For Better or For Worse?

Border Policy and Discursive Constructions of Subjectivities

Author: Emmy Olsson

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank my family and friends for all their love and support during the last few months. You have all been amazing, and I cannot thank you enough. A special thanks to Carl Petersson, I could not have done this without you. I would also like to thank my supervisor Martin Hall for your advice and my classmates for all the comments throughout this semester. Last but not least, I would like to thank you, John Woodlock. I really appreciate all of your support and thank you for being such a true friend.

Abstract

The current refugee crisis can be said to have affected not only actual borders, but also borders within subjectivities. With a poststructuralist and deconstructive approach, subjectivities are recognized as constructed through language and within discourse, and in turn, induced through policy. Thus, in order to examine the discursive construction of subjectivities, this thesis critically engage with border policy, and more particularly with the European Agenda on Security (EAS) and the European Agenda on Migration (EAM); agendas produced during 2015 and thus has the potential to affect the future European collective identity. The implicit represented problems identified within the agendas where the *dangerous other* and *lack of solidarity*. These represented issues were in turn philosophically supported by ontological induced fear and the epistemological uncertainty was answered through emphasis on the *other*. The process can be seen as a linguistic interrogation of discourse where discursive reconstructions of subjects and subjectivities are revealed. As such, challenges and fractions were found within the agendas, through strategies of alienation, externalization and future rationale (constructing limitations within subjectivities), which in turn hampers, and potentially weakens, the European collective identity. Relational power structures take part in these discursive articulations and the EAS and the EAM partake in producing the future European collective identity, for better or for worse.

Key word: Policy, deconstruction, poststructuralism, ontological insecurity, the European Union, securitization, collective identity, subjectivities

Word count: 19 792

Table of Content

1. Introduction

"We must build a kind of United States of Europe. [...] why should there not be a European group which could give a sense of enlarged patriotism and common citizenship to the distracted peoples of this turbulent and mighty continent? [...] Therefore I say to you: let Europe arise!" (Churchill, 1946)

The European project, a project of a unified region with cohesion and solidarity, was articulated by Churchill in 1946 at the University of Zurich. His aim was to eradicate nationalistic tendencies and unite the people of Europe (European Union, 2015). In 1973 the project took another step toward a more unified region when introducing the concept of a European identity for the first time (Stråth, 2000:385). It was a concept articulated at the European Community Summit in Copenhagen and emphasis was put on the Community and the United Europe[1]. This longing for a more united community was also seen in the last State of the Union speech held by Jean-Claude Juncker, the President of the European Commission, when he spoke of unity and solidarity and where he stated that "*there is not enough Europe in this Union. And there is not enough Union in this Union*" (Juncker, 2015:5), indicating the need for a more unified Europe. As such, the identity discussion continuously evolves within EU policy just as identity construction continuously is (re)created through articulations of subjectivities. Yet, the wish to create a non-nationalistic region, with a collective sense of belonging, seems perhaps even further away today based on resurrected borders as a response to the refugee crisis. Therefore, this thesis aims to analyze the present border policy along with its discursive constructions of subjects and subjectivities.

In many years migration has been part of the security discourse in the European Union, the EU, and discussed in terms of security issues (Huymans, 2000, 2006; Leonard, 2010; Guild, 2003). Nationalist movements have spurred and the EU project seems to be hitting a wall, literally. In times of crisis, such as the current refugee crisis, identity and identity construction becomes, to a greater extent, part of the political arena and through language, also a part of the discursive construction of social reality. This is recognized by Eugen Weber, who emphasized that when a crisis hit a democratic society, the *other* and the fear of the *other* becomes central (Bauman, 2004:117). In other words, availability and limitations within subjectivity becomes apparent. Who we are and what we do, in relation to the *other,* are questions that are debated and discussed and are both connected to the construction of

---

[1] At this point in time there were nine member-states, Communities, in the EU, former European Economic Community. They agreed upon the need to articulate the European Identity which they also explicitly referred to in terms of their common heritage, obligations and responsibilities (Declaration on European Identity, 1973).

identity. Thus, my interest is focused on the potential contradiction between the aim of the European project and the narratives (re)produced through EU border policy.

With demographic changes and increased immigration, the European map is transforming and borders are being built, both actual and ontological ones. Through the link between migration and security, together with the notion of resurrected borders, identity and constructions of subjects and subjectivities can become apparent through a deconstructive approach of border policy. Thus, this study seeks to explore the link between border management and the possible creation of the European collective identity construction through (re)articulations of subjectivities. More specifically, the thesis will focus on the link between the European Agenda on Security (EAS), the European Agenda on Migration (EAM) as well as the possibilities and limitations placed upon subjects and subjectivities.

1.1 Aim and Research Question

This thesis will conduct a discourse analysis upon the EAS and the EAM through a qualitative and deconstructive approach, and analyze the findings through political psychology and securitization. These two agendas represent the two dominating themes in this thesis, security and migration. Both of these agendas are discussed through the concepts of borders and identity. Whereas *borders* are explicitly referred to within the agendas, *identity*, with consideration of a poststructuralist school of thought and deconstruction of policy, is expressed through more implicit articulations. In other words, the aim is to examine and discuss the potential effects recognized through the discursive construction of subjectivities. The aim of this thesis is built upon the following research questions;

- How can the discursive notion of a collective European identity be understood in relation to EU border policy?
  - What are the potential implications and effects upon the European collective identity, based on articulations found within the EAS and the EAM?

The ultimate purpose is to critically engage with the agendas and examine the potential within the EAS and the EAM to strengthen or possibly weaken the European collective identity. By adopting a poststructuralist approach, this examination is done with a belief in a non-causal relationship between policy and identity. At the same time, through the analytical tools borrowed from political psychology and securitization scholars, this thesis seeks to further explore if the potential implicit hegemonic discourses of identity within the agendas may affect, if not weaken, the idea of a stronger European collective identity.

1.2 Terminology

Before proceeding, a few concepts need to be clarified. *Solidarity* here means sense of cohesion and unity, which is discussed in relation to EU Member States. More particularly, the meaning of solidarity is described as a "unity or agreement of feeling or action, especially among individuals with a common interest; <u>mutual support</u> within a group" (Oxford Dictionaries, 2016. Emphasis added.). This term is applied based on the long term goal, to create a collective identity where citizens of the EU, and Member States, feel solidarity (mutual support) within EU borders. This is not far from how prominent IR scholar Martin Schulz explains it. He stated that "European solidarity is about sharing responsibilities and leaving no one alone" (Schulz, 2015).

Discourse is recognized here as a meaning system (re)articulated through language. The connection between policy and discourse is based on the understanding that policies are built within discourse (Bacchi, 2009:7). Language again plays a vital role since language can be studied in order to see how meaning is created through policy and within discourse. Moreover, discourse is often discussed in relation to identity since discourse is argued below, as constituting the existence of identity.

Throughout the thesis, the concept of *EU* and *Europe* are not separated but articulated as interlinked. The reason for not make a clear distinction between the two, except that it would require a more extensive discussion about identity and its role within the EU and Europe, is because the agendas used in the analysis do not make a distinction between the two. However, implicitly the EU is referred to in terms of a political institution and Europe as its collective.

1.3 Disposition

Following this introductory chapter, chapter 2 starts by presenting previous research in the field where focus is placed upon the EU identity, the relational and constructed part of identity and the ability to (re)negotiate it. Moreover, the concept of solidarity and cohesion is also central within this chapter. This is followed by the background where previous agendas and work performed by the EU is introduced in order to situate the discourse wherein the EAS and the EAM are articulated. Both the previous research and the background are crucial in order to situate this thesis in the context of policy and identity construction in relation to (in)security.

Chapter 4 presents the methodological framework where poststructuralism is introduced along with its philosophical understanding of reality and knowledge production. Within this chapter, the link between policy and identity becomes clear and emphasis is placed upon the

ontological importance of language. This is followed by a presentation of the deconstructive method which is to a large extent based on Carol Bacchis' writing on policy, where policy is regarded as articulating problems rather than solutions. Moreover, the questions articulated by Bacchi and utilized in this thesis are also included within this section. Lastly, chapter 4 ends with presenting the main materials used within this thesis as well as limitations.

Chapter 5 presents the theoretical framework and thus focus is placed upon ontological security, as part of political psychology, and societal security, with background in Copenhagen School. Within the first part, the connection between identity and security becomes clear as well as the importance of the collective. Also, Volkans theory of Chosen Glories and Chosen Traumas is presented within this section through its connection to ontological insecurity. When it comes to societal security, attention is put on the relationship between identity and society and on identity as constitutively important for a collective to exist.

Focus is then turned to chapter 6 where the analysis is presented. This section is divided in in six parts, thematically answering the main questions posed by Bacchi as a guiding tool for policy deconstruction. The *dangerous other* and lack of solidarity were found to be the main implicit problem representations within the agendas. Thus, throughout the analysis the *dangerous other* and lack of solidarity are deconstructed in order to investigate subjectivities along with its possibilities and limitations. Lastly, the findings are summarized and discussed shortly in chapter 7, as well as suggestions for future research.

2. Previous Research

Research on identity and the EU is broadly touched upon. Despite this extensive research, I have not been able to locate any research specifically focusing on European identity deconstruction in relation to EU border policies. However, as will be argued in the methodological section, policies always contain identity constructions and a negotiation of subjectivities, thus it feels even more motivating to proceed with this thesis. In order to situate this project in relation to the EU collective identity, this section aims to introduce some of the focal points within previous research where EU, identity and security are central. What needs to be remembered is that the literature produced before 2014 also has another contextual aspect, and is not written with the knowledge of the amount of refugees in need of help at this point in time; a situation referred to as the refugee crisis.

The focal point varies amongst scholars. There is literature that has a norm- focused approach toward the EU collective identity, where it serves as a protector of human rights and democracy (Sedelmeier, 2003), and where solidarity is recognized as a core value within foreign policy (Lucarelli and Manners, 2006). Other scholars focus on self-interests and the need of security along with people's ability to change identity accordingly (Craw, 2012); or focus can be placed on the need of a European identity and the ability to merge identities, creating a hybrid (Kohl, 2000). The diversity in the literature is immense, but the emphasis is primarily on solidarity and cohesion, the collective identity and the aspect of the *other* along with the possibility to (re)create and (re)negotiate identity.

One part of the academic field has a more deconstructive approach along with a European focus. This is to an extent summarized in the book *Europe and the Other and Europe as the Other* edited by Bo Stråth (2000). Stråth sees the European identity as a construction based on language and emotions (ibid:22), and he along with Hayden White, Lutz Niethammer amongst others, discusses the European identity from a historical perspective. They display how the European discourse has been affected over time and thus take the contextual aspect into account. Stråth, through his deconstructive as well as reconstructive approach, sheds light on the historically constructed image of Europe where he aims to demonstrate the possibilities within the concept of Europe. He recognizes Europe as a discourse, a discourse connected to national identity, either as part of it or in opposition to it (ibid:13). Similar to the possibility of the collective EU identity being a part of the national one is explained in terms of hybridity by Martin Kohl (2000). He argues that this depends upon EU's ability to produce a social contract, where inclusion is in focus. This is related to migration and the possibility that due

to exclusion, migrants turn to their previous nationality in terms of identity, which can be explained as absentee nationalism (Kohl, 2000).

Stråth further emphasize that identity relates to the sense of sameness and unity (meaning, to make whole), a state of being, arguing it is a discourse that is also a project which is under constant (re)negotiation. Thus, identity is understood as something discursively created and as something that is in constant flux. This is similar to Zygmunt Bauman who understands Europe as a project that continuously evolves (2004). However, the connotation between European and non-European is essential in identity construction (Stråth, 2000:17). This supports the notion that identity is always relational as argued by Gerard Delanty below. Nonetheless, the differentiation, based on Jacques Derridas' system of oppositions (ibid:406), does not have to be articulated in negative terms; instead it can simply be recognized as a demarcation of identity, of what it is not. Focus is in turn, placed upon juxtapositions in identity construction (Stråth, 2000; White, 2000; Niethammer, 2000). The renegotiation, referred to by Stråth, can, according to Laura Cram, be possible through the ability to re-imagine identity. She states this is possible due to one's self-interest (Cram, 2012: 78). Thus the discussion moves towards a more political one.

Moreover, it is recognized by White that identity construction is kept alive through re-identification which put emphasis on discourse and its power. Identities are constructed in discourse and since one act in accordance to the assigned identity, the deconstruction of discourse becomes vital (White, 2000:68-70). White further draws upon Roland Barthes' understanding of different variations of identity, or as he puts is, power of the matrix (ibid:75), where focus is placed upon different forms of interpretations. Moreover, Delanty also focuses on the notion of unity and demarcation between the *self* and the *other*. With a social constructive approach, he put emphasis on the discursive construction of the European identity as strategically constructed and claims that identities are always relational (Delanty, 1995:3-5). Yet again, the differentiation however does not have to be negative, but simply recognized.

Besides the understanding of identity in terms of the emotional feeling of sameness, it is also recognized as a concept used to construct community; a community where the feeling of cohesion is essential (Stråth, 2000:20). This is also a concept articulated in EU border policies (see chapter 3). In line of these thoughts, Stråth claims that lack of cohesion also indicates lack of collective identity (ibid:21). Cohesion is also connected to solidarity through the understanding that "solidarity gives rise to social cohesion and depends upon an awareness of and identification with a collectivity" (Hunt and Benford, 2004 :434). Cohesion is also central

to Viktoria Kaina who asked "*how much pressure can the community tolerate in order to persist and what does the family hold together in times of scarcity, conflict, danger and threat?"* (2009:5). She, and what will be seen in the previous agendas presented in chapter 3 by the EU, recognizes social cohesion and collective identity as central for a community. Yet, she also emphasizes the vulnerability of the EU (Kaina, 2009), making it even more important to analyze and recognize how the collective is narratively (re)produced by EU policies. Moreover, Kaina is critical to the top-down approach, pointing toward the issue of governmental legitimacy if identity is constructed and forced upon the citizens. However, by recognizing the non-causal relationship between identity and policy by applying a post-structural school of thought, one can also recognize that the identity produced by policy is in turn rearticulating the identity discourse available as shown in chapter 4.1.

Furthermore, Bauman put focus on the community and the feeling the concept of community brings. He refers to community as the safe place where solidarity exists within the *in-group* which in turn is placed against the *out-group* (Bauman, 2001). He indicates that in order for solidarity to work there has to be a safe and coherent community. However, it is argued by Kohl that the EU collective identity is not needed as long as the EU does not require solidarity (Kohl, 2000:119), again pointing toward the contextual aspect. By only looking at what the EU explicitly states in concern to the lack solidarity along with its incentives to induce it (see chapter 6), an EU collective identity seems necessary.

The concept of identity and Europe is discussed further within Securitization Studies. The research question within this thesis can be seen as an extension to Ole Waever's statement "*one can ask how the nation/state identification is upheld by way of narratives on Europe, and conversely how Europe as a political real concept is stabilized by its inner connection to other – maybe more powerful – we's*". (Waever, 2002:25). However, this thesis does not focus on the narratives on Europe but instead on the narratives produced and reproduced through EU policy, namely the EAS and the EAM. When analyzing the narratives it has also been acknowledged within this field of research that a more positivist-oriented approach would not be beneficial. This due to the fact that EU identity related questions are based on feelings, which is hard to measure since they are expressed differently by different people (Craw, 2012), putting emphasis on the need to recognize interpretations and positionality.

To summarize, due to lack of previous research similar to this thesis, focus is placed on research in relation to the collective EU identity and the possibility to (re)negotiate identity. This possibility to affect subjects and subjectivities supports the argument that identity is contingent at the same time as it displays its connection to cohesion and solidarity. Based on

this reading, solidarity gives way to cohesion which in turn is crucial for the plausible EU collective identity to exist.

3. Background – Previous EU Agendas

This chapter is written in order to give a broad overview of previous agendas produced by the EU in order to gain an understanding of the realm of EU security policy in which the EAS and the EAM is currently in place. Central here is the articulations found in the old agendas in relation to migration and solidarity. These will in turn contextualize the discourses used in the EAS and the EAM. The previous agendas are all within security policy, whereas the EAM, where migration is central, is the first of its kind, hence the focus is placed on previous security agendas along with its articulations on migration and solidarity. The old agendas in focus are from 2003, 2008 as well as one from 2010. As will be shown in the analysis, these two concepts are discursively used throughout the EAS and the EAM. However, before proceeding, a reference to the Treaty of the European Union is made.

According to the objectives within EU, the union shall "*promote economic, social and territorial cohesion, and solidarity among Member States*" (article 3) and "*it shall contribute to peace, security, the sustainable development of the Earth, solidarity and mutual respect among peoples, free and fair trade, eradication of poverty and the protection of human rights...*" (article 5). Also "*the Member States shall work together to enhance and develop their mutual political solidarity*" (article 24). Lastly*, "they shall <u>refrain from any action</u> which is contrary to the interests of the Union or likely <u>to impair its effectiveness as a cohesive force in international relations</u>*" (article 24. Emphasis added)[2]. The last sentence is of interest since the aim of this thesis is to engage with the EAS and the EAM and analyze its potential affects upon subjectivities, which in turn, has an effect upon solidarity and cohesion (see chapter 2 and 6). In sum, the Treaty highlight the importance of cohesion and solidarity amongst its Member States as well as the importance to avoid actions standing in its way.

In 1973 in Copenhagen, the Declaration for the European Identity was agreed upon and presented by the nine Member States. This was the first time that the EU explicitly, officially and publicly referred to the concept of a European identity. They defined European identity in terms of unity, togetherness, obligations and responsibilities. The document referred to the dynamic nature of the construction of a United Europe with the aim to create a European Union. The declaration also discussed the EUs' obligation toward other regions and of the importance to act as a single entity (CVCE, 2013). The goal of the creation of the European Union was achieved 20 years later, the same year as the citizenship of the EU came into force

---

[2] All these belongs in the Treaty on European Union http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A12012M%2FTXT (EUR-Lex, 2012)

and worked as a ticket to the free and open European Community. This was articulated in the Treaty of Maastricht on European Union in which it said that "*every citizen who is a national of a Member State is also a citizen of the Union*" (EUR-Lex, 2010)

Turning attention to the most previous agendas concerning security, the EU presented a European Security Strategy in 2003, which was reviewed in 2008, followed by the Internal Security Strategy for the European Union in 2010. The agenda from 2003 brought up global challenges such as poverty, diseases and competition for natural resources along with key threats in terms of terrorism, weapons of mass destruction and state failure. The strategic objective was to think globally but act locally. Moreover, when presenting the policy implications for the EU it was also stated that the EU and the United States of America "can be a formidable force for good in the world" (Consilium, 2003:13). The review five years, in 2008, argues the EU "remains an anchor of stability" (Consilium, 2008:2. Emphasis added), indicating the importance of the EU on a global scale. This was further supported in the agenda were challenges was claimed to arise out of globalization while at the same time put emphasis on the fact that at EU remains the biggest donor to those states in need. This type of categorization of EU, the noble protector, is also recognized in the EAS and the EAM and as such, analyzed in chapter 6.

The connection between migration and security has not been as apparent as in the EAS and the EAM, as shown in the analysis, however a few references has been made. The agenda from 2003 only refer to migration ones, and then in terms of illegal migrants. However, it is discussed as a threat, a threat posed from weak and failing states (Consilium 2003:4). The reviewed version from 2008 articulates illegal immigration in connection to our security but also in terms of climate change. In the agenda from 2010, the connection is seen again, but here in terms of border management (European Union, 2010:26).

As migration is to a large extent connected to security within the EAS and the EAM (see chapter 6), so is solidarity within the European project, as shown within the previous research and through the statement made by President Juncker. Mutual solidarity was referred to in terms of making the EU, as a global actor, more effective in terms of global security in 2003. In 2008, the agenda wrote about solidarity and the need for Member States to show solidarity, as *we* are facing challenges through energy security. The agenda from 2010 states that Europe guarantees solidarity and that "we", the Europeans, are united (European Union, 2010). These statements are discussed in the analysis, but due to the different ways of articulating them within the EAS and the EAM. Throughout the 2010 agenda cross-border threats and challenges are discussed such as terrorism and cybercrime.

4. Methodological Framework

The deconstructive approach applied in the analysis is supported by concepts from political psychology and securitization, and more particularly by ontological insecurity and societal security, theories presented in the theoretical framework. In this chapter, methodological considerations are discussed with focus on the poststructuralist school of thought. This is followed by a section devoted to deconstruction of discourse before ending it with material and limitations.

4.1 Poststructuralism

Before conducting an analysis the methodological framework needs clarification. It is about how I, as a researcher, ontologically situate myself and at the same time display epistemological choices. It is about how this thesis perceives reality and what knowledge is and how it can be produced. After introducing the meaning of methodology and shed light on the methodological choices available, this section turns to the poststructuralist understanding of identity. As such, this section seeks to explain why the poststructuralist approach is methodologically suited for the upcoming analysis and clarify the poststructuralist understanding of the non-causal relationship between policy and identity.

The philosophical questions that need clarification are the researchers' comprehension of reality and knowledge production. This concerns ontological assumptions, assumptions about reality and the nature of being, along with answers to the epistemological question of what knowledge is and how it can be measured (Jackson, 2010:26). There are several of different methodological approaches. What distinguish them are the methodological discussions concerning the relationship between the subject and the object and whether or not they rely upon each other (ibid:36). To put simply, this philosophical debate is about the belief or disbelief in a reality that exists without interference.

I have conducted the analysis from a poststructuralist perspective since it recognizes the ontological importance of language and its centrality in the understanding of reality. It is a perspective that shares some of the social constructivist philosophical viewpoints, both being within the reflectivist spectrum (Hansen, 2006); meaning, far from the positivist approach. Poststructuralism was further created as a critique toward structuralism (Waever, 2002: 23), and in contrast to structuralism, the approach recognizes instability as the building block of meaning along with the belief that meaning is continuously evolving and in flux. This is supported through the ontological understanding of language as not only constructing but also constitutive (Hansen, 2006:17). Language can moreover be explained through a system of

signs, but never fixed. It is involved in both the process of producing the meaning of the identity but also the construction of it. In other words, without language and (re)articulation, the understanding of identity would simply not exist. Thus, language takes part in creating our reality, which support the understanding that language never can be seen as neutral (Jørgensen and Philips 2002:3).

Moreover, the poststructural school of thought recognizes not only the ontological importance of language but also its contingency and instability. Thus, identity can be regarded as constantly being in the process of renegotiation. By this, it abandons not only the positivist understanding of reality but also the Universalist perception on a fixed system generating Universalist truths. Thus, no truth claims can be made and neither can a system of meaning be fixed (Hansen, 2006:18). However, even though stability and fixed meaning is impossible, this is still the aim within discourse; a utopian goal that can never be achieved which further goes along with the deconstruction approach developed further down. Also, poststructuralists highlight the power of discourse in relation to knowledge since it is in discourse that reality is constructed (ibid:16). This is similar to social constructivists who recognize that knowledge as based on perception hence the impossibility to present reality objectively. Thus, reality it is explained as dependent upon articulation and re-articulations. The linguistic importance is further supported within sociology, where Thomas Luckmann argues that communication is the foundation of construction (2008:278). In other words, focus is put on language as well as upon power within articulations.

Prior to focusing on the interrelated connection between policy and identity, a brief reflection is discussed here to clarify how, from a poststructuralist perspective, identity is ontologically and epistemologically situated. With the comprehension of language as the tool that produces meaning it does not come as a surprise that language is, within this line of thought, of great ontological importance. There is no objective understanding of identity and it exists through articulations and linguistic representations (Hansen, 2006:17). In line with the poststructuralist ontological understanding of reality, the epistemological tools are consequently about discovering how identities and policies are linguistically articulated (ibid:24). Thus, as seen in the deconstructing approach (chapter 4.2), the chosen method is about asking questions in order to dismantle and reveal discourse, in which subjectivities are discursively created.

The poststructuralist school of thought is, as understood above, of great importance to this thesis as it put emphasis on the relationship between policy and identity. As this thesis aims to examine the potential fragmentation policy discourse has upon identity construction, the

poststructuralist approach is beneficial. More particularly, this philosophical understanding allows this thesis to focus on the link between policy and identity with a belief in a non-causal relationship between the two. Construction of issues such as immigration along with its implicit articulations on subjects and subjectivities is central within policy discourse. These subjectivities are in turn manifested through discourse (Hansen, 2006). Policy is thus dependent upon the existing identity construction; while at the same time (re)articulates identity which keeps the identity construction to stay alive. This again demonstrates the centrality of language and its power of producing meaning. Yet, through this non-causal relationship an analysis of the link between policy and identity is in focus rather than the blaming game where it is all about cause and effect. It is about deconstructing discourse and analyzing the possibilities and limitations within subjectivities. The identity is (re)articulated within border policy and done so in accordance to the availability in discourse.

The impossibility of causality is understood through the clarification that representations "*of identity are simultaneously the precondition for and (re)produced through articulation*" (Hansen, 2006:10). This means that policy discourse entails both the production and reproduction of identity which makes foreign policy essential in the analysis of identity. Articulation is thus vital for identity to exist, but so is the absence of competing discourses (ibid), which can be related to what is unsaid within the EAM and the EAS (see chapter 6). The political possibility also becomes of interest in this two-way street between policy and identity construction. The discursivity becomes apparent through the understanding that policies are made to enforce action, or create problems (as shown in chapter 4.2 and 6), and to create a system, based on articulation, and through the use of subjectivities articulate problems (ibid:22). With this reasoning it becomes possible to analyze policies that does not explicitly refer to identity, but yet, takes part in its construction through discourse. In other words, poststructuralism opens up the possibility for a discursive analysis where the linkage between the two, through political discourse, can be analyzed.

Lastly, in the process of constructing identity the concept of otherness involves the juxtaposition process, which is commonly shown within poststructuralist writings (Waever, 2002: 24). There are different degrees and types of otherness such as themes of geographical or political character within policy discourse (Hansen, 2006:19). Moreover, national identity is also based on the juxtaposition of what it is not, which can be analyzed when examining the construction of the plausible European identity. In the section below where, the method of deconstruction is presented, categories are one focal point within the deconstruction process. In regard to that, poststructuralists emphasizes that collectives, such as us and them, are key

categories when analyzing identity (Waever, 2002:25). By applying this approach not only language is of importance but also the perception of it. Thus in this case, the analysis is besides the focus on establishing who the "us" and "them" are also concentrated on the perception of these subjectivities.

To summarize, policy and identity are interlinked through the non-causal relationship and identity is, through discourse, not only social but also discursive and highly political. In order to analyze the link between policy and identity, language must be acknowledged as ontologically important along with the realization that without (re)articulation of identity and an analysis of the perception of it, identity can simply not exist. However, even though emphasis is put on the link between policy and identity, the potential possibilities and limitations within identity discourse can change. Like all discourses, the identity discourse is in constant flux and is continuously renegotiated from within.

4.2 Identity deconstruction

The poststructuralist approach, with emphasis on language as constitutive and constructing as well as policy effects upon identity, this thesis, through deconstruction, focuses on how subjectivities are established within the EAS and the EAM. Thus, in order to analyze this link and to fully understand how the European collective identity can be understood in terms of political policy, a deconstructive approach is needed and strategies of otherness and differentiation, as found within the EAS and the EAM, will be discussed. The epistemological focus on the articulation of identity is apparent throughout the method. The centrality within this approach is concerned about asking different questions, as a linguistic interrogation of discourse, where the aim of the method is to present a nuanced picture of what is actually being articulated in terms of subjects and subjectivities. By deconstructing identity within the EAS and the EAM one can get a snapshot of how border policies discursively construct collective identity which at the same time will reflect the actual sense of the collective identity. It is about dismantling discourse and highlighting alternative interpretations of the text. As stated above, this thesis does not make any truths claims, but rather to engage with policy in order analyze discourse availability. Thus, this section introduces the deconstructive approach, which relies heavily upon Carol Lee Bacchis' writings, with its emphasis on representations and subjectifications, along with the inquiries used as a roadmap for the analysis.

The method extensively introduced by Carol Lee Bacchi, is called "*What the Problem Represented to be*", also known as the WPR approach. It is built upon poststructuralist

discourse psychology amongst other perspectives, making the approach philosophically available for this thesis. The approach sees subjects and subjectivities as constituted in and established within policy, as well as it sees policy as a part of discourse (Bacchi, 2009:265). This approach brings the analytical focus on not just language but also its underlying assumptions, values and accompanying signs which are all part of the system of meaning. This is what Bacchi refers to as conceptual logics (ibid:7), similar to the understanding of the concept interpretative repertoires; a concept utilized in a more constructionist setting where repertoires are used to construct versions of reality and the position of the *self* and *other* (Potter, 1996; Potter and Wetherell, 1987). Here the interpretative repertoire, the discourse, is resourceful and flexible; a flexibility recognized also within conceptual logics through the understanding that discourse is always in flux.

Language is in focus since it is both constitutive but also constructive, and thus essential in meaning creation. However, meaning is also created through the instability within discourse, hence the need to linguistically interrogate discourse and analyze the internal negotiation taking place within the system of meaning. To enable an analysis of the collective identity, this thesis needs to disclose the discursive policy discourse in order to further expose the potential fragmentations within the EAS and the EAM as it takes part in forming the European collective identity. The process of deconstruction is a concept developed by Jacques Derrida, and his work of Grammatology. His work was also related to this negotiation of discourse and its affect upon identity. As discourse is constantly evolving just as policy is continuously rearticulated, the analysis to be recognized as a moment in time; or as Derrida puts it, a moment of discourse (1967:62). Focus is put on signs and the creation of meaning.

> *No one doubts that man is changed by his senses. But instead of distinguishing the changes, we confuse them with their causes. We attach too much and too little importance to sensations. We do not see that frequently they affect us not merely as sensations, but as signs or images, and that their moral effects also have moral causes. Just as the feelings that a painting excites in us are not at all due to colors, the power of music over our souls is not at all the work of sounds. Beautiful, subtly shaded colors are a pleasing sight; but this is purely a pleasure of the sense. It is the drawing, the imitation, which gives life and spirit to these colors. The passions they express are what stir ours; the objects they represent are what affect us. Colors entail no interest or feeling at all. The strokes of a touching picture affect us even in a print. Without these strokes in the picture, the colors would do nothing more (Translated by Spivak, 2016, from Derrida, 1967:53)*

In other words, in order to understand the picture, the different layers of paint need to be scrutinized. When analyzing discourse the process of differentiation often becomes apparent, just as the poststructuralist perspective recognizes identity as something created in terms of what it is not and thus put emphasis on the need of differentiation. It is in this process that through explicit and implicit divergences between the *self* and the *other*, that meaning is created. A meaning which is decided through negotiation of signs (Scott, 1988:36-37). This process in turn can be divided in two ways; a positive process of linking and a negative process of differentiation (Hansen, 2006:20). As explained in the analysis, the differentiation between the self and the other does not have to be negative, but dividing.

When conducting a deconstructive analysis upon policy discourse, in this case in relation to identity construction, Bacchi and the WPR approach, becomes helpful. Policies are articulated in terms of problem-solvers, however through this approach they are rather problem-creators and can thus also be studied in order to visualize how that particular issue is assumed (Bacchi, 2009). It is about dismantling the represented problem recognized in policy and determining what presuppositions and assumptions strengthens the represented problem. Policies usually contain more than one representation problem at the same, seen through both implicitly and explicitly articulations (Bacchi, 2009:4; Bacchi, 2008:1). This is where this thesis put focus on borders as explicitly mentioned within the agendas and identity as implicitly represented.

By understanding the relationship between identity and the focal points in the agendas, the agendas are not only presenting a solution to the issues of security and migration, they also contains representations of how these issues are understood and thus also contain representations of identity. Moreover, when conducting a deconstructive discourse analysis with the aim of dismantling discourse, focus is put on identifying binaries, where exclusion and the binary hierarchy are central elements, and key concepts and categories and thus also the meanings assigned to them (Bacchi, 2009:6-8). The general understanding is that all representation of a problem is an interpretation; an interpretation that needs to be analyzed since the outcome depends upon the actual interpretation. In other words, policy is not a solution to a problem but a meaning-creator. As such, the question must be raised in concern to what kinds of issues are represented within the EAS and the EAM which in turn effect subjects and subjectivities?

The questions guiding this analysis (see below) are, except its focus on what is articulated, also interested in the unsaid, what is left out and silenced. This is further emphasized gender

scholarship, where silences are explained as things that are not explicitly spoken or written. These silences indicate what is taken for granted and what is understood in terms of normality (Kronsell, 2006:109). These silences lead to questioning what seems natural and shed light on what is not being said. Thus, in relation to what is assumed, the method of deconstruction is concerned with what is excluded within the discourse which turns the attention to what issues and/or perspectives are not represented. This could be answered by analyzing the simplified division of binaries (Bacchi, 2009:13). The binaries can indicate what is dominating within discourse and thus also what is silenced and through this process also reveal power structures.

With regard to the research question the most prominent inquiry is concerned with the effects produced by certain representations. Here the subjectification and discursive effects are relevant. Both of these effects are related to what is possible or limiting due to the established subjectivities (ibid:16). The positionality of subjectivity within discourse is thus determining the positions available, hence affect the way we feel about the *self* and *other* (ibid:17). For instance, if the *self* is articulated as a hero and all negative aspects are either silenced or externalized, the position as a hero becomes discursively hegemonic and strengthen, and in turn affect the self-perception. However, the use of causal explanatory factors, often seen within traditional Foreign Policy Analysis (Hansen, Weaver: 2002:28), is not particularly in line with the post-structuralist understanding of causality as something impossible. Poststructuralists ontologically recognize identity and policy as interlinked (Hansen, 2006:17). This means that at the same time as identity is (re)constructed within foreign policy, foreign policy, as a discursive practice, is dependent upon existing identity representations. Also, the interlinked relationship between identity and policy is studied in accordance with the belief that meaning is established through language (ibid:19). Based on this understanding, this thesis has adopted a poststructuralist and deconstructive approach as they complement one another in relation to the research question.

As understood from the text above, juxtaposition is central in the deconstructive approach. This can be seen throughout this entire thesis where it refers to constructions, (in)-security, and where even securitization is positioned in relation to what it is not. Derrida's understanding of deconstruction is concerned with both the exposure of dichotomies and its related constructed appearance (Scott, 1988:38). As such it can be asked what strategies of otherness and differentiation can be found within the EAS and the EAM? Generally, the process of deconstruction is about revealing dichotomies and paradoxes. It is about making all building blocks of the discourse visible. The analysis (in chapter 6) is based on the following deconstructing inquiries explicitly presented by Bacchi (2012:21):

1. *What's the 'problem' represented to be in a specific policy or policy proposal?*

2. *What presuppositions or assumptions underpin this representation of the 'problem'?*

3. *How has this representation of the 'problem' come about?*

4. *What is left unproblematic in this problem representation? Where are the silences? Can the 'problem' be thought about differently?*

5. *What effects are produced by this representation of the 'problem'?*

6. *How/where has this representation of the 'problem' been produced, disseminated and defended? How has it been (or could it be) questioned, disrupted and replaced?*

These questions are articulated in terms of the represented problem (or the *dangerous other* and lack of solidarity) found in the EAS and the EAM. The goal within a poststructuralist discourse analysis is to "*show how first-order facts are dependent upon a particular discursive framing of the issue in question and that this framing has a political effect*" (Hansen, 2006:22), or as Bacchi puts it is to "*reveal underlying assumptions and preconceptions in problem representation and to identify and reflect upon silences*" (2009:9). This goal is in accordance with the goal of this thesis where, through a deconstructive discourse analysis, critically examine the identity discourse and its possible discursive framing.

To summarize, the deconstructive approach is in line with the methodological understanding of language as constructive and constitutive. It put emphasis on conceptual logics, the system of meaning, where subjects and subjectivities are established within discourse. Central in this method are the questions that steer the analysis, questions that focus on assumptions, juxtapositions, categories as well as on what is excluded and unsaid. Thus, the process of deconstruction will make it possible to identify discursive constructions of subjectivities within the EAS and the EAM.

4.3 Material

The main material used within the analysis is the agendas presented in the introduction, the *European Agenda on Security* and the *European Agenda on Migration*. Those agendas were chosen since both were produced last year, in 2015, and represent part of the EU border management. Thus, since the EAS and the EAM are newly produced, they will too take part within the negotiation of subjectivities and thus, also potentially affect the future European collective identity. However, in order to situate the recognized problem represented within the agendas, the background makes use of previous security agendas; *A Secure Europe in a Better*

World - European Security Strategy from 2003*, Providing Security in a Changing World* from 2008 (as a revised version based on the one in 2003) and the *Internal security strategy for the European Union Towards a European security model* from 2010. An intertextual analysis could have been done within a more extensive research project. However, in this thesis past agendas are only utilized to give a brief background of the EAS and the EAM which is now in place. Moreover, the EAS and the EAM were also chosen since both explicitly are written in conjunction with the other. All agendas, past and present, are all easy to access from the EU official websites.

Lastly, this thesis has to a large extent relied upon writings made by Catrina Kinnvall, Carol Bacchi, Jef Huysmans, and Bo Stråth.

4.4 Limitations

The research done within this thesis is limited by its material but also in regards to time and scope of this project. In terms of material, this thesis is limited to the EAS and the EAM in order to look at the potential future affects upon the European collective identity. The possibility of widening the scope of material could possibly have further supported the problem representations as well as its accompanying assumptions. As such, it would also have been beneficial to draw on Foucauldian genealogical theory as a part of the deconstruction in order to show how the representation of an issue and the discourse evolved. This within the WPR approach is connected to the third question (Bacchi, 2009:10). However, due to the constitutive understanding of discourse, the deconstructive method indicates the structure of the discourse as it is seen today through policy. If the focus had been put on a possible change within subjectivities, a more intertextual approach with material from different point in time would have been beneficial. Instead, previous agendas are discussed in the background in order to situate the focus within the current policies.

By conducting a discourse analysis from a deconstructive and poststructuralist approach, questions concerning reliability need to be recognized. As understood, it is an interpretivist approach which means that everything chosen, even for this thesis, is done so in accordance with those concerns I have as a researcher. In other words, total objectivity is impossible and affected by the subjectivity within me as a researcher. Thus, the way this thesis interpret the material could be seen differently. With that said, through the poststructuralist understanding of reality, this thesis does not aim to make any truth claim nor does it aim to make any

generalization. Instead, it aims to problematize and display the potential within the agendas to contribute to a possible fragmentation of the European collective identity.

What has not been touched upon in this thesis is the differentiation between the identity of the EU and Europe. This in itself can be problematized and discussed in length. However, since the EAS and the EAM refer to its policy in terms of both EU and Europe; how it is about to secure European societies and strengthen European security, this thesis has chosen to avoid this discussion since it would only led to confusion and more question marks. The EU and Europe, in terms of identity is thus in this thesis looked upon as strongly interconnected.

The philosophical limitations is based on my, as a social scientist, intersubjective participation in society. This is related to the issue of objectivity, since I am too, affected by my position and ideological understanding articulated within my community. In the material selection I need to be aware over the fact that that itself is a matter of revealing my personal understanding of an issue. In regard to the inability to achieve total objectivity the research produced need to be regarded as a part of the created social reality. Meaning, the interpretations made within this thesis is also based on my subjectivity. Moreover, the poststructuralist approach has an interpretivist outlook and thus all knowledge that are produced is done so though some sort of power relationship and ontological presumptions. Since language is what constructs identity, based on representations of subjectivities, this thesis also contributes to the construction of identity. The inability to remain objective is thus something that needs to be kept in mind while reading this paper.

As will be embarked on in the analysis (see chapter 6), both actual and emotional borders are discussed; emotional, in terms on ontological insecurity, relational power and the need to differentiate between the *self* and the *other*. How the EU is ontologically perceived as connected to the feeling of a collective identity thus the analysis is based upon a more philosophical understanding of identity and identity construction. Focus here is thus put on the ontological perception of a unified European identity. Moreover, this discussion will be based on the ontological security perspective, emphasizing the need for a stronger unity amongst the collective. This perspective denotes that when experiencing existential uncertainty one respond through the affirmation in identity. When securitizing national borders the regional identity gets affected which in turn affects what can be regarded as the ontological map of Europe.

5. Theoretical Framework

In recent month, borders have been discussed in relation to the current refugee crisis. Borders are being (re)constructed and member-states of the EU have taken back the control of national borders, hindering the free movement of people which is a crucial part of the Schengen-agreement[3]. This process demonstrates how borders are being protected by concepts such as security and identity; discourses used as chess pieces by politicians through border policies. With the understanding that poststructuralism steers how this project recognize reality and how this reality can be studied, the theoretical tools chosen are done so in order to analyze the explicit and implicit articulations in terms of subjectivities within the EAS and the EAM. The political psychological part presented brings focus to the connection between identity and insecurity where the theory refers to emotions, the mind, and the nations-state. The theoretical understating builds a bridge between the political and the individual level. Securitization brings the focus to the security process with its ability to move from the nation-state to the community, where it becomes possible to talk about Europe as a collective society.

5.1 Political Psychology and Ontological Security

With emphasis on borders, security, and identity this thesis has a transnational focus where political psychology plays a part. It is about analyzing the political process of border management and recognizing the link to collective identity. Thus this section discusses collective identity and the contribution of the ontological security perspective. An overview of the ontological security concepts is introduced, followed by an explanation of the connection between identity and security and the importance of the collective. Emphasis is placed upon how the collective can be seen as a security entity and how the EU can be recognize as a plausible collective identity provider. The psychological focus sheds light on the relational part of discourse. Lastly this section turns to identity construction and otherness along with an overview of Chosen traumas and Chosen Glories and the strategy of homesteading.

The toll globalization has taken upon collective identity is recognized with resurrected borders and its effect on the free movement of people within EU. With the aim to understand the contextual effects of border policies has upon identity, political psychology is needed within this thesis in order to bring the political to the individual and show how structures

---

[3] Within the policy it is stated that "*the Schengen area and cooperation are founded on the Schengen Agreement of 1985. The Schengen area represents a territory where the free movement of persons is guaranteed. The signatory states to the agreement have abolished all internal borders in lieu of a single external border [...] Schengen cooperation has been incorporated into the European Union (EU) legal framework by the Treaty of Amsterdam of 1997*" (EUR-Lex, 2009)

affect behavior. Political psychology is chosen due to its focus on identity theories, its studies within the field of immigration and citizenship, along with the attention put on Europe and integration. Here, the interest in the construction between the *self* and the *other* is in focus (Nesbitt-Larking et.al 2014:4). It is about human behavior and the political aspect. The field is according to the political psychologist Van Ginneken, "about the need to control, to regulate, and to understand" (1988:6, cited in Nesbitt-Larking et.al 2014). Put shortly, it is about the understanding of the link between the political and the psychological.

With this in mind, the ontological security perspective developed by Anthony Giddens within political psychology, shed light on the interconnectedness between identity and security. Ontological security is about reducing existential anxiety and create a sense of ontological security (Manners, 2014:268). It is when this is done through the reaffirmation of collective identity, that this concept becomes interesting. This further underlines the connection between security and identity, where identity controls how secure one feel and when the need to reaffirm or change identity. Thus this could also mean that one chooses to form a new identity. Catarina Kinnvall (2004:746) explains it as a concept that "refers to a person's fundamental sense of safety in the world and includes a basic trust of people", generating a more individual focal point. Jennifer Mitzen however, has taken a more state-centered approach and argues that the need to feel ontological secure also applies to states (Mitzen, 2006), making this argument possible to move between the individual and the collective. Thus, this thesis primarily focuses on the securitization of subjectivity, in this case concerning the creation of a stable collective identity as a response to ontological insecurity and existential uncertainty. This is in order to expand knowledge with regard to the potential of implicit identity construction can have upon collective identity. As such, this steers the question toward which collective is strengthened through the present discourse in policy?

In relation to the focus on the collective European identity, identity is a safety mechanism that brings people together. More particularly it is in seen "as an anxiety-controlling mechanism reinforcing a sense of trust, predictability, and control in reaction to disruptive change by reestablishing a previous identity or formulating a new one" (Kinnvall, 2004:746), making it plausible for a new identity to take form if it produces the sense of safety needed by the collective. When these emotions become real people have tendency to draw closer to the collective that for them reduces the feeling of being ontologically insecure; a collective that can be whatever collective that brings security and stability to the self (ibid:741-742). In other words, this does not have to be national or cultural, but any collective that is able to produce the feeling of security. This suggests that the EU as a region could take on the role as a

collective if it produced stability. Also, drawing on Giddens understanding of identity as something dependent on power and contextual aspects of identity construction is also a project (Kinnvall, 2006:31), an ongoing process. Besides security, borders are recognized as a building block within this perspective through the understanding that borders can be seen through emergency narratives creating the feeling of uncertainty where security is in turn, used in order to reverse this sense of uncertainty (Kinnvall and Svensson, 2015:6). People are moving from country to country and borders are changing which challenges the preservation of the constructed identity.

As stated above, it is about securitizing subjectivity; about creating one stable identity. However, this is also done through the (re)construction of the stranger other (Kinnvall, 2006:36), where again, the poststructuralist process of juxtapositions becomes apparent. Identity construction is thus facilitated through the separation between us and them. This categorization can be explained through social identity theory and self-categorization theory. These theories offers an understanding of the *self* and the *other*, which can be used in order to further understand the process of differentiation. These are based on Tajfals minimal group paradigm where an "own group" is favored above "another" group. It is about creating a reality where the in-group is the better and more stable group. This is done by recognizing the similarities among the in-group members together with the dissimilarities with others, out-groups (Kinnvall, 2004:750). This can connected to what Bauman, as referred to in the previous research section, explained in terms of the need to feel secure within the community against what is placed outside this community (2001); to create a stable and secure in-group.

Volkans *Chosen Traumas and Chosen Glories* are both used in the context of ontological insecurity. Ontological traumas refer to mental recollection of the past and construct your negative experiences of the other based on that constructed memory. Chosen glories are about self-esteem and are just like the traumas providing ontological security through a sense of unity (Kinnvall, 2004:755). Moreover, this perspective highlights the need to find a signifier that provides security and inclusiveness. This is done through nationalistic signifiers which serve as the protection from distant other (ibid:762). The rise of resistance politics can also be understood in terms of the perspective of ontological security since it sees the link between insecurity and the need for identity mobilization (Kinnvall, 2006:29). When people become scared and feel uncertain they need to reaffirm their stabile identity in relation to past memories or past identities. This may be imagined identity, or not, which is in line with Giddens observations. He emphasized the toll globalization had taken upon society and how the sense of security that was felt in the small communities was lost. However, this is, as

Giddens highlights, not always the case since many were seemingly powerless in their social situation; a situation where independence was not a given (Giddens, 1991:6). Thus, it is more built upon an imagined past. The emotional level is through this awareness tied to the psychological level which in turn supports the need for this perspective.

As argued by Kinnvall, Volkans theory of Chosen Glories and Chosen Traumas with its psychoanalytical emphasis can complement a more structural approach (Kinnvall, 2006:50). Volkan and Kristeva add an emotional dimension to the search for one stable identity through their focus on traumas, fear and other historical evidence. A chosen trauma can be used to interpret new trauma. These emotions provide comfort when experiencing ontological insecurity (ibid:56-57), which in turn can be recognized as a strategy of homesteading. When one's home is taken or changed, as in the case of refugees coming into the home of the EU, the sense of security is lost and a new home and identity need to be reestablished. It is about creating a "neighborhood that reflects a certain community" (ibid:32), which is further also connected to the process of othering; a concept explained by Norbert Elias. He and John Scotson emphasizes the power within the established, the in-group, who has the ability to situate themselves above the outsiders, the out-group (1965: xv). They also showed how the difference between the in- and out-group was accepted by the outsiders, thus also supports Bacchi to the extent that identities are constructed based on the subjectivities available in discourse (2009:16-17). The construction of self and other is used in order to securitize subjectivity and reduce existentially uncertainty. Nationalism has served this cause through its ability to use and affect discourse, and through that create a sense of security. This is an intersubjective process which results in ontological security for some and insecurity for others. (Kinnvall, 2004:764).

The essentialist part of identity becomes clear through Volkans understanding of the present, past and the future. Here the stranger other and emotional aspects become part of securitizing subjectivity (ibid:751). "*A psychoanalytic approach cannot replace a structural one, but it can compliment it*" (ibid). This is based on Volkans object relation theory where the other is framed as an object or abject. It becomes evident to keep the self and the other separated which is done through psychological processes of justifications. This is used to make the stranger other into the enemy. Exclusion becomes part of the discourse (ibid754), and thus part of the identity construction. The usefulness of this understanding, as a complement to ontological security, is the understanding that the imagined past work in affect to global mobility. However, with Volkans theory with the essentializing process the poststructuralist approach need to be addressed and explained due to its disbelief in

essentializing. Having a theoretical tool acknowledging this process, along a philosophical understanding of the process as part of a reality created by discourse, is not an issue. On the one hand, this thesis has the tools given by Volkan and the concept of ontological security, tools used in order to understand the ongoing identity process. On the other hand, one it has the poststructuralist approach which does not neglect the usefulness of these tools, but rather sees these types of categorization as a part of the discursive construction of reality. This is realized not because people are constructed in a way to always essentialize the *self* and the *other*, but because the discourse allows this to continuously be rearticulated.

Another helpful tool presented by Kinnvall and the perspective of ontological security is analyzing security as thick signifier. This tool put emphasis on the contextual dimension of the term security through the aim of "*unmasking those structural relations through which security discourses are framed*" (Kinnvall, 2006:26). By making security part of a certain framework thus can be viewed as a strategic choice and through the political power affect the ontological sense of security. This tool involves the deconstruction of three different process; the first process is about the narratives surrounding security and the understanding of its ability to affect the sense of safety; the second is about the understanding of how this become apparent on the local level; the third process is concerned with to *"the extent to which people become preoccupied with search for one secure identity"* (Kinnvall, 2006:27). This is about the investigation of the why behind the feeling of insecurity and of the responses to these feeling, and why some collectives are more attractive than other (ibid:35). However, a poststructuralist issue with the securitization of subjectivity is that this perspective narrows the understanding of identity reconstruction since it believes in the possibility to reach one stable identity. Instability and not stability is what creates meaning. This is also why this theoretical framework needs to expand beyond this concept and utilize the securitization concept elaborated on below.

In sum, the political psychology, or more particularly the perspective of ontological insecurity does not only recognize the link between the political and the individual, it also acknowledge the link between identity and security. In times of an articulated crisis, insecurity increases along with the need to reaffirm identity. Border policy is of interest in this thesis through its partaking in the construction of subjectivities, as it through it narratives contributes to insecurity which in turn has to be reduced by the feeling of a secure community. Moreover, securitization of subjectivities becomes apparent through juxtapositions and through the process of through discursive power place the in-group above

the out-group. Fear and trauma are two factors recognized as used in search for a stable identity.

5.2 The Securitization Process and Societal Security

The focus on insecurity through the perspective of ontological security is in this thesis further supported by Copenhagen School and the securitization perspective and more particularly on societal security. Even though the focus within ontological security has turned away from securitization in the last writings, this thesis retracts the focus due to the very situation at hand concerning the securitization of borders. Through the use of societal security, where society is central rather than the state, the analysis is able to discuss and elaborate on the EU as a collective society. When referring to security and the construction of identity in relation to borders, the framework of securitization becomes relevant. It is a framework aiming to explain how an issue (migration) becomes (de)securitized through the understanding that security is all about survival and thus security need to be articulated in terms of a threat, and more particularly in terms of an existential threat (Emmers, 2013:132). When analyzing the process of securitization this thesis need to identify the referent object, in this case the EU (identity), along with the securitizing actor, here, the EU political elite. Thus, this section aim to show the connection between society and identity, explain the securitization process, and illustrate how this theoretical perspective explains that without identity there cannot be a collective.

Previously, identity is explained in terms of its relation towards security and how a collective can facilitate that sense of stability. It is seen in political terms since the securitization of migration is too conducted on the political level (Huysmans, 2006:63). Moreover, "*societal security refers to security situations in which social developments, in this case migration, threaten identity of people, rather than the state as a sovereign organization*" (Huysmans, 2006:64). This suggests that when articulating migration as a security concern it also can become an identity threat to the people. However, even though the ontological security perspective put emphasis on the other and how the other becomes an existential threat, the perspective of societal security recognizes that this does not have to be the case. Instead, immigration can become a threat by articulating it in terms of other policy developments (ibid).

This theoretical perspective of societal security expands on the shared perception of the collective. Here, emphasis is put on the connection between society and identity and on how

society is about "*the self-conception of collectivities and individuals identifying themselves as members of that collectivity* "(Roe, 2013:178). In other words, if members of the EU do not recognize themselves as such, the EU identity can also be seen as a mere utopian understanding of the EU project that the project itself does not psychologically support. However, the understanding of identity from the perspective of societal security supports this thesis through the understandings of identity and solidarity. Thus this thesis has more of a post-structural approach.

Turning to the securitization process, it can be recognized in two steps. The first step is about description of the threat that the referent object is about to face and the second step is about when the actor has convinced the public the (potential and existential) threat is real and the public in turn, by its believe it is true, given their approval for extraordinary measures to be taken (ghettoization)(Emmers, 2013:132-133). When an issue is framed in terms of security through securitization the issue itself becomes securitized (ibid). Moreover, the securitization perspective recognize speech act as the method in order to convince the public. In other words, it is done through "*a discursive representation of a certain issue as an existential threat to security*" (Emmers, 2013:134). Emphasis placed on in the articulation and use of language within a (political) public arena. This is in line with the constructivist approach in the Copenhagen school where security is seen as something socially constructed. In order for this threat to become real, the audience needs to have a shared understanding of what security is (ibid:135). Thus, the discourse itself needs to be articulated in line with that understanding and accordingly convince the audience that a particular issue is a threat to the referent object. "*The adaption and implementation of extraordinary measures involve the identification and classification of some issues as the enemy that needs to be tackled urgently*" (Emmers, 2013:135). This suggests, by moving migration into the security discourse within EU policy, the enemy is being presented in terms refugees.

The securitization approach argues that the process of securitization can "*consist of both discursive (speech act) and non-discursive (policy implementation) dimensions*" (Emmers, 2013:135). As such, the perspective of societal security recognizes how language can take part in discursive representations but does not place emphasis on constructions within policy. However, when the policies become securitized the policies can in turn lead to discursive effects as seen below in the analysis. What is understood though is the fact that this process can lead to a backlash in relation to civil liberties (ibid:316), which in this case can be seen as the backlash against the policy regarding free movement of goods and people; a backlash against the European project.

Societal security is connected to national identity with focus on collectivities. From this perspective it is understood that "*if a state loses its identity, it will not survive as a state*" (Roe, 2013:177), which support this thesis' understanding that without a common European identity; the EU project will not survive as a community. This is further connected to the self-perception of this community; whether or not one perceive the *self* as a member within the collectivity. In sum, the perspective of societal security facilitates the thesis with a theoretical support for the EU to be regarded as a collective community. The refugee crisis is related to the securitization of migration, and as explained, when something becomes securitized it also becomes a threat. In turn, the process of securitizing migration can be explained in two steps; 1) when the issue (migration) is described as a threat, 2) when the public become convinced that the represented issue is in 'fact' that, and thus also a threat to the community. Lastly, the process of securitization also is understood as affecting the perception of reality.

6. Analysis

As stated above my aim is to deconstruct the EAS and the EAM as well as analyze discursive constructions of subjectivities found in the agendas along with its potential effect the European collective identity. More particularly, this thesis aims to answer the research question stated in the introduction: *How can the discursive notion of a collective European identity be understood in relation to EU border policy and what are the potential implications and effects upon the European collective identity based on articulations found within the EAS and the EAM?* This is grounded in the contextual background of previous agendas; the connection between solidarity, cohesion and a collective identity recognized in previous research. Furthermore, the analysis is based upon the poststructuralist recognition of language and the link between policy and identity; the theoretical tools and concepts given by ontological security and societal security; as well as the contribution of Bacchis' writings about deconstructing policy.

The analysis is not an endeavor to summarize and evaluate the policies but to critically engage with the represented problem implicitly articulated within the EAS and the EAM. This is done through the notion of policy-as-discourse and where discourse is seen as a practice, a practice that is contingent and constitutive. It is about the meaning-creating process implicitly found within policy. When continuing it is important to keep in mind that, in accordance with policy deconstruction, the method produced by Bacchi, the agendas are seen as meaning-creators rather than problem-solvers. The analysis departs from the first question posed by Bacchi, what is the problem represented to be? The upcoming sections are divided based upon the six main questions given by Bacchi as was presented in the method section above (chapter 4.2). Through the poststructuralist approach, how subjectivities are established within policies is central (Bacchi, 2008:265). The first three questions in the analysis are concerned with the implicit represented problem along with its underpinnings and historical lineage. The last three focuses on what is left out or silenced (Bacchi, 2009:12). The subheadings are thematically divided in accordance with the deconstructing process followed by the question. This is done to indicate the potential within the EAS and the EAM to fragment the European collective identity; a fragmentation that potentially takes place within the agendas through the system of meaning.

6.1 The dangerous other and lack of solidarity

- *What's the 'problem' represented to be in the European Agenda on Migration and the European Agenda on Security as new policies within border management?*

This section is about clarifying the implicit representation(s) found in policy (Bacchi, 2012:21), in this case, within the EAS and the EAM, which is further explained and analyzed in the upcoming sections. As mentioned before, both agendas refer to security and borders and does so in connection to the so called refugee crisis. In other words, borders and migrations are both part in a process of securitization. However, two interconnected issues are recognized within the agendas; the hegemonic issue, which is implicitly represented within border management, is related to the concern of the *dangerous other*. This is done through the process of securitization of migration and securitization of borders whereas a distinction between *us* and *them* becomes vital. Through the use of fear, it further also indicates where and within whom the threat is situated. This represented issue is accompanied by the concern regarding lack of cooperation and solidarity as the means needed in order to address the fear of the dangerous other. The policies' way of dealing with the second issue is through incentives and recognition.

Securitization of migration, as seen through the connection between security and the social development of migration, is discussed in terms of the threatening *outside* a long cross-border crimes and terrorism. Thus, migration is implied as a threat to the collective, hence the need to securitize it. Both agendas argue for the need of more security, indicating that the EU lacks security as it is also emphasized that it has to become our "*main external priority*" (EAS, 2015). The fear of the other can be seen in the explicit amalgamation between security and migration, whereas migration is put within the security discourse. The EAS explicitly state that the agenda "*has to be seen in conjunction with the forthcoming European Agenda on Migration*" (2015:4). In turn, the EAM also refer to security measures explained within the EAS. Both agendas therefore emphasize the connection between the two; hence implicitly strengthen the connection between migration and security. In this process the question of who the *other* is becomes involved. Migrants are, in both agendas mostly referred to in general terms. However, within the EAM it is stated that most of them come from regions in Africa, Asia and Eastern Europe (2015:9). Thus, the agenda puts a face on the *other*, the *other* who is a security concern to the EU. The process of othering is also seen when pointing at the issue of smugglers (as criminals); smugglers who "*are not based in Europe*" (EAM, 2015:8. Emphasis added). In other words, it is emphasized that those who take advantage of migrants

also belong to the *other*. The differentiation between the good *us* and evil *them* becomes thus less questionable; a differentiation between the *in-group* and the *out-group* is thus implied.

The fear of the *other* as the underlying issue is not only expressed in terms of the *other* but also in regard to what is outside our borders. In other words, our borders need to be securitized. This is clear when the EAM talks about the possible threat from all directions toward the external borders (2015:3) and where the 'root' of the problem is situated outside (EAM, 2015:7, EAS, 2015:4). The 'root' of the problem leading to extremism and terror is in need of attention and preventive measures are needed according to the agendas. However, it is also put within the realm of the foreign; thus, the issue resides within *other* and to the outside. Within the EAS the main European security priorities are presented in terms of crimes connected to terrorism and cross-border activities (2015:12-13). The instability is also said to originate from "*EU's immediate neighborhood and changing forms of radicalization, violence and terrorism*" (EAS, 2015:2); thus, again, put fear towards the outside of the European border. Moreover, the entire security agenda put emphasis on borders and the need to support and strengthen them. As such, the divergence between the *self* and the *other* supports the understanding that the threat resides within the *other*.

In connection to fear of the *other* is the implicit issue of lack of cooperation and solidarity; something that Europe is in need of in times of crisis which is not only understood by scholars such as Kohl (2009) but also stated within the EAM (2015:3). In the beginning of the EAS, President Jean-Claude Juncker stated that "*combating cross-border crime and terrorism is a common European responsibility*" (2015:2), thus show on the connection between border management and security as well as recognizing the scope of the issue as a shared concern. However, as becomes obvious in the EAM, only a few Member States have contributed in the process of dealing with the migration crisis, while others have done nothing to help (2015:4). Meaning, only a few have shown solidarity. The European Security Agenda from 2010, presented in the background, explicitly made clear that Europe guarantees solidarity, which as understood by the EAS and the EAM is not the case today. The current agendas presents solidarity as lacking but highly needed and thus also put focus on how it needs to be enforced.

The issue of lack of solidarity is further shown through the understanding that there were only "*five Member States* [who] *dealt with 72% of asylum applications EU-wide*" (EAM, 2015:13). However, "*the scheme will take into account of the efforts already made on a voluntary basis by Member States*" (EAM, 2015:4). In other words, the ones who have shown solidarity will also be recognized for doing so. This is explicitly shown to be one of the main elements upon how the relocation scheme of 'displaced persons' is based, "*as it reflects the*

efforts made by Member States in the recent past" (EAM, 2015: 19). Thus, based on this incentive introduced by the policies, it becomes obvious that those who have contributed to increased cooperation and solidarity will be rewarded for doing so, and enforced amongst those who have not.

As stated, security issues originates, according to the policies, from the *outside* hence the process of securitization of migration and borders. This is also why the EAS argues for the need to increase cooperation with third countries (EAS, 2015:4), emphasizing that all existing security concerns are linked to the issue of the *dangerous other*. These processes thus take part in the discursive separation between *us* and *them*. The issue of lack of cooperation and solidarity is in turn emphasized based on the fear created from the hegemonic issue with the *other*.

6.2 Discursive creation of fear and forced solidarity

- *What presuppositions or assumptions underpin the representation of the dangerous other and lack of solidarity?*

The second question focuses on what is, in the EAS and the EAM, explicitly and implicitly stated in support of the representations of the *dangerous other* and lack of solidarity and thus strengthens them. The first and second questions are closely interlinked, but with focus on underpinnings and assumptions articulated within the agendas, binaries, key concepts and categories become essential. In short, the *dangerous other* is strengthened by fear of the *other*. This is shown through the process of deconstruction where in this question, focus is placed on the implicit binaries created between *us* and *them*, *inside* and *outside*, key concepts, such as terrorism and other cross-border crimes, as well as the categorization of the EU as the European protector. All which can be argued are connected to the relational aspect of identity and the construction of subjectivities. Secondly, focus is turned to the theme of forced solidarity. As shown below, institutions as well as future policies and systems are set up, or will be set up, in order to further strengthen our borders. This is done through forced cooperation and solidarity in order to also tackle the fear of the *other*.

The differentiation between the *inside* and *outside* can shortly be explained through the understanding that threat resides externally, and in order to create internal security, solidarity and cooperation is a must (Bauman, 2001). As such, based on the understanding that identity is relational a differentiation between *us* and *them*, between *inside* and *outside*, is needed in order to restore feeling of security. The sense of ontological insecurity operates within the

realm of fear. It is about the feeling of existential anxiety and the use of identity to reduce it (Kinnvall, 2004; 2006; 2014). By situating the sense of fear within discourse of migration and security thus has the potential to affect the search for a stable identity. In order to affect the process, the need to differentiate between the *self* and the *other* becomes useful, hence the need to focus on binaries. The psychological importance of borders and stronger borders becomes vital for a clear distinction between the *in-* and the *out-group* to exist. Within the EAS the importance of a Europe '*without internal frontiers*' (2015:2) is emphasized while at the same time highlight the need to support Member States closest to the external border and strengthen them. This indicates the need for a clearer distinction between the *inside* and *outside*. When borders are threatened, in this case by the '*migratory pressure*', security is utilized to regain confidence. This becomes clear through the articulations concerning terrorists, and what can be explained in terms of a repressive and externalization way of dealing with issues from within (Kinnvall, 2006:56).

The perpetrators of the recent attacks in both Brussels and Paris were born and/or raised in either France or Belgium. They were terrorist fighters, or as stated in the EAS, they are/were foreign terrorist fighters (2015); pushing for the issue to reside within strangers, the *other*. This is based on the definition of a foreigner which is explained as "*a person not native to or naturalized in the country or jurisdiction under consideration; alien* [,..] *a person from outside one's community*" (Dictionary, 2016. Emphasis added). The EAS thus, take part in discursively constructing subjectivity and what subjectivities are available within the identity discourse. Knowledge that the threat can come from the *inside* is problematic in terms of security, thus in order to provide security and secure a collective identity the threat from within is here situated inside the *other*. This can further be explained by the understanding that policies need to secure the collective *self*. In order to secure the collective identity, the terrorist must therefore be seen as a foreigner; someone belonging to the *out-group*. This can be recognized as both a form of repression and a process of externalization since the EU does not acknowledge the inner fragmentation and instead put all the blame upon the *other* (Kinnvall, 2006:51).

Moreover, the categorization of the EU as the European protector is seen in both the EAS and the EAM. If a protector is needed, there is also something that creates that need of protection; again a relational differentiation. This is about the protection of borders as well as more altruistic arguments in concern to migrants. The EAM put emphasis on those Member States that are in the '*frontline*' and in need of support to deal with migration (2015:5). Also the work done by FRONTEX is done so in order to protect migrants but also *our* borders. The

EU has, according to the EAM, also a duty to protect those who are *outside* (EAM, 2015:5), thus even though the EU recognize itself as the protector it does so through the differentiation of the *inside* and *outside*. Moreover, the securitization of borders is explained through the altruistic argument that it is about the safety for the migrants (EAM, 2015:6). This is summarized in the EAM with the subheading "*Border management – saving lives and securing external borders*" (2015:11). This is indicating that strengthen borders is about protecting *us*. However, it is not only is it about the protecting *us*, but also about saving *them* from *them* since smugglers is a part of them (EAM, 2015:8-9) and so are irregular migrants[4] who '*contributes'* to stigmatization as implied in the EAM.

In terms of lack of solidarity, as mentioned above, this thesis has recognized the theme of forced solidarity within the agendas. Solidarity as something not only asked for, but demanded, which supports the notion of the need of solidarity to reach a stable and secure collective (Stråth, 2000; Bauman, 2001). Solidarity and cooperation are articulated in terms of '*demand'*, '*need to show'*, '*permanent system'*, and '*mandatory relocation'*. All of these articulations indicate the lack of solidarity and the goal of creating a system that enforces it, thus also underpins the represented issue of its deficiency. In order for the system to work, or for the EU to ensure solidarity, systems are supposed to be set up in order to monitor this, such as the European External Action Service in cooperation with the Commission (EAS, 2015:16). According to the agendas, this is a way to foster and develop mutual trust (EAM, 2015:17; EAS, 2015:3). Due to lack of solidarity, forced solidarity is now needed in order to ensure internal security, and through that also ensure solidarity.

The underpinnings of the represented issues of the *dangerous other* and lack of cooperation and solidarity, found within the EAS and the EAM, is connected to fear of the *other* and forced solidarity. The relational part of identity construction and the need to differentiate between *us* and *them* is explicitly seen within the focus on actual borders, as well as implicitly seen within the emotional border, borders within subjectification, created through strategies of repression and externalization. The enforcement of solidarity not only underpins the issue of the lack of it, but also implies its importance.

---

[4] "Irregular immigrants are third-country nationals who do not fulfil, or no longer fulfil, the conditions of entry as set out in Article 5 of the Schengen Borders Code or other conditions for entry, stay or residence in that Member State" (European Parliament, 2015)

6.3 The past, the present and the future

- *How has the representation of the dangerous other and lack of solidarity come about?*

The third question within deconstruction refers to the historical linage and how the issues are built up and on discourses that contributes to these representations. Also, this relates to the previous agendas presented in the background (chapter 3). The general idea is to analyze decisions and developments that have affected the problem of the *dangerous other* and lack of solidarity. In order to do so, this thesis has chosen a more theoretical understanding of the present and its connection to the past and future. Focus here is put on articulations of frontline, defense and safe haven; concepts related to conflict and terrorist discourses. Moreover, this section sheds light on future rationale based on the present situation with migration.

In support of the *dangerous other* is the usage of discourses connected to war and conflict and done so in relation to migration and security. The concept of frontline is repeatedly articulated in relation to migration and the need to support those Member States situated on the frontline due to the '*migratory pressure'* (EAM, 2015). Thus, the use of frontline also implies that *we* are in conflict with the *outside*. Migrants are indirectly said to be the enemy in the battlefield since they are the ones who put pressure on the external borders, our frontline. Those Member States that are in the frontline are encouraged to also make use of the tools produced by the EU (EAM, 2015:6), in line with the understanding of EU as the protector, and here, also as the provider of mechanisms needed in the conflict. Besides the emphasis put on the EUs' ability to facilitate the Member States with what is needed in this conflict, the use of frontline can be regarded as an emotional element in order to securitize subjectivity, which in turn justifies the differentiation between *us* and *them* (Kinnvall, 2004:750-754).

Moreover, the concept of 'defense' is also articulated in terms of the Common Security and Defence Policy within the EAM, whereas the policy is said to be needed in order to address 'root' security issues, which above is said to be in the realm of migration. The EAM also states that "*migration will become a specific component of ongoing Common Security and Defence Policy*" (2015:5), again placing the *other* within the security discourses, making migration something to fear and something we need to defend ourselves against. Consequently, the use of defense is in support of a strengthened frontline. As the category of a protector implies we are in need of protection as seen above, the concept of defense implies *we* are under attack. Again, all connected to the discourse of war which in turn also can be seen as originates from past trauma of disturbance. With that in mind, the agenda put

emphasis on the fact that Europe should continue to be a safe haven. Moreover, this safe haven is said to be for those fleeing persecution but also a "*destination for the talent and entrepreneurship of students, researchers and workers*" (2015:2), where the second category of people, who are not in need of home but can contribute, are more than welcome.

The EAS are in terms of security, as seen above (chapter 6.2), referring to the terrorist attacks in Brussels, Paris and Copenhagen (2015:12). This serves two purposes in terms of the past and the future. First of all, it serves as a way of linking together the Member States through a shared trauma, recognized as comforting when experiences ontological insecurity (Kinnvall, 2006:57). Secondly, it serves also as an indicator of what to come if the threat is not securitized as well as it serves as an emotional reminder of the threat, a threat who resides in the *dangerous other*. This is what this thesis refer to as future rationale. When articulating terrorists in terms of foreigners, even though said to be EU citizens, it puts limitations within subjectivity. Thus, the EAM discursively take part in constructing subject availability, or what can be explained as the "*emotional dimension of securitized subjectivity*" (Kinnvall, 2006:50).

Both agendas present several measures taken in order to increase internal security. These are also presented as measures to "*use for future crises as well when our external borders comes under pressure*" (EAM, 2015:3); pressure from *outside* and the *other*. This indicates that the fear does not only reside within the ongoing migration crisis but articulates it as a more general outside threat. In the process of applying past traumas as collectively experienced as well as articulating the possible common and future threat can be recognized as a mechanism to produce feelings of security which in turn also strengthen the collective identity. As such, the threat of the other can be seen as future rationale. Whereas migration is the symptom of the 'actual' threat of the *other* today, other issues posed by the *outside* might look different in the future. Thus, migration explicitly is the cause of issues seen today as presented within the agendas. However, implicitly this it is only a symptom of the represented problem of the *dangerous other*; a *dangerous other* that will, in accordance with future rationale, persist.

Moreover, this is followed by the implication that the pressure will escalate by stating that "*the EU should not wait until the pressure is intolerable*" (EAM, 2015:4). As explained above, this too can be seen as a strategy of future reasoning and/or in support of cultural imagination. Meaning, the issue at hand is articulated in a way that increases the feeling of fear, which according to Kinnvall is the product of cultural imagination (2014:320-321). It is stated that "*Member States will need to show solidarity and redouble their efforts to assist those countries on the frontline*" (EAM, 2015:4). The frontline Member States are, according

to the EAM, experiencing pressure and thus in need of a functioning system (2015:13); a system of cooperation and solidarity. The pressure is in the agenda anticipated to rise and become '*intolerable*', as it suggests an '*emergency response*' which includes a '*temporary distribution scheme*' (2015:4). The *other* is thus seen as a security risk, a risk expected to increase, and a risk that requires all Member States to show solidarity and accept those asylum seekers given by the EU.

In sum, fear is used not only to underpin both the need to enforce solidarity and the feeling towards the *dangerous other*, but it is also used for future rationale and a way to unite the collective in order to create a stable identity. The reference to past terrorist attacks legitimates and strengthens the fear of the *other* as well as it is used for future reasoning and cultural imaginaries. Through the use of frontline and defense as well as safe haven, the collective is brought together, and based on future rationale; it is brought together as a collective against the *other* and the *outside*.

6.4 Discursive limitations within subjectivity

- *What is left unproblematic in this problem representation? Where are the silences? Can the 'problem' be thought about differently?*

This section is concerned with what is ignored and left out which is also a part in setting the boundaries within discourse and subjectivities. In other words, what can be recognized as limitations within the represented issue of the *dangerous other* and lack of solidarity? Thus, this thesis put focus on power and discursive limitations within subjectivities, and more particularly on the process of externalization with the neglected issue of marginalization through epistemological focus on the *other* as the threat. In connection to this is also the process of institutionalization of solidarity.

Subjects and subjectivities are (re)established within policy and thus the WPR approach is concerned with the underlying assumptions found in policy (Bacchi, 2009:277). As seen above, subjects of the *dangerous other* and the EU as the European protector are both found within the EAS and the EAM; policies which are new and have the possibility to affect future subjectivities. However, the poststructuralist approach within this deconstructive method is based on the understanding that policies do not create subjectivities, yet they do have the possibility to induce them (Bacchi, 2009:42), hence the necessity to also take into account what is unsaid. Through the ability to affect how one feel about the *self* and the *other*, what is not said plays a part. This is where attention is turned to what was mentioned above, the strategy of repression and externalization as a process of epistemological certainty. It refers to

the process of securitization of subjectivity; it is about reducing the feeling of uncertainty about who to be afraid of by framing the *other* as the threat (Huysmans, 2006:53).

The 'who' behind these terrorist fighters is indicated within the EAS since it is stated that they are foreign terrorist fighters, excluding *them* from *us*. Furthermore the 'who' is also connected to Syria, Iraq and Libya, the countries to where these fighters are travelling to (2014:12). By doing this, the agendas also avoid the uncertainty within the epistemological question about 'who' to fear, as a way to increase the sense of unity (Hysmans, 2006:52-53). As such, the epistemological uncertainty is focused on the potential threat within the *other*, as fear can be built upon the notion of an *actual* or *potential* enemy (Sheehan, 2005:93). Migration can thus be categorized as the potential threat. As seen above, the creation of fear underpins the assumption of the *dangerous other* which in turn also provides an epistemological answer to who to fear. Besides reaffirming the emotional sense of fear towards the *other* based on the potential threat*,* the articulations can also be seen as constraints in subjectivity (Gill, 2012:92); a constraint in the availability within identity construction. By claiming *other* and articulate *them* as a threat, the policies also implicitly say who not to fear. However there are also different degrees of otherness. In relation to foreign terrorist fighters, the EU is working together with the Unites States, Canada and Australia to capture these fighters (EAS, 2015:7); referred to as third countries. Consequently, it situates those three nations within the realm of good and less foreign.

As seen above, strategies of externalization can be recognized as a way to reduce unwanted characteristics within the *self* upon the *other* (Kinnvall, 2006:54). However, the process of externalization is left unproblematic. Instead of the EU taking responsibility for those EU-citizens who became terrorist fighters as well as the problem with stigmatization, focus is on externalizing those issues and placing them upon the *other*. This can be explained through the writings of Hysmans (2006:51-52) who argues that due to the difficulty to clarify the European identity, focus is turned to the *other* and action taken toward the *other*. This is seen in agendas in terms of fingerprinting migrants and the need to secure European borders. In turn, this can be recognized as an exercise of power, since the established EU is in need of an established outsider. Through exercise of power, the strategy of externalization can take part in securitizing subjectivity and thus limit the ability to deal with the issues within the collective such as the recruitment of new terrorists and the issue of stigmatization. Both reflected upon in terms of the *other* and the *outside*. The understanding expressed in concern to stigmatization is seen in the statement that "*unsuccessful asylum claimants who try to avoid return, visa overstayers, and migrants living in a permanent state of irregularity <u>constitute a</u>*

serious problem. This corrodes confidence in the system. <u>It offers strong arguments</u> for those looking <u>to criticise or stigmatise migration</u>" (EAM, 2015:7. Emphasis added). This ignores the responsibility from *us*, the *self*, and instead places the issue within migration. Again, putting unwanted characteristics found in the *in-group* within the *out-group*.

With the goal of creating a community with unity and solidarity, and where the collective identity is needed in order for the community to persist, attention is placed on the *other* and the ability for the collective to unite through the *other*. Diversity within the collective is silenced and instead of recognizing the issues within, they are externalized and placed upon the *other*, discursively taking part in the construction of the *dangerous other*. However, the issue of unity and lack of unity as seen in the introduction where Jean-Claude Juncker, the President of the European Commission, explicitly suggested that the EU is in need of more unity, thus the issue of marginalization is important. Here Julia Kristeva argues it is imperative to "*recognize the foreigner within ourselves*" (Kinnvall, 2006:52). In turn marginalization will decrease and so will the limitations within subjectivity. However, both agendas are within the realm of securitization of migration and where the *dangerous other* is the implicit represented issue, and thus also the answer to the epistemological uncertainty of who to fear. The categorization of the altruistic EU as the noble protector, also fails to take responsibility for those EU-citizens who are recruited by terrorists. Thus, as a consequence of the externalization strategy, this ignores the possibility that the threat can reside within the *self*.

Solidarity is, as mentioned, dependent upon the feeling of security and issues dealt with within border management. By creating a safe community, solidarity becomes possible. However, as recognized through the deconstructing process of the EAS and the EAM, solidarity is enforced and in turn, EU the protector will provide security. Not the other way around. What fails to be recognized is the problem with institutionalization of solidarity. As argued by Hysmans, a political created structure is not the solution to produce trust. As such, forcing solidarity upon Member States does not secure a sense of trust. Solidarity, in the sense of unity and mutual trust, is not a feeling that can be pushed upon the Member States. This along with the epistemological certainty about who to fear, (which at the same time answers who not to fear), indicate a discursive use of power in constructing subjectivities. Lastly, theoretically, the externalization process and the institutionalization of solidarity can be argued as standing in the way for a more united and less limited subjectification construction.

6.5 Power of induced ontological fear

- *What effects are produced by the representation of the dangerous other and lack of solidarity?*

The effects created by the EAS and the EAM and its constructing nature can be theoretically discussed from the perspective of ontological security and securitization. Thus this section is about highlighting the potential effects discursively created by the agendas with the understanding that they are operating within an existing identity construction. Policies do not create subjectivities, but they are politically induced (Bacchi, 2009:42), thus potential effects need to be discussed. Based upon Bacchis' writings, focus is more particularly put on three interrelated different types of effects; discursive effects, as discursive limitations affecting social life; subjectification effects through its establishment in discourse, and lastly, lived effects (Bacchi, 2009:15). Potential effects on the basis of the agendas refer to the effect of increased ontological insecurity, paradoxical effects and relational power structures, discursive problematization of stigmatization, and the possible increase in border controls and border management.

Based on the understanding that effects produced by representations of certain issues affect different groups differently (Bacchi, 2009:15), theoretical tools are needed in order to map out potential implications. By doing this, existing power relations also becomes apparent. Thus, emphasis is put on the ways these represented problems affects not only people but also their relations (Gill, 2012:79). The discursive effects are based on what is mentioned in previous questions where actions are taken in accordance with the *dangerous other*. Emotional effects gained from the *dangerous other* is the feeling of insecurity; a feeling which in turn has a potential to effect identity and identity construction, based upon the connection between identity and security. By framing the agendas in terms of a threat, one can expect an increase in ontological insecurity. This is supported by politics of fear, which by setting up mechanisms, such as taking fingerprints and register migrants, as suggested in the EAM, can be recognized as an implicit way of focusing on the *dangerous other* (Hysmans, 2006:52). Addressing the threat of the *other* can be seen as a discursive reproduction of a collective; a way to support a collective (van Troost et. al 2013, cited in Kinnvall, 2014:321). This can be seen as collaboration between induced fear and discursive structures of insecurity through the process of securitization.

Related to the sense of ontological insecurity, as seen above, is the emotional dimension of fear. Referring to migration in connection to the *dangerous other* can be seen as induced

ontological insecurity, which put emphasis on relational power structures. Thus, the discussion is turned to effects produced by politics of fear, or as this thesis frames it, in terms of power of induced ontological fear. This is an emotion that effects juxtapositions of identities and securitization of subjectivities (Kinnvall, 2004). Through the implied reinforcement of power structures, subjectivities are also affected accordingly. This is in line with the understanding that policies and its problem representations include possibilities and/or limitations within subjectivities (Bacchi, 2009:16-17). In other words, groups are affected differently depending on where they are situated within discourse. When migrants are situated as the *dangerous other* and troublemakers, it limits the way they feel and see themselves due to the constructed subjectivities available, and thus the system can be seen as a reinforcement of fragmentations within the collective.

The differentiation between the European self and the *dangerous other* has the potential to reinforce relational power structures. However, with two issues represented within the EAS and the EAM, the power relations found in the agendas include paradoxical effects. In line with the understanding that policies and its problem representations include possibilities and/or limitations within subjectivities (Bacchi, 2009:16-17), the representation of issues seem to induce limits not only on the *other* but also upon the European collective *self*. The securitization process of migration and borders indicate that the *other* is subordinated to the EU, which in itself can be a discursive way to unite the collective. However, with the represented issue of lack of solidarity, paradoxically, also puts limits within the European *self* since it indicates lack of trust. When an issue is recognized within policy, attention can be placed on who is responsible for the issue represented (Bacchi, 2009:18). In this case, it is indicated that the ones who are responsible for this issue of lack of solidarity are the Member States. However, this is a paradoxical situation since the aim is to create unity, which the represented issue of lack of solidarity hampers. When the problematization of lack of solidarity indicates an uneven relationship between Member States it puts pressure on the collective. As such, the potential effect can be seen as a fragmentation in the collective since it increases insecurity, and as recognized by Kinnvall, nationalism has the potential to step in as a security provider (2004:757-758).

Another paradoxical situation, in relation to lack of solidarity, occurs when dissimilarities within the collective, the *in-group*, are implied. The subjectivities available are affected by social psychology and as recognized by Bauman, it is about creating a stable and secure *in-group*. In order for this group to become secure it needs to acknowledge similarities amongst the ones within the same group (Bauman, 2001; Kinnvall, 2004). As seen throughout the

deconstruction, this is something the agendas are aiming for; a cohesive *in-group*, based on solidarity and trust. However, what they implicitly are claiming is the lack of all of these components. The *in-group* lack solidarity and trust, based on the need to set up monitoring mechanisms to keep track of who is doing what; they need to enforce solidarity since not all Member States are doing their part. Thus, if similarities are needed in order to strengthen the *in-group*, dissimilarities can be expected to do the opposite.

It is recognized, through the lens of societal security, that it is possible that the securitization process can end up with a societal backlash (Emmers, 2013:316), which can be said about the resurrected borders we see in Europe today as a result of the '*migratory pressure'*. Thus, the lived effects are made possible through positioning of subjectivities within border management, which in turn opens up the possibility for a potential backlash for the European project and its collective identity. Thus through this, the process of induced fear is also connected to borders. By framing policies in terms of insecurity, policies also contributes to fear which in turn has been recognized for having an actual effect upon border management. Moreover, this is related to future rationale, as mentioned above, which has been recognized as a strategy used to legitimize border action (Kinnvall, 2014:320). Which in turn, also can be said about the use of migration discourse is connected to concept of war and conflict. Effects upon political action are seen through the process of securitization. When an issue such as migration is accepted as a threat by the collective more substantial political action is also legitimized (Kinnvall, 2014:322).

Moreover, articulations also reveal what is and what is not available in discourse in terms of identity and subjectifications (Bacchi, 2009:17). As explained by Elias and Scotson, subjectivities are determined by the power of the established (1965). The (re)negotiation within identity discourse is contingent, but the ability to actually renegotiate is still limited. This limitation is set within the EAS and the EAM. Categorization of subjectivities and juxtapositions are in the light of this question guidelines for the negotiation of subjectivities; contributing to the difficulty to actually change the identity of the *self* which is argued as possible by scholars within political psychology.

As seen above, induced ontological fear has effects on all three levels. The effects are interconnected and to some extent paradoxical in terms of the aim of a collective European identity. Induced ontological insecurity has effects upon subjects and subjectivities, both in terms of limits and possibilities. However, the represented issue of lack of solidarity also limits the European collective identity, as it put emphasis on the dissimilarities within the collective. Also, the issue with resurrected borders can be explained as a societal backlash as

an effect of securitization. Thus, if securitization continuous the potential for further societal implications increases.

6.6Backlash and legitimization

- *How/where has this representation of the dangerous other and lack of solidarity been produced, disseminated and defended? How has it been (or could it be) questioned, disrupted and replaced?*

This question was not part of Bacchis' early writings but has been added later on (Bacchi, 2012; Bacchi, 2009). It contributes to a better understanding of the challenge posed within the represented issue of the *dangerous other* and lack of solidarity, or as Bacchi puts it, it encourage "*a sharpened awareness of the contestation surrounding representation of the 'problem'*" (Bacchi, 2012:22). Thus this thesis recognizes this question as a way to intersect all of the arguments above and recognize the potential fraction(s). This is based upon recognized tensions and contradictions within the EAS and the EAM which in turn might indicate a possible challenge for the European project, where the aim is to unite and create a secure and stable community.

Based on the understanding of the European project and the theoretical explanations, the European project is dependent upon several features. If one imagines the European community in the middle, it is surrounded by layers of different features, all needed in order for the community to persist. Closest to the community is the sense of belonging, a collective identity; a feature required for the community, explained through societal security, to survive (see chapter 5.2). Positioned outside the identity is the feature of social cohesion and solidarity (see chapter 2), both just as vital for a collective identity as identity is for the community. Lastly, the glue that keeps the feature of solidarity intact is the sense of safety. In other words, the focus on insecurity and the European ability to provide ontological security is in itself a survival instinct; a way to keep the community alive. However, by analyzing the system of meaning within the different layers, a potential risk of a weakened collective European identity can be acknowledged.

The represented issues of the *dangerous other* and lack of solidarity, as explained above, are implicitly (re)produced within the agendas. The *dangerous other* is supported by politics of fear and insecurity which in turn are maintained by juxtapositions and distinctions within subjectivities. The representation of the *dangerous other* can be recognized as philosophically defended by ontological induced fear as well as an answer used to reduce the epistemological

uncertainty of 'who' to fear. As such, it increases insecurity and implicitly also indicates 'who' not to fear. Moreover, the use of future rationale further defends the problematization of the *other* as the threat. In turn, the representation if the *dangerous other* can be questioned since it is not articulated in line with the aim of the European project where focus is placed on the ability to unite and secure. The policy, when analyzed as a meaning-creator, is through its narratives on the *dangerous other* causing disruptions within subjectivities. As explained, this could be a way to unite the collective. However, it does so without providing security at the same time as it risks making the potential threat and actual one through its constructing limitations within and for the *other*.

Turning to the represented issue of lack of solidarity which is supported by the belief that solidarity "*will need to be maintained for as long as the migratory pressure persists*" (EAM, 2015:3). Thus, it is described as a defense mechanism rather than an emotion building on cohesion and unity. As such, the issue of lack of solidarity can also be recognized as defended in terms of the '*migratory pressure*'. Moreover, '*migratory pressure*' can be recognized as an event that made the issue of lack of solidarity apparent, or at least as the mechanism which made sure solidarity was/is even needed. The normalization of solidarity, where blame and shame becomes a part of the way it is presented, also takes part in defending the representation of the issue. As First Vice-President Frans Timmermans said in relation to the EAS in April this year, "*Law enforcement authorities in all our Member States should both 'think European' and 'act European', as internal security is a shared responsibility*" (Timmermans, 2016), making solidarity unquestionable and conclusive for the European collective. However, just as the issue of the *dangerous other*, the representation of lack of solidarity can be questioned since it also causes disruption in the path of reaching a stable and secure collective. It indicates dissimilarities which been argued has the potential to weaken the collective and where the institutionalization of the concept solidarity are set up in order to create trust, theoretically lacks support.

The elements of fear are recognized as support of the discursively articulated binary between *us* and *them*, between the '*true*' European identity and the *dangerous other*. The constraints within subjectivity makes it possible for issues within Europe to be explained by blaming the *other*, but it also facilitates the *other* with no other choice then to adapt to the subjectivities made available within discourse. The externalization process is, as explained, a strategy in support of the *dangerous other*. Since it is acknowledged that the EU identity is hard to clarify (Hysmans, 2006), attention is put on clarifying the *other* as a means to unite the self. However, as also expressed above, if the *self* would recognize the *other* within,

limitations of subjectivity would decrease along with marginalization. The discussion then perhaps needs to open up for a more divers European identity where faults are realized and security could rise. This is linked to the process of securitization of migration and the potential risk followed by this process. The threat can be either real or perceived (Sheehan, 2005:53), actual or potential (ibid:93). Thus, by framing the *other* as dangerous, making a clear distinction between *us* and *them*, and externalizing unwanted characteristics upon the *other*, limitations within subjectivities also has the potential to push the perceived to become real, to push the potential into an actual threat. With the aim to create a union with more union within the European project, theoretically, the process of externalization as well as securitization needs to be reversed.

In sum, this last question aimed to increase the knowledge about the (re)constructed subjectivities by focusing on tensions and contradictions found in the EAS and the EAM throughout the process of deconstruction. This was explained by first mapping out the different layers needed for a community, the European collective, to survive. The collective identity, as positioned closest to the community, is recognized as dependent upon cohesion and solidarity, which in turn requires security. Secondly, potential fractions were indicated. The *dangerous other* could be regarded as philosophically defended, a defense building upon fear, fear placed upon the other; causing disruptions in subjectivities. The issue represented in terms of lack of solidarity, which narratively was described as a defense mechanism in the EAM, was in turn defended by migration which through its pressure upon the EU made solidarity a collective requirement.

7. Concluding Discussion

The purpose of this thesis has been to critically engage with policy related to border management, and more particularly with the EAS and the EAM, as those were created during 2015 and thus has the potential to take part in the process to renegotiate identity by inducing subjectivities. The analysis can be read as a linguistic interrogation of discourse, an interrogation visualizing the negotiation of subjects and subjectification. The implicit identity construction, within both agendas, can be explained in terms of discourse availability; both agendas are constructed within the same discursive realm where constraints within discourse decide what is plausible and not. In light of the process of deconstruction, the narratives within policy are understood as producing problems rather than solving them. The represented issues found were the *dangerous other* and lack of solidarity; representations that discursively (re)construct subjects and subjectivities. As such, the EAS and the EAM have the potential to disrupt or strengthen the collective identity.

Both security and solidarity is recognized within the agendas as lacking, where migration, as the symptom of the *dangerous other*, is responsible for the issue of the *dangerous other* and Member States are seen as responsible for lack of solidarity. In order to hamper these issues, the agendas indicate that strategies of alienation, externalization and future rationale are articulated with the aim to secure and unite the collective. However, by discursively negotiate subjectivities, potential effects in terms of limitations and/or possibilities can be recognized within the identity construction. The representation of the *dangerous other* is strengthened by fear of the *other*, through the categorization of the EU, the noble and altruistic protector, as well as by articulations of terrorists and stigmatization, issues placed upon the *other* as the one responsible. Furthermore, the *dangerous other* can be recognized as philosophically supported through induced ontological fear, and by the narratives also portray 'who' to fear, thus avoid epistemological uncertainty. In turn, lack of solidarity, (solidarity which is seen as a defense mechanism needed due to the *dangerous other*,) is an issue which indirectly demonstrates the dissimilarities within the collective, and as such, potentially weakening it.

The aim of this thesis has not been to criticize the work done by the EU in relation to border management, but to critically engage with the agendas and analyze discursive constructions of subjects and subjectivities found within the EAS and the EAM along with its potential to affect the future European collective identity. Based on theoretical assumptions, the narratives within the agendas revealed potential fractions in relation to the aim of the EU,

to unite and secure. Moreover, tensions within subjectivities also revealed contradictions in terms of paradoxical effects. As seen in the analysis, the represented problematization of the *dangerous other* and lack of solidarity implicitly articulated in the agendas, take part in forming the collective; for better or for worse.

This thesis encourages future research upon the connection between policy and identity construction in order to increase the knowledge of its power and as such, also understand the potential possibilities and limitations created through its articulations. Increased knowledge in terms of potential affects would similarly increase the possibility for the EU to, instead of hampering a strengthened collective identity, politically produce policies in accordance to their aim of generating a secure and cohesive community. Through an intertextual analysis, a comparison between the changes in subjectivities over time along with the progression of border control would thus also indicate the power of policy and its narratives concerning subjects and subjectivities.

8. References

Bacchi, Carol L. (2009) *Analysing policy: what's the problem represented to be?* Pearson: French Forest

Bacchi, Carol L. (2008) *Women, Policy and Politics*, Sage Publications: London

Bacchi, Carol L. (2012) *Introducing the 'What's the Problem Represented to be' approach*, in Engaging with Carol Bacchi, Strategic Interventions and Exchanges, edited by Angelique Bletsas and Chris Beasley, University of Adelaide Press: North Terrace

Bauman, Zygmunt (2001) *Community, Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*, Polity Press: Cambridge

Bauman, Zygmunt (2004) *Europe: An Unfinished Adventure*, Polity Press: Cambridge

Chalmers, Alan. (2004) *What is this thing called science?* (3rd ed.). Open University Press: London

Churchill, Winston (1946) *United States of Europe*, the Churchill Center, accessed: 12/03/2016 http://www.winstonchurchill.org/resources/speeches/1946-1963-elder-statesman/2970-united-states-of-europe

Consilium (2003) *A Secure Europe in a Better World, European Security Strategy*, Brussels, 12/12/2003

Consilium (2008) *Providing Security in a Changing World*, Brussels, 10/12/2008

Craw, Laura (2012) *Does the EU Need a Navel? Implicit and Explicit Identification with the European Union*, Journal of Common Market Studies, 50(1): 71-86

CVCE (2013) *Declaration on European Identity*, *Document on The European Identity* published by the Nine Foreign Ministers on 14 December 1973, Copenhagen, 18/12/2013, accessed: 7/4/2016.
http://www.cvce.eu/en/obj/declaration_on_european_identity_copenhagen_14_december_1973-en-02798dc9-9c69-4b7d-b2c9-f03a8db7da32.html

Delanty, Gerard (1995) *Inventing Europe, Idea, Identity, Reality*, Palgrave Macmillan: London

Dictionary (2016) *Foreigner*, accessed: 15/04/2016

EAM (2015) *The European Agenda on Migration,* the European Commission, Brussels, 13/5/2015

EAS (2015) *The European Agenda on Security,* the European Commission, Strasbourg, 28/04/2015

Elias, Norbert & Scotson, L. John (1965) *The established and the outsiders: a sociological enquiry into community problems*. Cass: London

Emmers, Ralf (2013) *Securitization in Contemporary Security Studies*, Oxford University Press: Oxford

EUR-Lex, (2010) *Treaty of Maastricht on European Union,* updated: 15/10/2010, accessed: 10/04/2016 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:xy0026

EUR-Lex (2009) *The Schengen area and cooperation,* updated: 3/08/2009, accessed: 15/04/2016 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=URISERV%3Al33020

European Parliament (2015) *Briefing, Irregular immigration in the EU: Facts and Figures*, updated: 04/2015, accessed: 17/05/2016

http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2015/554202/EPRS_BRI(2015)554202_EN.pdf

European Union (2015) *The Founding Fathers of the EU*, accessed: 12/03/2016 http://europa.eu/about-eu/eu-history/founding-fathers/

Farmer, Ben (2016) *Who is Salah Abdeslam and who were the Paris terrorists? Everything we know about the Isil attackers,* The Telegraph, published: 18/03/2016, accessed: 6/05/2016 http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/france/11996120/Paris-attack-what-we-know-about-the-suspects.html

Giddens, Anthony (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity: self and Society in the late Modern Age*, Polity Press: Cambridge, pp. 187-201

Gill, Zoë (2012) *Located Subjects: The daily lives of policy workers* in Engaging with Carol Bacchi, Strategic Interventions and Exchanges, edited by Angelique Bletsas and Chris Beasley, University of Adelaide Press: North Terrace

Guild, Elspeth (2003) *International terrorism and EU immigration, asylum and borders policy: the unexpected victims of 11 September 2001,* European Foreign Affairs Review, pp. 331-346

Hansen, Lene (2006) *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*, Routlegde: New York

Huysmans, Jef (2000), *The European Union and the securitization of migration*, Journal of common market studies, 38 (5): 751-777

Huysmans, Jef (2006), *The politics of insecurity: fear, migration and asylum in the EU*, Routledge: London

Jackson, Patrick T. (2010) *The conduct of inquiry in international relations: philosophy of science and its implications for the study of world politics*, Routledge: New York

Jørgensen, Marianne W. and Philips, Louise (2002) *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*, Sage Publications: London

Jean-Claude Juncker (2015) *State of the Union*, published: 9/09/2015, accessed: 20/11/2015 http://ec.europa.eu/priorities/soteu/docs/state_of_the_union_2015_en.pdf

Kaina, Viktoria (2009) *EU Governance and European Identity*, Living Rewievs in European Governance, 8(1)

Kinnvall, Catarina (2004) *Globalization and Religious Nationalism: Self, Identity and the search for Ontological Security*, in Political Psychology, 25(5): 741-767

Kinnvall, Catarina (2006) *Globalization and Religious Nationalism in India, The search for ontological security*, Routledge: New York

Kinnvall, Catarina (2014) *Fear, Insecurity and the (Re)Emergence of the Far Right in Europe*, in Nesbitt-Larking, Paul et.al (2014) Introduction: Origins, Developments and Current Trends in The Palgrave Handbook of Global Political Psychology, Palgrave Macmillan: New York

Kinnvall, Catarina and Svensson, Ted (2015) *Governing Borders and Security*, Routledge: New York

Kohl, Martin (2000) *The Battlegrounds for European Identity*, European Studies, 2(2): 113-137

Kronsell, Annika (2006) *Methods for studying silences: gender analysis in institutions of hegemonic masculinity*, in Feminist Methodologies for International Relations by Ackerly B., Stern, M., True, J. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge

Luckmann, Thomas (2008) *On social interaction and the communicative construction of personal identity, knowledge and reality*, Organization Studies 29(2): 277-290

Lucarelli, Sonia, and Manners, Ian (2006) *Values and principles in European Union foreign policy*, Routledge: London

Manners, Ian (2014) *Political Psychology of European Integration in Introduction: Origins, Developments and Current Trends*, The Palgrave Handbook of Global Political Psychology, Palgrave Macmillan: New York

Mitzen, Jennifer (2006) *Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and the Security Dilemma*, European Journal of International Relations, SAGE publications, 12(3): 341–370

Mole, Richard (2007), *Discursive Constructions of Identity In European Politics*. [Elektronisk Resurs], n.p.: Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke

Nesbitt-Larking, Paul et.al (2014) *Introduction: Origins, Developments and Current Trends* in The Palgrave Handbook of Global Political Psychology, Palgrave Macmillan: New York

Niethammer, Lutz (2000) *A European Identity?* in Europe and the Other and Europe as the Other, by Stråth, Bo, PIE-Peter Lang: Bruxelles

Oxford dictionaries (2006) *Solidarity,* accessed: 11/03/2016

Potter, Jonathan (1996) *Representing reality: Discourse, rhetoric and social construction,* Sage: Thousand Oaks CA

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987) *Discourse and social psychology; beyond attitudes and behavior*, Sage: London

Roe, Paul (2013) *Societal Security in Contemporary Security studies* by Alan Collins, Oxford University Press: Oxford

Sayer, Andrew (2000) *Realism and social science*, Sage: London

Sedelmeier, Ulrich (2003) *EU Enlargement, Identity and the Analysis of European Foreign Policy, Identity Formation through Policy Practice*, European University Institute

Scott, Joan W., (1988) *Deconstructing Equality-versus-Difference: Or, the Uses of Poststructuralist Theory for Feminism*, Feminist Studies, 14 (1): 32-50

Spivak, Gayatri C. (2016) *Jacques Derrida Of Grammatology,* John Hopskins University Press: Baltimore

Schulz, Martin (2015) *Speech held at a European Council Meeting* in Brussels, in 15/10/2015, accessed: 10/02/2016 http://www.europarl.europa.eu/the-president/en/press/press_release_speeches/speeches/speeches-2015/speeches-2015-october/html/european-council-meeting---speech-by-martin-schulz--president-of-the-european-parliament;jsessionid=5C41FDC4423CF914CC43B41F90C76BD8

Stråth, Bo (2000) *Europe and the Other and Europe as the Other*, PIE-Peter Lang: Bruxelles

Timmerman, Frans (2016) *European Agenda on Security: Paving the way towards a Security Union*, Press Release, European Commission, 20/04/2016, accessed: 10/02/2016 http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-16-1445_en.htm

The Treaty of the European Union (2012) *Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union*, accessed: 10/02/2016 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A12012M%2FTXT

Van Ginneken, J. (1988) *Outline of a Cultural History of Political Psychology*, in Stone W and Shaffner, P. eds. The Psychology of Politics, New York: Springer-Verlag. Cited in Nesbitt-Larking, Paul et.al (2014) Introduction: Origins, Developments and Current Trends in The Palgrave Handbook of Global Political Psychology, Palgrave Macmillan: New York:

Waever, Ole (2002) *Identity, communities and foreign policy: discourse analysis as foreign policy theory* in European Integration and National Identity by Hansen, Lene and Waever, Ole, Routledge: London

White, Hayden (2000) *The Discourse of Europe and the Search for a European Identity*, in Europe and the Other and Europe as the Other, PIE-Peter Lang: Bruxelles