “natural” to talk about a “European interest” at the energy market. The European Commission has a clear vision about the future energy policy, where Europe is presented *as* the internal market, hence members with a foremost national energy market, with less developed regions or outdated infrastructure, is considered as less European and opposite to the preferred Pan-European identity promoted by the European Commission. Consequently, a membership in the Union does not automatically mean that agents are considered “European”. As a result, at the same time as a European identity is defined and consolidated an opposite is created, an otherness within Europe; members who have not yet met the required conditions of what it mean to be truly European.

Energy is presented as the “life and blood of our society”, thus a threat towards energy security would imply a threat towards the EU itself. Similarly to the construction of international mobility as a threat, the increased demand for energy at the international market is portrayed as a potential threat towards the energy supply within Europe. Europe is presented as vulnerable to threats from the “outside” which generates an additional type of otherness, namely the agents in the international market who compete for the same energy resources as the EU. The identity of the EU, the notion of “the other” and insecurity is hence shaped jointly and the notion of identity and insecurity as a “mutually constitutive process” is highly relevant in the strategy paper (Weldes et al, 1999:11ff).

The energy policy is presented as a necessary part of the foreign and security priorities and an issue which affects all of the members equally and therefore require the members to act together and speak with one voice. The rationality of an objective European interest identified by the European Commission as well as the internal market based on a liberal rationality of government can be regarded as a response towards the return of geopolitics within the member states. A liberalized internal energy market initiate unity among the members states towards external agents such as multinational energy companies but also towards energy exporters such as Russia. The internal energy market has hence become a part of the foreign relations and priorities (Young, 2011: 47ff). Similarly to the notion of “Schengenland” and the process where the EU is becoming territorial, the “European interest” articulated in the strategy paper is closely related to an integrated and effective internal market within the EU. The energy security could be guaranteed if the member states speak with one voice towards external agents. The European identity and the European interest are hence closely linked with a specific geographical area where certain agents are included and other is not. Furthermore, as explained in part four, after the energy crisis with Russia the Commission called for a coherent strategy concerning the security of supply which was further extended when the Treaty of Lisbon entered into force. This could additionally be regarded as a part of the process where the EU is becoming territorial, since the internal energy market is presented as the centre of the common energy policy and the integration to the internal market is an essential

factor which affects the influence of the members in the common energy policy. Consequently, if the members are well integrated in the internal energy market within the EU they are also an evident part of the *common* EU energy policy.

The governmentality employed in the energy strategy paper could shape the notion of a common European identity through constructing “the other” both inside the EU but also outside the EU through the foreign and security policies. Working for the common interest within the Union is encouraged in the strategy paper by rewards such as enhanced access to public funds. The power expressed is not a repressive form; it is the “dull” form of power constantly present in our daily life. Furthermore, it is the art of governing which intend to shape the behavior of agents, not by repressive means, but through a certain logic and knowledge.

5.2 Deixis of banal nationalism and the EU energy strategy

The rationality of government and the presumed identity in the strategy paper is further indicated by the deixis applied in the text. The routine word “the” is used for instance in “the internal energy market” (5), “the industry sector” (9), “the security of internal energy supplies” (5). The use of “the” construct a presupposed context which appear to be objective and “natural”, there is no question of which industry sector that is meant by “the industry sector” or who’s security that is referred to in the phrase “the security of internal energy supplies”. The deixis “our” is also applied repeatedly in the strategy paper; “our society” (4), “the well-being of our people” (4), “our borders” (13) and “our geopolitical strength” (1). This deixis explains which agents who are a part of the context and hence contribute to remind the readers about whom they are and who they are not. “Our society” could have several different meanings but the context in the strategy paper informs of which and what kind of society that is meant by the phrase. “Our society” could refer to a state, the closest community and so on, but in the strategy paper “our society” is equated with a society that should strive to reduce the importance of national borders and regulations and instead attempt to construct a deregulated internal energy market with a common approach to external agents. This is the identity presupposed by the agents reading the strategy paper and this should be the preferred identity for those who want to be a part of the European society. The use of “the industry sector” and “our borders” are two examples of “homeland- making phrases” which both presume and renew the specific context in the strategy paper as “the context” and consequently, as home. These phrases construct a context which goes hand in hand with the borders of the internal energy market, hence the areas within the internal market is presented as home while geographical areas and regions outside is not. In the foreword to the “Energy 2020” paper the Commissioner for Energy, Günter H Oettinger uses the deixis “we” in sentences such as “[...] we should exploit our geographical strength” and “[...] we need a step change in our research and innovation

policies”. The Commissioner expresses the interests and measures considered best for Europe and by doing so, he states what definition and meaning of Europe that is applied and hence also what needs and ambitions that is expected of the EU members. Consequently, the meaning of Europe is “flagged discursively”, deixis like “our”, “we” and “the”, presented as closely connected to a geographical territory operates as “homeland making phrases” and possibly contributes to the idea of the EU as “a homeland itself”. Furthermore, it reproduces the construction of “the homeland” and who are included in it and who are not.

6 Conclusion

The themes problematized by the European Commission in the strategy paper “Energy 2020- a strategy for competitive, sustainable and secure energy”, illustrate how Europe are identified as, and applied alternately with the EU. The identity of the EU is articulated *as* the internal market, and in particular, as an *effective* and *integrated* internal market. The internal market is presented as the context and as the “home” which the members should strive to be part of, this is the necessary requirement to be regarded as truly European. Consequently the identity is articulated as closely associated with a particular geographical area; the internal market. The internal market is not a permanent or predetermined geographical area, agents who meet the requirements of reduced national borders and regulations could be included, and agents such as new members of the EU with an outdated infrastructure could be excluded. Consequently, the idea of the EU becoming territorial is also applicable in the discourse of energy and energy security, as well as in the discourse of Schengenland and immigration, which was stated in the introduction. The identity articulated above is closely associated with the construction and reproduction of insecurity, through the close relationship between the construction of *the other* and the construction of *the threat against the security of supply and energy security*. The other is articulated as the member states with a foremost national energy market and outdated infrastructure, and as the agents in the international energy market, competing for the same energy resources as the EU. “The other” is presented as a threat towards the energy security and the EU. Furthermore, an integrated internal market is becoming the standard through a process of normalization which additionally constructs ingroups and outgroups, inside as well as outside the EU. The identity is legitimized by the rationality implying that the European Commission could address the *objective* needs of the members, and hence also identify what is to be considered as threats towards the energy security. Furthermore, the identity is legitimized by the rationality and knowledge that the EU is an agent and institution separated from its members; hence objectives articulated by the European Commission should be regarded as factors necessary and desirable by all the members since it is possible for the European Commission to express what is best for Europe. The identity articulated in the strategy paper does not merely encourage the feeling of belonging to symbols like the flag and the anthem. The articulated identity *encourages a certain identity* and illustrates *who* are supposed to feel European and *who* are supposed to have a bond to the flag and the anthem and *who* are not. Consequently, agents who can meet the requirements of an effective and internal market are supposed to feel European and to have a bond to symbols like the flag and the anthem, others are not.

As been referred to during the essay, the connection between identity, insecurity and territory in the discourse of immigration has been acknowledged by scholars, and evidently this connection also exists in a less obvious area like the European energy strategy. Governmentality studies are a helpful approach to analyze how certain kinds of logic and rationalities exist and influence policies and statements in different discourses. Furthermore, it illustrates how the knowledge and expertise according to which we structure our life is not “natural” or “objective”. It is constructed within different discourses and as Foucault stated, “truth” cannot be separated from power. Within the area of peace and conflict studies, governmentality studies with its ability to questioning what appears to be natural and objective is a useful approach to continue the research about the construction of insecurity and identity as well as the construction of threats towards security. Governmentality studies along with discussions about energy policies and energy security illustrate how an extended definition of security opens up for new research areas within the area of peace and conflict studies. As stated in the introduction, the energy policy of the EU and its relation to identity and insecurity is one of many discourses which the extended notion of security has generated.

7 References

- Baylis, John, 2011. "International and global security". I Baylis, John, Smith, Steve & Owens, Patricia. *The globalization of world politics: an introduction to international relations*. Oxford: Oxford Press. 232-242. Fifth edition.
- Bergström, Göran & Boréus, Kristina, 2005. *Textens mening och makt : metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys*. Lund: Studentlitteratur. Second edition.
- Barlebo Wenneberg, Søren, 2000. *Socialkonstruktivism -positioner, problem och perspektiv*. Malmö: Liber.
- Billig, Michael, 1995. *Banal Nationalism*. London. Sage Publications.
- Billig, Michael, 2009. "Reflecting on a critical engagement with banal nationalism—Reply to Skey." *The Sociological Review*, No. 57, 347-352.
- Birchfield, John S & Duffield, Vicki L, 2011. "Introduction". I Birchfield, Vicki L & Duffield, John S. *Toward a Common European Union Energy Policy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 1-9.
- Buonanno & Nugent, 2011. "Explaining the EU's Policy Portfolio: Applying a Federal Integration Approach to EU Cohesion Policy". Bruges Political Research Paper No. 20. [Working Paper]
- Carvalho, Maria da Graça, 2012. "EU energy and climate change strategy". *Energy*. No 1,19-22.
- Checkel, Jeffrey T & Katzenstein Peter J, 2009. "The politicization of European identities". I Checkel, Jeffrey T & Katzenstein Peter J (red.). *European Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1- 28.
- Council of the European Union, 2009. "Treaty of Lisbon". 15/5/2013. Available:
http://europa.eu/lisbon_treaty/full_text/
- Dean, Mitchell, 2009. *Governmentality. Power and rule in modern society*. London: Sage Publications.
- De Jong, Sijbren & Schunz, Simon, 2012. "Coherence in European Union External Policy before and after the Lisbon Treaty: The Cases of Energy Security and Climate Change". *European Foreign Affairs Review*, No. 2, 165-188.
- European Commission, 2011. "Europe 2020 initiative- Energy 2020. 13/8/2013. Available:
http://ec.europa.eu/energy/strategies/2010/2020_en.htm
- European Commission, 2011. "Energy 2020- a strategy for competitive, sustainable and secure energy". 20/4/2013. Available:
http://ec.europa.eu/energy/publications/doc/2011_energy2020_en.pdf

- European Commission, 2009. "The January 2009 gas supply disruption to the EU: an assessment". 15/5/2013. Available: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/strategies/2009/doc/sec_2009_0977.pdf.
- Foucault, Michel, 1980. "Power/ Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972- 1977. Ed. Gordon, Colin. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Foucault, Michael, 1991. "Governmentality". I Burchell, Graham & Gordon, Colin & Miller, Peter (red.) *The Foucault Effect, Studies in Governmentality*. Herfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf. 87- 104.
- Fornäs, Johan, 2012. "European identification: symbolic mediations of unity and diversity." *Global Media Journal: Australian Edition*; 2012, No 1. 1-10.
- Gordon, Colin, 1991. "Governmental Rationality: an introduction." I Burchell, Graham & Gordon, Colin & Miller, Peter (red.) *The Foucault Effect, Studies in Governmentality*. Herfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf. 1- 52.
- Jørgensen, Marianne & Philips, Louise. *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: Sage.
- Joireman, Sandra F, 2003. *Nationalism and political identity*. London, New York: Continuum.
- Kalm, Sara, 2008. *Governing Global Migration*. Lund: Department of Political Science.
- Léonard, Sarah, 2010. "EU border security and migration into the European: FRONTEX and securitization through practices." *European Security*, No. 2. 231-254.
- Lövbrant, Eva & Stripple, Johannes, 2013. "Governmentality". I Death, Carl (red.). *Critical Global Environmental Politics*. London: Routledge. Forthcoming.
- Maltby, Thomas, 2013. "European Union energy policy integration: A case of European Commission policy entrepreneurship and increasing supranationalism." *Energy Policy*. No. 55. 435-444.
- Murray Li, Tania, 2007. *The will to improve*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Nilsson, Roddy, 2008. *Foucault, en introduction*. Malmö: Égalité.
- Paterson, Matthew & Stripple, Johannes, 2010. "My Space: governing individuals' carbon emissions." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, No. 28. 341- 362.
- Risse, Thomas, 2009. "Social Constructivism and European Integration". I Wiener, Antje & Diez, Thomas. *European Integration Theory*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rose, Nikolas & O'Malley, Pat & Valverde & Mariana. "Governmentality". *Annu. Rev. Law Soc. Sci.* No. 2. 83- 104.
- Scott V, Shirely, 2008. "Climate Change and Peak Oil as Threats to International Peace and Security: Is It Time for the Security Council to Legislate?". *Melbourne Journal of International Law*, October 2008. No. 2. 495-514.
- Scott V, Shirely, 2012. "The Securitization of Climate Change in World Politics: How Close have We Come and would Full Securitization Enhance the Efficacy of Global Climate Change Policy?" *Review of European Community & International Environmental Law*; 2012, No. 3. 220-230.

- Stripple, Johannes, 2012. "The Subject of Security in a Warming World". *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, No. 2.
- Sovacool, Benjamin K, 2011. "Introduction: Defining, measuring, and exploring energy security". I Sovacool, Benjamin K. *The Routledge Handbook of Energy Security*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Youngs, Richard, 2011. "Foreign Policy and Energy Security: Markets, Pipelines and Politics". I Birchfield, Vicki L & Duffield, John S. *Toward a Common European Union Energy Policy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 41- 60.
- Walt, Stephan M, 1991. "The Renaissance of Security Studies". *Mershon International Studies Review* No. 41. 211-39.
- Walters, William & Haahr, Jens Henrik, 2005. *Governing Europe. Discourse, Governmentality and European integration*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Walters, William, 2012. *Governmentality. Critical Encounters*. New York: Routledge.
- Weldes, Jutta & Laffey, Mark & Gusterson, Hugh & Duvall, Raymond, 1999. "Introduction: Constructing Insecurity". I Weldes, Jutta & Laffey, Mark & Gusterson, Hugh & Duvall, Raymond. *Cultures of Insecurity. States, Communities and the Production of Danger*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1- 34.
- Winter Jørgensen, Marianne & Philips, Louise, 2000. *Diskursanalys som teori och metod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Winzer, Christian, 2012. "Conceptualizing energy security". *Energy policy*, No. 46. 36- 48.