

Men trots att det finns utförliga källhänvisningar och noter som förklarar vilka källtexter som Watts lutar sig mot, så framstår källorna aldrig som problematiska eller svår-tolkade. Det är skickligt, men bedrägligt.

Watts är uppenbart kunnig och visar i notapparaten att han är väl förtrogen med den relevanta forskningen. Han har en talang för dramatik och berättande och hans prosa är lättillgänglig, ibland på gränsen till väl tillspetsad med moderna uttrycksätt vilket kan dölja historiska skillnader. Hade den historiska analysen uppblandats med den samtidspolitiska dimensionen hade det på ett sätt varit mer förstäeligt. Watts, liksom sina antika föregångare, hade drivit en tes för att göra en samtidspolitisk poäng. Men nu stannar det någonstans mittemellan.

“The Republic could have been saved.” Så skriver Watts mot slutet av sin genomgång (s. 281). Män som Tiberius Gracchus, Cicero och Caesar valde att inte rädda republiken och det romerska folket deltog i nedmonteringen genom att rösta på eller låta sig mutas av dessa män. När medborgare tar sin republik för given riskerar den att gå förlorad, skriver Watts och lägger till att det som var sant 133 före vår tideräkning är sant 2018. Watts slutord blir att annars väntar en osäker, mörk och destruktiv framtid. Med sådana enkla poänger lämpar sig *Mortal Republic* utmärkt som källmaterial i den ständigt nödvändiga analysen över Roms inflytande på vår samtid.

Isak Hammar är verksam vid Historiska institutionen, Stockholm universitet.  
E-post: isak.hammar@historia.su.se

**Pettersson, Johanna, 2018. *What's in a Line? Making Sovereignty through Border Policy*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.**

Anmälan av Jussi Laine

‘What’s in a Line? Making Sovereignty through Border Policy’, a doctoral dissertation by Johanna Pettersson, is about borders. It focuses on an outer border of the Schengen Area, where Norway meets Russia in the north. A Local Border Traffic Permit was introduced here in 2012, giving residents in the area on both sides of the border the possibility of visa-free movement across it. Pettersson explains that from a Norwegian perspective this border, comprising only a small percentage of Norway’s total border, is located in a remote and sparsely populated area, yet has been geopolitically significant throughout the last century because of its harbours’ strategic position and the importance of Barents Sea natural resources. In this sense, she argues, the Norwegian-Russian border may be described as an over-terminated border: it has represented not only a territorial and administrative boundary between two states but a political and symbolic boundary between two opposing world systems.

While the actual research questions of the dissertation target this particular border policy at this specific geographical setting, the overall underlying inquiry Pettersson seeks to address is why some borders are open while others are not. As a political scientist, her approach to borders clearly follows the tradition of that discipline, having also incorporated nuances from international relations and political geography. True to her training yet going against the grain of recent border studies scholarship, Pettersson understands borders first and foremost as territorial markers of sovereignty. She explains that borders mark the edges of territories and political-administrative systems, and draw lines

between the citizens of each state. In their role as states' territorial demarcations borders' capacities serve to create, reinforce, and maintain differences between states. Based on selected existing literature, she then suggests that most explanations for borders being open are connected with the characteristics of neighbouring states: the more alike two states are, the more likely they are to share an open border. Any power inequalities across both sides of a border – for example, in terms of military power or economic standards – may create insecurity and result in demands for more closed borders.

Pettersson argues that questions of open borders can be answered using a theoretical framework combining an analysis of a state's sovereignty motives with a two-level analysis of the border's functions. Her argument consists of two components: first, sovereignty is here understood as the state's capacity to maintain power and control within its territory, and she argues that states pursue open or closed borders depending on the perceived risks and opportunities that changes in their border policies will have for that capacity. Second, since border policies often have significant effects on local border communities, to answer this question, she contends that we must also understand that the state and its borderlands are not necessarily aligned in terms of the role the border is expected to fulfil. Depending on neighbour-related border objectives, there may be differences concerning the challenges the opening of a border is perceived to represent. An important addition in her thinking is that the centre-periphery differences with regard to how open the border should be may, in themselves, be the cause of challenges to sovereignty: she therefore suggests that the motives of both the state and the borderlands in relation to borders must be combined in any analysis.

In her introductory chapter Pettersson first places the case of the Norwegian-Russian Local Border Traffic Permit in the wider European (and global) context of how states

react to challenges to their borders. Second, she outlines her argument that borders are sites of sovereignty construction and then discusses her theoretical framework's main components. This broader framework focuses on the recent refugee crisis and the EU's response to it, which has seen barbed wire fences and walls being erected at external borders and border controls reintroduced even between Schengen countries. Parallel with this border securitisation, she discusses another border logic: what she refers to as 'the unfixed character of European Union membership'. Basing her thinking on existing literature, she clarifies that the external border to the east has witnessed the rise of complex, even contradictory, border regimes because they must simultaneously respond to both a need for control and a desire for openness. In her assessment the overarching dilemma that much of the literature on borders aims to resolve is our understanding of sovereignty in an increasingly globalised world, in which states are constantly being put to the test by issues transcending territorial boundaries. Given the recent rise of walls, fences, and the politics of closed borders in response to the challenges of globalisation, she urges us to examine more closely how borders continue to be of significance and the policies states adopt to preserve them.

Sovereignty is one of the key concepts in her study. By this she means the control of a specific territory constituted by the exercise of power and the acknowledgement of its legitimacy, both from within, in terms of citizens accepting the authority of the state, and from outside, in terms of other states recognising the state as sovereign. Thus, she concludes that sovereignty is always under construction by the actions states take to uphold it. Ideas about sovereignty not only become visible but are put to the test at the border and in the policies developed for it. She therefore argues that an important task is to study how challenges to borders are perceived, met, and adapted from within the state itself – that is to

say, how sovereignty is 'constructed' through border policies. To do this, she examines more closely periods and policies that reshape the function or meaning of the analysed border and result in more or less openness. She does this through an in-depth analysis of the articulation of sovereignty motives in Norwegian policy discourse during the four-year period between the first proposal of local visa freedom in 2008 until its introduction at the Norwegian-Russian border in 2012.

Her premise is that macro-level similarities between neighbouring states are insufficient for an understanding of the openness created by the introduction of local visa freedom between Norway and Russia. Instead, she suggests that a better explanation can be provided by a theoretical approach that views border openness as the result of sovereignty motives. From this perspective the degree to which borders are open can be understood as a result of the state's sovereignty motives – that is, in the policies states pursue to make their borders more or less permeable. To do this, she explains that sovereignty must be *differentiated*: different types of sovereignty motives must be available for the state to pursue. Her dissertation conceptualises these different sovereignty motives as belonging to three different sovereignty *dimensions* – *geopolitical*, *material*, and *societal* – which together constitute the work's main analytical framework.

If we agree with Pettersson that sovereignty should be understood as multi-dimensional, the priority given to different dimensions of sovereignty may be seen to determine how open a border will be. For example, a focus on territorial integrity and security – what she calls the *geopolitical* dimension – may result in more closed borders and the construction of walls and fences, whereas a focus on economic growth and access to new markets – what she calls the *material* dimension – may result in more open borders to facilitate trade. The theoretical assumption advocated by the scholars

whose works Pettersson discusses is that states make 'sovereignty bargains', which means that they accept limitations to some dimensions of sovereignty to strengthen others. This theory is used to explain why states enter into binding bilateral or international agreements with other states, even though such agreements may limit a state's autonomy over the control of its own borders.

However, the inclusion of a societal dimension of sovereignty in the analysis of border policies complicates the notion that there is an adversarial choice between security and the economy. Pettersson makes a valuable insight in stating that social relations and identities within and across borders are often far more complex than neatly drawn borders on maps can reveal. Indeed, states are seldom internally homogenous. Borders structure asymmetrical relationships and power dynamics not only between states but also *within* them – for example, between the core and periphery or between regions. More precisely, how the border is understood at a state's centre may differ greatly from what it represents in its borderlands. Taking this point seriously, she suggests that we can neither assume that changes in how a border is governed will have the same meaning in the centre as in the border region, nor that policy change travels easily from the intention of the central institutions to its impact at the border. With this in mind the dissertation focuses on a comparison of the perspectives of both the centre and the periphery regarding the introduction of local border traffic permits. More specifically, it is argued that if the state, at the central level, and the local border community share similar ideas about the function the border should have, the risks of centre-periphery conflict or tension as a result of pursuing a particular border policy are reduced, as agreement between the two levels means that it will not weaken the state's internal legitimacy.

Based on these theoretical notions, Pettersson proceeds to detail the actual aims of

her work. Overall, her dissertation aims to further our understanding, conceptually and empirically, of how sovereignty and borders are connected. As some notion of a border is implicit in most definitions of sovereignty, the dissertation's theoretical ambition is to investigate and make explicit this connection. It is argued that sovereignty is manifested and produced at the border through ideas concerning its role. Following this argument, her dissertation's empirical ambition is to analyse how ideas about the border were expressed in the case of the Local Border Traffic Permit and thus show how the pursuit of visa freedom at the border with Russia makes sense from the perspective of Norwegian sovereignty.

The original work, which follows, is divided into two parts. The first presents the focal case for study and provides a more detailed background of the border between Norway and Russia, as well as a description of how the Local Border Traffic Permit, the permit that allows holders to cross the Norwegian-Russian border without a visa, works. It also includes a chronological review of how Norwegian policies towards this border have been analysed in previous academic studies and discusses how her analysis contributes to this research. The Russian perspective is completely omitted from the analysis, which may have been a practical decision; however, it undoubtedly makes the study of this interstate arrangement in a specific binational setting seem lopsided.

She moves on to examine the two overarching theoretical problems she has introduced: first, the question of how and why sovereignty and borders are interlinked, and how sovereignty can be unbundled into different dimensions; and second, why both state-level and local-level perspectives on what the border should be are important for the connection between borders and sovereignty. She derives the actual theoretical framework structuring her analysis from this.

The second part of the dissertation is divided into four more chapters, the first

three of which contain an empirical analysis of the focal case. These analyse the introduced different dimension of sovereignty in relation to the Local Border Traffic Permit from the perspectives of both the Norwegian state (the centre) and the borderlands (the periphery). The objective of each of these chapters is to determine the arguments in the public discourse relating to this policy. The motives, risks, opportunities, and challenges of implementing a visa-free zone for the centre and the periphery are identified and compared.

Pettersson argues that in the case of this border there are many identity factors that might have been seen as obstacles to an open border – the long history of the border as a barrier between 'West' and 'East' and differences in languages, religions, economic development, and political systems are all elements that could easily be translated into questions of belonging and thus into barriers to more open movement across the border. With this in mind she decisively underlines that when we investigate why borders become more or less open, the important question to ask is for whom they become so, and that a perceived distance from, or even hostility towards, the border-crosser is difficult to reconcile with more open borders. Her analysis reveals that when the border permit is raised at government level and when some form of identity or cultural argument is raised in parliamentary debate, it is not expressed as a perceived risk. The study finds few concerns that might align with the otherwise common discourse in relation to opening borders – that is, seeing increased diversity as a risk factor for societal coherence.

From a societal-sovereignty perspective region-building projects have the potential to challenge the national imagined community by being identity projects in themselves. However, Pettersson clarifies that a regional identity does not necessarily challenge the national identity, although it may be perceived as doing so. She concludes from this that there is a clear focus on functional rather

than cultural identities in both the central and local discussion: Russians are primarily associated with their functions for Norway (as consumers or employees) rather than with something related to their Russian-ness (e.g. language differences or being more cultured than Norwegians). The majority of references to Russians as border-crossers in her study relate to their capacity as a resource for the local community, virtually excluding the aspect of cultural identity from the equation.

Regarding the geopolitical dimension of sovereignty, Pettersson has discovered that the strategy of building friendly bilateral relations with Russia is complicated by Norway's position between the EU and the Russian Federation. At both the central and local levels acting within Schengen rules has been perceived as a challenge to sovereignty, as it may limit Norway's ability to negotiate efficiently with Russia. While the agreement on the Local Border Traffic Permit was formally a bilateral agreement between Norway and Russia, it was undertaken within the Schengen framework. Pettersson sees this as an indication that the Schengen Agreement has restricted Norway's ability to enter into a more extensive bilateral agreement on visa freedom than the prescribed thirty-kilometre zone, effectively undermining Norway's ability to regulate its own borders. Furthermore, although the border has become more open in terms of visa regulations, it was found that both the central and local discourses emphasised that this would not entail a more porous border in terms of surveillance and border control, thus indicating that the introduction of local visa freedom was understood as a potential security risk that must be met with an increased border control capacity.

Pettersson's analysis of the material dimension of sovereignty shows that growth opportunities were clearly important motives for the introduction of the Local Border Traffic Permit in both central and local contexts. Nevertheless, she has identified an interesting difference in terms of what this economic

motive represented: whereas the economic benefit of increased cross-border flows in the local context was primarily seen as a *goal in itself*, in the central context this objective was connected to a *security motive*, as economic cross-border activity was expected to work as a means of achieving geopolitical stability in the region.

Regarding the more societal dimension of her analysis, Pettersson has found that in contrast to the focus on crime and prostitution in the public discourse of the early 1990s, in the context of the Local Border Traffic Permit Russian border-crossers were not portrayed as 'dangerous others' but as neighbours and a resource for the local community as workers and consumers. The conclusion she draws from the 'we are such good neighbours' themes in this discourse is that, by being repeated in both the central and local discourse, this idea has served to preclude and minimise any societal tensions that might have been galvanised by the further opening of the border.

Pettersson's analysis shows that the border permit differs from the broader Barents project in that the prospect of – or appeal to – shared identities has rarely been expressed. She argues that the role of identity may be mitigated by a focus on other themes: it is a possible line of conflict, but it does not necessarily need to be articulated as a threat to the national community of a state. Borders, even when they separate two states that at first sight are very different, may not necessarily give rise to identity conflicts when they open up if, at least, the economic gain is worth more than the identity risk. An important finding she has made is that the economic motive related to an increase in trade activity across the border may be seen as a government strategy for strengthening the local economy on the Norwegian side of the border. This may be understood as a means of holding the Norwegian centre and periphery together, not via national identity claims but by keeping domestic economic inequality in check.

An analytical framework primarily focusing on one of the sovereignty aspects would not have been able to fully capture the significance of this border permit. Pettersson's study shows that this single border policy instrument encompassed a range of motives and was expected to have an impact that ranged from the everyday lives of people living on either side of the border to bilateral relations between Norway and Russia. Indeed, she concludes that themes from the three different dimensions were present in the Norwegian discourse on introducing local visa freedom along the border with Russia. Prominent motives for entering into this bilateral agreement were, among others, that it was intended to strengthen and stabilise bilateral relations with Russia, increase economic activity in the region, and promote a friendly neighbourly relationship in the border region. Instead of bargaining, the study shows there is a cumulative relationship between the expected outcomes of this policy along different dimensions. The different dimensions of the expected policy outcomes can be understood as mutually reinforcing and part of a strategy to increase security. From the Norwegian perspective social and economic integration across the border contributes to the improvement of geopolitical sovereignty and thus does not constitute 'bargaining' between different sovereignty motives.

Given that the geopolitical is only expressed in terms of objectives in itself, whereas both societal and economic objectives are also seen as means to a geopolitical end, Pettersson assumes that, had the Norwegian government perceived the opening of this border and the economic benefits of doing so as opposed to its geopolitical concerns, they would not have pursued this course of action. This study provides evidence that it was clearly a strategy to meet both the geopolitical and economic challenges on the border with Russia; however, interestingly enough, the strategy was argued for in such a way that any potential trade-offs between

openness and security were reduced to a minimum.

Pettersson contends that borders may have very different meanings at the national level, where policy is made, and at the local level, where day-to-day border relations take place. Based on this insight, she recommends that the understanding of the border at these two levels should thus be of concern to scholars interested in the question of border permeability, as the pursuit of closed or open borders creates different challenges depending on the extent to which the centre and the periphery agree concerning how the border should be managed. She suggests it would be very interesting for future studies of border policy change to test whether centre-periphery motive alignment can explain the success or failure of different border policies. She also suggests that we should approach explanations of an open border with an open mind as to what openness means and with analytical tools that allow us to identify the roles the border is expected to play. This should also encourage more comparative approaches that identify and explain different approaches to, and outcomes of, border policies.

Any border policy change is most likely to be successful when the centre and periphery agree about what the border's purpose is. Thus, in cases where border change leads to destabilisation or centre-periphery conflict, future studies might show that this may be explained by competing or conflicting understandings of the purpose the border should have or what the role of the border should be. As sites of policy implementation, sovereignty demonstration, and bilateral contact, as well as of physical exclusion and symbolic inclusion, borders are certainly more than merely lines on a map. Thus, she argues, borders need more, not less, attention from political science because the research front is now opening up to more theoretical ambitions of making general explanations, as well as a focus on more comparative research that endeavours to systematise what we already

know about borders. Such questions need answers that are connected with states and sovereignty.

In all, Pettersson's dissertation is an original, coherent and well conducted work. As discussed above, the work utilises the chosen theoretical frame to better understand the investigated empirical case, and in so doing provides us with new insights and even ways forward regarding this very particular case at the Norwegian-Russian border. What I did, however, find surprising was the apparent contradiction between the announced scope of the study, borders, and the indisposition by Pettersson to engage with the prominent border studies literature, which undoubtedly would have a lot to give for this work. Certainly, borders are about politics, but not only that. One of the main reasons behind continued persistence of state borders has to do with their intertwined essence that includes also much subtle social and cultural factors. Even if the question is about a dissertation of *political science*, it is these entwined traces – ever so evident in the studies case – that would have enriched the analysis greatly. Indeed, starting the analysis from the border – rather than the broader processes that may transcend it – our gaze tends to the almost automatically tuned for the differences, rather than any potential factors that might glue the two sides together.

The second, apparent drawback of the work is its blunt one-sidedness. The study sets out to investigate a binational border area and specifically a bilateral agreement – but does that exclusively only from the Norwegian perspective. While I understand the need to narrow down the topic and all the additional requirements that conducting research on both sides of the border would have necessitated, I find it ungrounded that the Russian perspective was left completely out of the analysis and the reasons behind this decision was not explained to the reader. While a completely balanced approach might have been unrealistic, even unnecessary, to attain, even a brief discussion on the situation on, and

the perspective from, the Russian side would have balanced the work greatly. Despite these critical remarks, Pettersson's dissertation provides an important contribution to how we can understand the contemporary dynamics at this very particular border, which is – as she states – not only a territorial and administrative boundary between two states, but also a political and symbolic boundary between two opposing world systems.

Jussi Laine är docent vid Östra Finlands universitet.  
E-post: jussi.laine@uef.fi

**Benhabib, Seyla, 2018. *Exile, Statelessness, and Migration – Playing Chess with History From Hannah Arendt to Isaiah Berlin*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.**

Anmälan av Helen Lindberg

Stefan Zweig skrev en gång: "My literary work was burned to ashes in the same land where my books made friends of millions of readers. And so I belong nowhere and everywhere am a stranger, a guest at best." (Zweig 1943:6). 2016 skriver Dragana Kaurin att: "The most important part of being a refugee is being a good loser; it's the only way to survive this. You learn to lose your nationality, your home to strangers with bigger guns, your father to mental illness, one aunt to genocide, and another to nationalism and ignorance. You learn to lose your kids, friends, dreams, neighbors, loves, diplomas, careers, photo albums, home movies, schools, museums, histories, landmarks, limbs, teeth, eyesight, sense of safety, sanity, and your sense of belonging in the world." (Kaurin 2016).

Stefan Zweigs och Dragana Kaurins föreställning om en tillvaro som utkastad, i ett tillstånd av att ha förlorat precis allt, till och med känslan av tillhörighet till världen, finns i mitt