

# Policing Swedishness

Analysing discourses of suspicion in police narratives on  
internal controls of foreigners

Sarah Philipson

# Abstract

Based on a discourse analysis of police narratives on internal controls of foreigners, this thesis examines how discourses of suspicion are produced within policing. Methodologically and empirically engaging with interviews with police officers operating throughout Sweden, and theoretically drawing on the diffused practices of mobility management, the analysis shows that the police officers practice of internal controls of foreigners are guided by an insufficient frame of regulation. The legal framework has left grey zones for the individual police officer to fill in with their own interpretations of suspicious bodies, which are often built upon a 'gut feeling' or 'police gaze'. For their interpretation, the police officers draw on a narrow understanding on citizenship, constructing Swedishness as synonymous with whiteness as the frame of belonging towards which the 'foreigner' is measured. The 'foreigner' is further represented as a non-white man from the suburbs, hence, the police (re)produce discourses of suspicion through an ethnified, classed and gendered typology that constructs certain non-white bodies as pre-determined suspicious subjects.

*Key words:* Internal controls of foreigners, Sweden, border control, mobility, ethnic profiling

Words: 19 989

# Table of contents

- 1 Introduction..... 1**
- 1.1 Purpose and research question ..... 2
- 1.2 Internal control of ‘foreigners’: A legal framework for the Swedish context. .... 3
- 1.3 Disposition ..... 6
- 2 Theoretical Framework..... 7**
- 2.1 Policing through profiling..... 8
- 2.2 Research on Internal controls of foreigners in the context of Sweden ..... 11
- 2.3 Policing borders ..... 12
- 2.4 Policing bodies..... 14
- 3 Methodological Framework..... 19**
- 3.1 Performing controls: discourse analysis as method ..... 19
- 3.2 The interviews and interviewees: research design and material ..... 23
- 3.2.1 *Snowballing: Accessing interviewees* ..... 24
- 3.3 Methodological considerations and limitations ..... 25
- 4 Analysis: Controlling ‘the foreigner’ ..... 28**
- 4.1 The Police gaze ..... 31
- 4.2 From Territory to Mobility ..... 34
- 4.3 Embodied borders ..... 41
- 4.3.1 *“You cannot carry out a control just because he’s black”*..... 42
- 4.3.2 *“The rental units, that’s where the problems are”*..... 47
- 5. Conclusion ..... 53**
- 6. Bibliography ..... 55**

# 1 Introduction

Internal controls of foreigners came to dominate the public debate in Sweden in 2013, when REVA<sup>1</sup> first made headlines. REVA, a joint administrative project in 2009-2014 between the Swedish police, the Prison and Probation Service and the Swedish Migration Board, largely came to be associated with the police profiling non-white bodies in the subway and other public spaces (cf. Interpellation 2013/14:349; Interpellation 2014/15:9). However, the project came to symbolise internal foreigner controls in the public debate, losing sight of its everyday practices outside of this specific collaboration between the different agencies.

Since REVA, many things have changed in the Swedish political landscape. As of last year, the world is experiencing the greatest humanitarian refugee ‘crisis’ since the second world war, with estimations reaching more than “60 million refugees, asylum-seekers and internally displaced persons worldwide as a result of conflict and persecution” (UNHCR 2015). Migration and integration issues thus got an increasingly important place in public debate in Sweden. At most, the estimated inflow of people was about 2.000 a day, of which only half applied for asylum in Sweden, while others continued to the Nordic neighbouring countries (Larsson & Lundahl Djerf 2015).

On 21 June 2016, the government passed changes in the Aliens Act, containing provisions that precluded the possibility of permanent residence permits and family reunification, as well as increased the requirement for employment and income. As of now, 80.000 people are expected to be deported from Sweden within the next couple of years, and the Swedish Police Authority has gotten increased mandate to perform internal controls of foreigners within Sweden (SFS 2015:1073; SFS 2015:1074).

---

<sup>1</sup> REVA, *Rättssäkert och effektivt verkställighetsarbete*, can be translated into ‘Legally Secure and efficient work for enforcing deportations’.

The new border regime has gained great attention both politically and in media, yet little attention has been given to how such border politics play out in current political life within Sweden. It is thus important to engage with internal controls of foreigners in its own right, in a time where such practices are given greater political legitimacy, increased resources and priority within the police authority (Ju2015/02002/PO).

To engage with internal controls of foreigners further require us to critically engage with issues concerning national identity and politics of belonging in the Swedish context. For that purpose, it is interesting to study the police officers' perception of which bodies that belongs and, which doesn't, as they function to delineate 'foreigners' from citizens in the Swedish setting. The police officers' understanding of what bodies fit the national imaginary of citizens and their position as state functionaries thus gives them the privilege of determining which bodies to control, and which bodies are allowed to pass (Khosravi 2011; Hydén & Lundberg 2004). In that sense, the police do not only convert politics into practice through the implementation of governmental policy, but also functions as a locus on control-related issues, for example seen in their increased authority on border controls (cf. Hydén & Lundberg 2004; SFS 2015:1073; SFS 2015:1074).

## 1.1 Purpose and research question

The temporary Aliens act (SFS 2015:1074) and the changing border policies in the Swedish setting have lead to increased internal controls of foreigners within the nation, while simultaneously reintroducing the nation's frontiers through temporary border controls. The practice of internal controls of foreigners is projected to increase within the coming years, as the government has announced that 80,000 people are to be deported (Svensson et al. 2016). To interrogate how the police deploy such controls, and how they delineate 'foreign' bodies from Swedish bodies in the enactment of the internal controls of foreigners are here of key interest. It is important to question whether the individual police officer's ambiguous interpretation between 'similarity' and 'difference', between 'us' and 'them' and between 'Swedes' and 'foreigners' shapes the predominant conditions that determine whether an individual will be controlled or not.

While previous research on ethnic profiling to little or no extent has engaged with the contextual or meaning-making consequences of such practices, and largely left out the perspective of social actors and police narratives in particular (Glover 2007; Östlund 2013: 101), this study aims at bridging that gap. Inspired by this, the thesis will engage with how discourses of suspicion are produced and practiced in the police narratives on internal controls of foreigners. The research question that informs the analysis is thus:

How are discourses of suspicion (re)produced in police narratives on internal controls of foreigners?

In light of this question, this thesis engages with the perspectives and narratives of police officers, thus offering crucial insights to a field that has largely been left unexplored and neglected in the Swedish setting. This thesis aims to contribute theoretically to the field of critical border studies, while empirically adding to the understanding of internal control of foreigners in the Swedish context.

## 1.2 Internal control of ‘foreigners’: A legal framework for the Swedish context.

In the preparations for Sweden’s entrance in the Schengen partnership, the Swedish government (prop. 1997/ 98: 42) emphasised that the internal control of foreigners was an essential element of policing, and that such controls were the prerequisite for opening the internal borders towards other EU nations. When Sweden entered the Schengen Agreement in 2001, the task of controlling the national borders shared with neighbouring member states were thus substituted with the task of monitoring the internal space(s) in the Schengen area by *internal foreigner controls*. Internal control of foreigners is a practice that all police officers have the ability to carry out, however, it is the border police’s responsibility to ensure that people do not reside in the country without a residence permit, and the border police is the unit who enforces decisions of expulsion. Such controls are regulated by the Aliens Act (SFS 2005:716), chapter 9, section 9:

It is the duty of an alien staying in Sweden, when requested to do so by a police officer, to present a passport or other documents showing that he or she has the right to remain in Sweden. (...) If the alien fails to do so, he or she may be collected by the police authority (...). Controls under the first and second paragraphs may only be undertaken if there is *good reason to assume* that the alien lacks the right to remain in this country or there is otherwise special cause for controls (my emphasis).

The police authority builds its ‘Regulations and General Advice of the Police Internal Controls of Foreigners’ (2011) on the Aliens Act, in which eight sections regulate how the police can enact a control, and how such controls should be documented (RPSFS 2011:4). The main aim of the controls is to ensure that foreigners do not reside or work in the country without fulfilling the requirements for doing so, and to detect foreigners who have a refusal of entry or expulsion that shall be enforced (RPSFS 2011:4 §3).

Internal foreigner controls have been an integral part of border control practices since Sweden’s entry into the Schengen Area in 2001. However, it was first in 2007 that the National Police Board decided that internal controls were to be an integrated part of regular policing (cf. Leander 2014a; 2014b). It is declared in the Aliens Act that a control “may only be undertaken if there is a *good reason to assume* that the alien lacks the right to remain in this country or there is otherwise special cause for controls” (SFS 2005:716 8a§ 9 chap, my emphasis). ‘Reason to assume’ is a legal term for the requirements the police must fulfil in order to perform a lawful control, yet little information is given on what is deemed either a ‘good reason’ or ‘reason enough’ when assessing control subjects.

Furthermore, according to RPSFS 2011:4 §3, the police is not allowed to conduct internal controls of foreigners solely based on a person’s appearance. This is further reiterated in a supervision report from 2014:

Foreign appearance alone is not enough to make such a control; it requires e.g. informed intelligence or tips. A person’s behaviour or social interaction can justify a control of foreigners, or information can emerge in connection with a traffic or criminal investigation (Tillsynsrapport 2014:14, my translation).

Combining internal foreigner controls with other forms of controls are a recommendation, while ‘reason to assume’ provides the legal basis for an internal foreigner control. Therefore, identity controls are recommended to be performed in

parallel with other events such as assault cases, controls of vehicles, and/or workplace raids to secure the evidentiary requirements in ‘reason to assume’ (Leander 2014a; Tillsynsrapport 2014:14). It is here important to note that all police work can progress into an internal control of foreigners.

On January 2016, the Act on “special measures in the event of serious danger to public or domestic security” came into force (SFS 2015:1073). This gave the Government authority to reissue border controls at the national border, while at the same time expanding identity controls within the nation, in order to “maintain law and order or to protect national security” (SFS 2015: 2 §). Consequently, the Swedish government issued regulations on identity controls, requiring transportation companies carrying passengers into Sweden by boat, bus or train to conduct ID controls as part of the extended carrier liability (SFS 2015:1073; SFS 2015:1074).

This was further institutionalised on 21 June 2016, when the parliament passed changes in the Aliens Act, thus limiting the possibility of issuing permanent residence permits, family reunification, and supply requirements. These changes have been heavily criticised by all the constative bodies (cf. Amnesty 2016; FARR 2016; UNHCR 2016). As a result of these policies, the border regime is temporarily re-established at the geographical Swedish border, while internal controls are increasingly performed within Sweden. In that sense, border controls are no longer placed exclusively at the frontiers of the nation, but they are also dispersed throughout society. The legal framework is important to understand as this is what guides the individual police officers in their enactment of the internal controls of foreigners.

While there is no established translation for ‘inre utlänningskontroller (internal controls of foreigners)’, the controlled subjects are predominantly referred to as ‘foreigners’ in policy documents, why such terminology will be used throughout the analysis. The controls will thus be referred to as internal controls of foreigners, rather than internal controls of Aliens, as ‘foreigner’ better correspond to the Swedish term ‘utlänning’. Furthermore, the use of ‘alien’ connotes a dehumanising practice which signals an inhumanness of the controlled subject, a notion I do not wish to reproduce in this thesis.



## 1.3 Disposition

The thesis is divided into five chapters. The first chapter consists of the introduction and the purpose of the study, the research question, as well as a brief outline of the legal framework for the practice of internal controls of foreigners. The second chapter starts with a presentation of previous and current research on policing in both an international and Swedish context. This is followed by the theoretical framework, namely “Policing borders” and “Policing bodies”. Chapter three is divided into three main sections, i) discourse analysis as the analytical framework, ii) interview as a method of data collection, and iii) methodological considerations and limitations. Chapter four holds the analysis and is divided into three main themes, of which the first is oriented around the practice of internal controls of foreigners, focusing on the concept of ‘reason to assume’; the second theme revolves around the ambiguous border and how border controls are performed by multiple actors; while the third theme engages with embodied borders. The concluding chapter offers a brief summary of the analysis, while also offering a conclusion to the research question.

## 2 Theoretical Framework

I will in this thesis draw on the growing field of a vernacularised border approach that emphasises the increasingly dispersed nature of borders. Where previous studies have engaged mainly with governance in the form of state power or policy, I will here shift focus to policing as a form of social governance, which diffuses the threshold of nation borders. As such, rather than questioning whether borders exist to keep something in or out, we here turn our gaze to the consequences of this border regime.

\* \* \* \* \*

The notion of ‘policing’ is central to this thesis as it is a concept that captures the diverse meaning of control practices that reach beyond the police in its institutional sense. Policing includes control practices and social regulations that signify contemporary governance. This form of social governance has come to constitute a partnership between the police and other government agencies such as schools, real estate companies, as well as private security firms and civil society organisations (Peterson 2013: 14). Such partnerships may indicate that the police authorities are dependent on other societal agents to maintain control and social governance in society (Peterson 2013: 14-15). Social governance in the form of policing has thus shifted from having been an ‘exclusive state affair’ to now involve “governmental, supranational, market, and voluntary organisations” (Peterson 2013: 15, my translation). While the police maintain their monopoly of violence as a control institution, the increasingly common procedure of partnerships is captured in the concept of ‘plural policing’ (see for example Banton 1964; Loader 2000; Jones and Newburn 2006). For instance, the border police often collaborate with governmental institutions such as the fire and rescue services, the Swedish Tax Agency, and the Social Insurance Office to conduct joint controls and rely upon such institutions initiative to conduct workplace raids (SOU: JU2012: 2014).

Similar processes of social governance and control practices can further be found in the control of spatial borders against “the perceived threats posed by ethnic minorities to stability, order and social cohesion”, as captured by the concept ‘policing ethnicity’ (Garner 2007; Peterson & Åkerström 2013: 3). Such terminology plays into a political discourse that not only cast suspicion upon the bodies of perceived ‘foreigners’, but also criminalises them as potential sources of societal insecurity (Bigo 1994; Huysmans 2000; Vollmer 2011). In its widest sense, such control practices can be understood as governing in/exclusion, hence visualising processes in which ethnic minorities become targets of control, demarcation and exclusion (Peterson & Åkerström 2014: 4). The practice of policing thus becomes an issue of controlling borders and the bodies that are (un)able to move across these. Following this line of thought, the two following sections will present and discuss current and previous research in the field of policing, as seen in the section ‘policing through profiling’ and briefly touch upon previous research concerning internal controls of foreigners in the Swedish context. The succeeding sections that stand as the thesis’ theoretical framework will then connect these practices to a deeper understanding of borders and how such (b)orders are projected onto certain bodies through the two themes ‘Policing borders’ and ‘Policing bodies’.

## 2.1 Policing through profiling

The police is an interesting institution to study not only in its function of turning politics into practice, but also since it moves across all layers of society (Östlund 2013: 100). The increased political demand on the police to achieve effectiveness and produce results has effects on operational police work. Young argues that such a policy of ‘effectiveness’ has contributed to a shift of controlling ‘suspicious individuals’ to controlling ‘groups of suspicious social categories’ (Young 1999: 44). Such practices have gained great attention in the US, and are commonly referred to as racial profiling, or ethnic profiling if addressed in a European setting. This refers to the police practice of ‘stop-and-search’, which links certain ethnic markers to discourses of criminality (Goodey 2006: 207; Östlund 2013: 100-1). Such profiling practices are often said to be informed by crime statistics, however,

crime statistics can be said to reflect the distorted pattern of ethnic profiling already carried out by police authorities (Peterson 2013: 13). In this view, statistics and controls constitute a vicious circle that contributes to an overrepresentation of ethnic minorities in crime statistics, which in turn is used to legitimize the use of such stereotypical risk profiles and practices (Holmberg 1999:21; Peterson 2013: 13). Such tendencies thus construct ‘suspicious populations’ that risk “suffer harassment by law enforcers rather than receiving protection from the law” (Hudson 2008: 278 in Peterson 2013: 13).

In a similar vein, policing has been depicted in terms of “the power of suspicion” by Lars Holmberg (1999), referring to how the police rely on biased assessments of their surroundings in order to maintain control. Drawing on the typologies utilized by the Danish police officers Holmberg interviews, he learns that female drivers are not deemed suspicious, while young non-white men from suburbs often get targeted, hence the notion of *policing by typology* which captures the gendered and racialised aspects of policing (cf. O’Dougherty 2006; Sollund 2006; Kempa & Singh 2008). Another aspect of policing is the ambiguous relationship between the police and the law, where the police tend to interpret and utilize the law depending on the situation they are in. This thus becomes a *grey zone*. These grey zones of police officers’ own assessments and interpretations are crucial for the outcome of interventions (Holmberg 1999). Such informal knowledge has been captured in Liv Finstad’s work *Polisblikket* (2000), an ethnographic study of the Norwegian police set in Oslo. She introduces the concept of *the police gaze* as the gaze that is trained to detect and expose suspicious and criminal activities. Hence, the police gaze is supposed to study the world with suspicion and with its discernment help the police with the distinction between the respectable citizen, and the criminal (Finstad 2000: 60-2). The police gaze can be seen both as an individual ability, and a collective knowledge/experience within the police collective (Finstad 2000: 115-17; Görtz 2015: 97). Policing is thus an important practice to interrogate, since it captures the formal and informal practices of the police officer’s assessment and interpretation for intervention. Hence, to understand how discourses of suspicion are reproduced in internal controls of foreigners, we need to pay attention to the nuances in the practice of policing from the perspective of the police officers.

While there is a wide range of research on the practice of profiling, police officer’s own perspective on ethnic profiling has been overlooked in favour of

quantitative research or a focus on the social processes that promote the occurrence. The tendency to link marginalised groups to areas with high rates of crime has arguably contributed to this lack of attention (Glover 2009: 33). While such statements resonate with a Swedish academic context, international research has had an extended coverage of the practices of ethnic profiling, especially in a British context (cf. Hall 2013[1978]; Ahmed 2000; Buerger & Farrell 2002; Harris 2006; Philips & Bowling 2007). Further, research on ethnic profiling has to little or no extent engaged with the contextual or meaning-making consequences of such practices, and that the quantitative focus has taken place on the expense of the perspective of social actors in general, and police narratives in particular (Glover 2007; Östlund 2013: 101). As such, orienting this study to not only the Swedish context, but also engaging with the perspectives and narratives of police officers offers crucial insights to a field that has been left unexplored.

While British research in the context of ethnic profiling offers important analytical and theoretical insights, translating such results onto a Swedish context can be problematic. The US and UK's colonial history has shaped national politics and power relations between different ethnic groups in a way that reinforces racial hierarchies, in a way that plays into the politics of policing (Östlund 2013: 104). While Sweden does not share the same colonial legacy, the role the nation played in the Swedish colonial project is largely unknown or downplayed in the national setting (Palmgren 2009; Habel 2012). This unawareness and the relatively late influx of migrant populations in Sweden compared to that of the UK or US can be seen as setting the stage for the Swedish context (Östlund 2013: 104). Similar problems of generalisability are found in the dissimilarity between the police authorities in different countries, another is the societal context in which the research is being conducted, e.g. in how 'race' has a given place in American and British research, while 'ethnicity' is the key referent in Scandinavian research (cf. Hübinette & Tigervall 2009). Ethnicity is not seen as a static category, but rather as "productive and active social relations" (Peterson 2014: 10).

While there has been a lack of research on the exclusionary practices of policing minorities in a Swedish setting, the field has been given more attention the last decade. In 2004, the tendencies of ethnic profiling in internal controls of foreigners were established by Sofie Hydén and Anna Lundberg (2004). In their dissertation "Internal Foreigner Controls in Police Work" they describe ethnic

profiling as an inherent, yet informal, tool of policing. Lately, criminologists and sociologists have picked up similar traits, for instance in the anthology ‘The sorting police authority’<sup>2</sup> (Peterson & Åkerström 2013, see also Hydén 2008; Peterson & Uhnöo 2012; Uhnöo & Peterson 2011; Wieslander 2014; Görtz 2015). While the police officers interviewed by Hydén and Lundberg described profiling as based on intuition, similar stories of ‘gut feeling’ and ‘silent knowledge’ are prevailing in Östlund’s study on ethnicity as a distinguishing element in operational police work (2013: 119). He here finds that ethnicity is one among many other elements used by the police to distinguish suspicious bodies, and that ethnicity is given meaning when connected to immigration and criminality (2013: 98).

Hence, we need to critically interrogate how ethnicity and the construction of un/belonging shapes our understanding of potential crimes and criminal bodies. This resonates with how Peterson sees policing as contributing to ‘doing ethnicity’ (Peterson 2014: 11). Considering the recurring emphasis on grey zones, the police privilege of interpretation to act on their own discretion (Holmberg 2000; Östlund 2013), and lack of research involving the police experiences and perspectives on profiling in general, and internal controls of foreigners in particular, it is important to study the underlying social mechanism that informs such controls. This becomes particularly relevant in relation to the current vigorous political focus and economic resources on internal controls of foreigners and deportation in Sweden.

## 2.2 Research on Internal controls of foreigners in the context of Sweden

While the Swedish research field on policing has grown in the last decade, an explicit focus on internal controls of foreigners has largely been left out. As of now, the only studies that have engaged with these practices explicitly, are the previously mentioned dissertation by Hydén and Lundberg (2004), as well as Peter Leander’s (2014a; 2014b) two reports for the think-tank Arena Idea. Internal controls of foreigners are, according to Hydén and Lundberg (2004), initiated by a suspicion that an individual resides in the country without residence permit. However, the

---

<sup>2</sup> Swedish title: Den sorterande ordningsmakten.

distinction between conducting a control on legal grounds, and conducting a control that is ethnically discriminating is depicted as subtle. Drawing on this line of argument, Urban Ericsson then questions whether the law should be seen as discriminatory in itself, rather than merely in its enactment (Ericsson 2000: 256). The internal control of foreigners thus becomes a search for deviations, for suspicious bodies that does not fit the national imaginary (Hydén & Lundberg 2004; Urban Ericsson 2006; see also Ahmed 2000). This form of policing constructs equal rights before the law as a decree rather than a right. The one who cannot represent a trustworthy resemblance to the frames of belonging thus risk being controlled (Ericsson 2006, see also Yuval-Davis 2005; Khosravi 2006).

Leander (2014a; 2014b) on the other hand interrogates how the police are documenting their internal controls of foreigners. He finds a lack of reporting on controls conducted on people with legal grounds to stay in Swede, e.g. citizens or people with residence permits and he further detects regional differences. In that sense, a control conducted on a citizen in Kalmar tend not to be documented, while a control in Södermanland is documented in two different registers to ensure rule of law. A predominant theme was further how the police officers interviewed conduct controls solely on ethnic markers, and that these controls are not reported if the controlled person has the right to reside in the country (Leander 2014a; 2014b). The two reports of Leander sparked an investigation within the Police Authority, to see whether or not they had to clarify the regulations that prohibit ethnic profiling. However, in mail correspondence with the National Operational Unit (NOA), nothing has happened to the regulations on ethnic profiling. As such, it is important to question whether the individual police officer's ambiguous interpretation between 'similarity' and 'difference', between 'us' and 'them' and between 'Swedes' and 'foreigners' shapes the predominant conditions that determine whether an individual will be controlled or not.

## 2.3 Policing borders

The Balibarian notion of 'borders everywhere' acknowledge how border work in multiple sites and by a diversity of actors, yet does not automatically translate into borders as designed to catch *everyone, everywhere*. Rather, borders are meant

to locate specific bodies (Johnson & Jones 2014: 3). To explore what a border is we need to challenge the core assumptions associated with border studies where mutual recognition of a (state) border is seen as constitutive of its existence, as well as the assumption that borders need to be visible (to all) in order to work properly (Rumford 2012: 888). Rather, the vernacularized border approach suggests four key changes for our theoretical understanding of borders, and may figure as a conceptual toolbox for this specific logic of borders and bordering. The first change draws on the Balibar notion of “borders are everywhere” (2002). Borders are seen as overdetermined since they can be performed in multiple sites since “no political border is ever the mere boundary of two states” (2002: 79). Bordering practices now exist in airports, harbours, and non-conventional places such as travel agencies, motorways, and on the Internet – places that all can be monitored through different ways of controlling information for security purposes (Amoore and de Goede 2008).

The recognition that borders signify different things to different people constitutes the second change in border studies. Hence, borders are designed to separate and filter, to act differently on different groups of people. Borders can thus be empowering for some bodies, while threatening for others. This resonates with Balibar’s conception of polysemy, meaning how borders are used to actively differentiate between people in terms of social class. As such, people will have diverse experiences of the law, the police, the civil administration, elementary rights and freedom of movement depending on this differentiating principle (Balibar 2002: 81). From a phenomenological perspective of border practices, a passport can signify national belonging, as well as a *surplus* of rights for some bodies: “the border (...) becomes a point of symbolic acknowledgment of his status” (Balibar 2002: 83). For others, the border becomes a point of bodily encounter, a site he continually needs to pass to the extent that it becomes a place that he inhabits (Khosravi 2011). The border can thus symbolise “security or suppression, walls or bridges, barriers or turnstiles” depending on your position in the border regime (Cooper et al. 2014: 17). The polysemic character of borders hence visualises the distinguishing practices between the passage of ‘desirable’ bodies and the effort of keeping out ‘undesirables’ (Balibar 2000; Amoore and de Goede 2008; Cooper et al. 2014).



The third change is found in the dispersed location of borders. Borders still figure at the edges of nations, but also take a more distant shape, as seen in the development of offshore borders. This is e.g. seen in the externalisation of EU border and migration management, where EU borders are exported to neighbouring ‘third countries’ (Vaughan-Williams 2009: 19; Casas-Cortes et al. 2016). Thus, the border does not need to be visible to all in order to be existing (Rumford 2012; 2013). Rather, a vernacularised approach suggests a shift of emphasis from state bordering and the regulation of (contested) mobilities, to focus on borders in everyday practices and bordering as a political resource. From such a standpoint, the border as a political resource can be utilised not only by agencies of the state, but also by ordinary people. Hence, “borders are no longer seen as only belonging to the state” (Rumford 2013: 170), with borders “everywhere”, (non)citizens, entrepreneurs and civil society organisations can all engage in the construction and reconfiguration of borders (Ahmed 2000; Amoore and de Goede 2008; Khosravi 2011; Andersson 2014). To engage in borderwork is a way to dismantle the ambiguous character of borders and to rethink the agency of who is able to perform the border outside the realm of the state.

While the first, second and third change all can be said to be rooted in Balibar’s notions of overdetermination, polysemy and heterogeneity, the fourth change indicates that borders increasingly have become “mechanisms to ‘control mobility rather than territory’” (Dürschmidt and Taylor 2007: 56 cited in Cooper et al. 2014: 18). Arguably, the mobility dependent borders can be found in the idea of the biopolitical border, constructing the human body as the prime locus of border controls (Amoore 2006: 338). This will be further delineated in the next section.

## 2.4 Policing bodies

Border management is not simply a question of geopolitical policing and “disciplining of the movement of bodies across mapped space” (Amoore 2006: 337), but should more appropriately be understood in terms of *biopolitics*. The biopolitical border signifies the duality in the contemporary border regime: both the rise of digital technologies in border management and the turn to biopower in the sense that “the body itself is inscribed with, and demarcates, a continual crossing of

multiple encoded borders – social, legal, gendered, racialized and so on” (Amoore 2006: 337; Vaughan-Williams 2009). Biopolitics thus signify how states control bodies and lives of populations, thus constituting the body as a site for inscription for border politics, where people’s lives and mobility are subjected to regulations, interventions, and management (Fassin 2001: 1; Amoore 2006: 337; Vaughan-Williams 2009; Cooper et al. 2015: 15). The body should in this thesis be read as the controlled subject and how this is questioned in its belonging and therefore constructed as a stranger in the Swedish setting. The stranger thus becomes the ‘foreigners’ theoretical counterpart. While this involves the lived body, it first and foremost refers to the body’s orientation in the world (Ahmed 2006: 9, 16-7; Bremer 2010: 93-4). This orientation gives crucial analytical insights to how different bodies have different conditions to move in the world, hence affecting e.g. their mobility. This echoes the effects of the polysemic character of borders visualises how borders have different implications on different subjects (Ahmed 2006; Bremer 2010; Cooper et al. 2014). This ties into the politics of belonging, where exclusionary practices construct boundaries and borders that distinguish between those belonging and those seen as strangers (Yuval-Davis et al. 2005: 520-1). According to Yuval-Davis et al. (2005: 521) it is through such politics that population management policies and its exclusionary practices must be located.

Engaging with how discourses of suspicion are reproduced in police narratives on internal controls is thus a way to visualise the inherent boundary-making in politics of belonging. Boundaries and borders are not only a reflection of the power relations between “individuals, collectives and institutions” but are also a result of “subjective and situational processes” (Yuval-Davis et al. 2005: 521). Hence, while police officers are part of an institutional setting and guided by a legal framework, their individual agency should not be neglected. While citizenship signals membership, rights and duties, belonging is a ‘thicker’ term which includes the emotions that such membership evokes (Crowley 1999: 22; Yuval-Davis et al. 2005: 526). These emotions can be captured in individual and collective narratives of us and them, self and other, how the subjects perceive their position in the social world. Taking the body as an example, gender, social class and ethnicity/race all intersect and “produce markers of belonging and unbelonging” (Pettersson 2013: 419, my translation). However, this sense of belonging is activated through the experiences of exclusion rather than inclusion. In that sense, it is when the

perceived collective is deemed threatened that belonging becomes activated and “the individual, collective and institutional narratives of belonging become politicized” (Anthias 2002; Yuval-Davis et al. 2005: 526-8). The boundary-making of belonging figures within a political practice that exploits feelings of fear, mobilising people towards such exclusionary politics. Hence, in the case of internal controls of foreigners, such politics can be said to construct not only a homogenised ‘Swede’, but also a homogenised other in the shape of the foreigner. Internal and external security is thus constructed through exclusionary politics that are embodied in the figure of the ‘enemy within’ – the outsider inside, as well as in the figure of the foreigner (Amoore 2006: 338).

The figure of the ‘enemy within’ ties in with Ahmed’s (2000) theorization where she challenges the assumption that the stranger can be *anybody*, and sheds light on how the stranger is someone whom we have already identified in the very moment of our encounter. In that sense, the stranger is already familiar to us: “the figure of the stranger (...) is painfully familiar in that very strange(r)ness” (Ahmed 2000: 19). This echoes how policing by typology construct certain groups as less suspicious than others, a biased assessment that relies on a pre-determined figure of the suspicious subject of control (cf. Holmberg 1999). Recognising some people as *not belonging* sanctions the differentiation and enforcement of boundaries which requires somebody to signal estrangement, to not-be the nation space. As such, when identified as strangers within the nation space, they become those “whose proximity threatens the coherence of national identity” (Ahmed 2000: 100). The recognisability of strangers thus relies upon the assumption that some bodies can cause a threat to both property and person, where residents in a certain area may feel concerned about sharing public space with strangers, e.g. homeless people, [non-white] ‘immigrant’ youths, and drug addicts (Andersson 1990: 238; Ericsson 2006; Ahmed 2012: 22). Such vigilant behaviour among citizens is encouraged in the border regime, as seen in the dispersed nature of borders, where the citizen engages in risk management initiatives to report any behaviour deemed suspicious, becoming what Vaughan-Williams (2005; 2015) has termed “citizen-detectives”.

Similar acts of misrecognition and displacement of certain bodies are raised in Louis Althusser’s thesis on subjectivity, which he argues evokes misrecognition as the structuring ideological mechanism of public life. It is through this (mis)recognition that the state conditions its citizens with the choice of either

compliance or loss of social existence (Althusser 1970: 174–176; Iser 2013). Such ideological mechanism has, in his words, a function that:

‘recruits’ subjects among the individuals (it recruits them all), or ‘transforms’ the individual into subjects (...) by the very precise operation which I have called *interpellation* or *hailing*, and which can be imagined along the lines of the most commonplace everyday police (or other) hailing: ‘hey, you there!’” (1971: 162-163).

The act of hailing is linked to the differentiating principle within which the subject is recognised. Reading Habermas (1981; 1990), hailing can be seen as a *speech act* of participatory character, thus relating to individuals’ participation with, and interaction within, a discourse (Vollmer 2016: 7). Hence, returning to the practices of internal controls of foreigners, the act of the police hailing can be associated with how different bodies becomes subjected to discourses of suspicion and control. The act of hailing another constitutes the subject through its misrecognition, hence, the subject “becomes differentiated at the very same moment that they are constituted as such” (Ahmed 2000: 23).

Drawing on the Foucauldian notion of *bio power*, borders arguably exist wherever selective controls are performed, for example where *health* and *security* checks are conducted (Balibar 2002: 84). Returning to the example of how passports can figure as a state of acknowledgement, the relationship between some bodies and their passport is categorically mistrusted, which obstructs, interrupts and holds them back (Balibar 2002; Khosravi 2011). This resonate with the boundaries between what Amoore (2006) has termed “the trusted traveller” and the “untrusted traveller”. For the trusted traveller, the biometric submission firmly ends the control, while for the untrusted traveller, it marks the beginning of border negotiations (Amoore 2006: 32). Hence, from the perspective of mobility management, a passport does not only signify national belonging, but for some through their passport, the border becomes ‘an acknowledgment of his status’ (Balibar 2002: 83). The passport control thus eloquently illustrates the polysemic character of borders, as the ‘trusted traveller’ and “the untrusted traveller”, the one belonging and the stranger, will have two different experiences of bordering (Balibar 2002; Khosravi 2011; Rumford and Perkins 2015: 17).

Our way of understanding the locus of the borders hence needs to weave in the spatial negotiations between identity and strangeness. Hence, we need to interrogate how notions of belonging help structure who are perceived as a subject of control, as a suspected stranger.

## 3 Methodological Framework

This section is divided into three sections: first, the analytical framework of discourse analysis will be presented, which draws upon the Foucauldian concept of governmentality and a Butlerian understanding of performativity. Second, the research design and the material are presented, which consists of interviews with police officers on their experiences of internal controls of foreigners. Third, this is followed by a methodological discussion and limitations when engaging with interviews as a method of data collection.

### 3.1 Performing controls: discourse analysis as method

Within a Foucauldian tradition, disciplines and institutions can be understood as linked to discursive practices. Such practices both produce knowledge and constitute objects. Foucault defines discourse as “made up of a limited number of statements for which a group of conditions of existence can be defined” (Foucault 1972: 117). The statement is of relational character, hence, a statement must be related to an adjacent field for it to gain meaning. Statements are part of a “network” of other statements, where the correlations and connections between such otherwise dispersed proclamations construct what Foucault calls a “discursive formation” (Hansen 2000: 11; Foucault 2002: 41). Discourse can further be seen as a rule-bound system that imposes boundaries on that which gives meaning; hence knowledge and truth is created discursively (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 13). Foucault elaborates on this in his theory on *power/knowledge* where power within a discourse should be studied within social practices rather than seen as belonging to particular “individuals or the state or groups with particular interests” (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 13). Power should be seen as productive since power not only constitutes discourse, but the knowledge, bodies and subjectivities that figure within such discourse (Ibid.) As such, power shapes the conditions for our social world, where subjects are produced and attain their relationship to one another. Such conditions can be found in how ‘borders’ have become an institution in its

own (e.g. [border] police), with its particular subjects (e.g. ‘foreigners’) and practices (e.g. internal controls of foreigners). Power and knowledge are hence dependent on one another, since the foreigner is dependent on the perception of the nation and its borders in order to gain its deviant position towards the citizen.

The function of discourse analysis is, consequently, to examine how particular forms of knowledge take shape and how effects of such knowledge are created in discourse. It is to examine how meaning is ascribed discursively and what social consequences such meaning-making has (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 145). To engage with statements thus requires us to question how a particular statement emerges on the expense of other statements, and what social consequences such a choice carries (Foucault 1991: 59; 1972: 27-8; Hansen 2000: 12) While this thesis analyses statements voiced by individual police officers in an interview setting, such statements should not be seen as independent utterance of that individual. In a Foucauldian sense, the speaking subject should rather be understood as constituted by discourse, where the discourse “defines the possible position of speaking subjects” (Foucault 1972: 122; Hansen 2000: 13). Butler (1997: 34) clarifies how the subject speaks through discourse in an example of racist speech:

The subject who speaks hate speech is clearly responsible for such speech, but that subject is rarely the originator of that speech. Racist speech works through the invocation of convention; it circulates, and though it requires the subject for its speaking, it neither begins nor ends with the subject who speaks (...).

When reality is represented in a certain way, it not only constitutes subjects and objects in particular ways, but also inflicts boundaries on what is deemed true or false. In the case of internal controls of foreigners, a certain representation of reality imposes boundaries between ‘foreigners’ and ‘Swedes’, ‘desirables’ and ‘undesirables’ (Yuval-Davis et al. 2005: 520), which in the case of foreigner controls affect who is controlled and who is not. Thus, discursive representations of reality have social implications (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 145). Discourse analysis does not have one single method of conduct, but rather different research styles that aligns with its social ontology (Howarth 2007). It is here important to note that discourse analysis does not strive to ‘get behind the discourse’, or figure out what is *really* said in interviews. Rather the idea is that there is ‘no reality’ but

discourse, why discourse is the subject of analysis (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2000: 28).

To make sense of internal controls of foreigners, I will here draw on the Foucauldian concept ‘governmentality’, and complement it with Butler’s (2006) understanding of ‘performativity’. Foucault defines governmentality as “conduct of conduct”, ranging from the governing of the self to the governing of others (Lemke 2000: 2f). Governmentality thus includes:

the institutions, procedures, actions, and reflections that have populations as object. It exceeds the issue of sovereignty and complicates the question of control. It relates the power and administration of the state to the subjugation and subjectivation of individuals. It relies on political economy and policing technologies. (...) it has enriched our understanding of the subtle and complex games involved in the “biopolitics of otherness” (Fassin 2001a): a politics of borders and boundaries, temporality and spatiality, states and bureaucracies, detention and deportation, asylum and humanitarianism (...) (Fassin 2011: 214).

Butler draws on governmentality and performativity to explore the institutional and discursive practices and strategies of ‘the war on terror’ (2004: 52). While terror and internal control of foreigners are two separate issues, they both play on discourses of fear and suspicion, where stricter border controls can be seen as an effect of this fear. This can be seen in the increased mobility management in Sweden that followed the influx of refugees during the autumn 2015 (Butler 2004; Yuval-Davis et al. 2005; Vaughan-Williams 2009; Khosravi 2011; SFS 2015: 1074). Hence, examining the ways in which the Swedish police perform internal controls of foreigners and how such practices govern bodies, it is commonly argued that discourses of suspicion, fear and hostility marginalises the bodies that are associated with such distrust (Aradau 2004; Butler 2006; Huysmans 2005; Neal 2008). Combining performativity and governmentality works to visualise the institutional practices that figure to “legitimate extra-legal practices through the repetition of pseudo-legal categories”, as seen in the category of ‘foreigner’ (Neal 2008: 44-5).

The concept of performativity in Butlerian terms was first developed as a means to critically question norms of gender intelligibility (Butler 1999). In her analytics of governmentality, performativity is used to explore how transformed modalities of power are constituted, and how forms of relational subjectivity are produced



through such modalities (Neal 2008: 47-8). As such, relating to how citizens in the US come to see themselves in terms of ‘foot soldiers’ in the war against terrorism, who “stared down, watched, hounded and monitored” (Butler 2004: 77), the Arab population within the US, similar traits can be detected in the practice of internal control of foreigners in the Swedish context, where citizens are prone to report people to the police (Leander 2014). Internal controls of foreigners are thus a clear example of performativity and subject production as processes of governmentality: “managing’ a population is thus not only a process through which regulatory power produces a set of subjects. It is also the process of their de-subjectification, one with enormous political and legal consequences” (Butler 2004: 98). (De)subjectification relates back to Althusser’s work on how the ideological subject is constituted through the act of *hailing* or *interpellation*, in which the discourse appeals to the individual as a subject, and to an individuals’ participation with, and interaction within, a discourse (Vollmer 2016: 7). Methodologically speaking, performativity gives specific attention to repetitive and iterative practices of boundary-making, how boundaries (and borders) are established and fixed. When analysing how security subjects are produced, a performativity lens investigates the reiterations of practices that positions certain objects and subjects as potential threats (Aradau 2015: 70). To successfully analyse performativity hence involves ‘unpacking reiterations’, which means the repeated practices that give boundaries a sense of fixity. In order to study how discourses of suspicion are represented in police narratives, the following questions have been posed to the material:

- How are the internal controls of foreigners articulated?
- How is the ‘foreigner’ projected in the narratives?
- How is the controlled subject defined in the police statements?
- How is ‘reason to assume’ defined in the statements?
- How is suspicion articulated? Is there any discrepancy between places/bodies/situations?
- In what ways are un/belonging represented in the statements, what does such representation include/exclude through its categorisation?
- What knowledge is produced through their statements?
- Is there a consistency between the police officers in their projection of controls and suspicion?

Through the questions above, I will make visible the discourses that arise in the police officer's narratives on the distinguishing practice between the 'foreigner' and Swedish citizen in internal controls of foreigners.

### 3.2 The interviews and interviewees: research design and material

Methodology captures the considerations of "epistemological assumptions, ontological perspectives, ethical responsibilities and method choices" that structures the principles of our research (Aradau et al. 2015: 59). The empirical material for the study consists of interviews with police officers, since I am interested in their personal narratives on conducting internal controls of foreigners. Interview-based studies in "empirically and theoretically well-trodden grounds" do allow broader generalisations from an individual to the structural level. This is however dependent on the researcher to continually carry out recontextualisation so that the case is prevailing through out the analysis, while simultaneously relating to other 'cases'. (Crouch and McKenzie 2006: 489-91, see also Yin 2007: 28).

Guided by Steinar Kvale (2006; 2007), the qualitative semi-structured interview seeks to study and understand the interviewees' social world, through their own perspectives and words. Using interviews as a method is a way of accessing depictions and reflections of the informants' everyday work (Kvale 2006: 484). The interviews have been of semi-structured character, which means that they are informed by an interview schedule consisting of a predefined sequence of themes and questions. This approach offers the researcher greater flexibility to ask supplement questions and to deviate from the interview schedule to follow up on subjects introduced by the interviewees than with other interview forms. Another strength of the semi-structured interview is that it allows the researcher to be sensitive to the nuances of how the interviewees experience and perceive different events (Bryman 2008: 415), while giving the interviewee greater freedom to reflect, depict, and respond to the issues brought to the table (Kvale 2007).

The interview schedule is divided into six themes in order to address different issues concerning 'internal foreigner controls'. Starting off with i) descriptive questions concerning the police officer's background, how a regular work week may look like, work climate and questions concerning how an internal foreigner

control is conducted. This is then followed by ii) interpreting and theoretical questions concerning how one delineates *who* to control: ‘reason to assume, how to utilize the police gaze, and how one delineates suspicious bodies (connecting to the theoretical framework of Policing bodies), and iii) *where/who* perform controls relating to the theoretical framework of “Policing borders”: where are controls conducted, are there any ‘effective’ places for controls, intelligence based controls, partnership controls etc. These themes are further complemented by questions concerning iv) the process after a control, v) the political climate relating to the police practicing policy, and then vi) ethnic profiling/ethnic discrimination (see appendix 1).

### 3.2.1 Snowballing: Accessing interviewees

The interview selection is based on *snowballing*, which is relevant when accessing hidden and hard-to-reach informants. The strategy is to identify a sample that mirrors important resources in the field, and then have the participants inform the researcher of other potential participants of relevance to the study (Bryman 2008). It has proved difficult to access police officers for interviews due to the politically charged issue on internal controls of foreigners, why snowballing has played an important part in accessing the field. Bearing in mind that the snowball sampling method has been critiqued for its homogenous selection since it relies on people’s social networks and thus fails to be representative, I have used different networks to ensure heterogeneity among the interviewees. As such, while I can affect the sampling in ways that increase the heterogeneity, the police officers are still affecting the empirical base in ways that opens some doors, and firmly closes others by referring to people that they value as important (Davis 2008: 78).

I was able to access my first interviewees through contacting the media relations departments within different regional police offices. Among the seven regions, ‘Region Bergslagen’ was the only one that decided not to participate, which was motivated by lack of resources. This thesis thus includes interviewees from six different regions: East, West, North, South, Mid and Stockholm (Polissamordningen 2015). All but one of the interviews have been conducted face-to-face within the interviewees’ own region, while one was a phone interview. I have interviewed eleven police officers in total; four officers working with

community policing, and eight working within the border police. I have mainly focused on the border police, since they have the overall responsibility and the most experience with internal control of foreigners. The border police are also the unit responsible for educating other police units on border control-related issues, why their experience and knowledge can be seen as formative of other police officer's modes of policing such issues. I have also included local police officers in the interviews to further examine how police officers outside of the border police experience performing such controls and visualise such practices outside of the realm of the border police. The selection of interviewees includes a variety of officers in relation to aspects of age, geographic dispersion and positions within the police. However, of the eleven interviewees, only two are women. Furthermore, two of the interviewees are part of an ethnic minority, while the remaining nine are part of the white majority population in Sweden. There has been no intention to make comparisons between the categories, but rather to have spread within the categories to avoid homogeneity in the sample.

The interviews spanned between 1 and 2,5 hours in length and consists of approximately 21 hours of interview material in total. I've used a dictation microphone during 10 of the 11 interviews and transcribed the material. All of the interviews were conducted in Swedish, thus when I quote the police officers, it is my own translation of the interviews. I've had two persons checking my translations to ensure a better correspondence and give justice to the statements. However, discrepancies between the original quotations and my translations are inevitable, and thus important to keep in mind. One of the interviews were dictated on computer during the interview and was not recorded, as requested by the interviewee. The police officers participated in the interviews with the insurance of anonymity. As such, all names of the police officers given in the analysis are fictional. Furthermore, the regions have been mixed between the interviewees, and positions been left out since these could figure as identifying factors otherwise.

### 3.3 Methodological considerations and limitations

Interviews have been important in interrogating how discourses of suspicion are reproduced in the internal controls of foreigners in the Swedish context. After the

interviews were conducted, they were transcribed and coded in a data analysis programme. This has been beneficial as coding, memos and data linking are supported. It has also contributed to an efficient overview of the data and enabled a detailed analysis of the text. In an initial state of the text coding, the themes arising from the interview schedule was here used as the framework for the coding's, while deviations, repetitions and silences were structured as sub-categories. An example of such coding is how the theme 'Reason to assume' from the interview schedule has been coded as 1) Distinguishing factors, with sub-categories; 1.1) Behaviour, 1.1.1) Nervousness, 1.2) Clothing, 1.3) Language, 1.4) Appearance 1.4.1) Ethnic markers, 1.4.1.1) Black men. The following step has then been to connect and interrelate these codes to other relevant themes arising, as for example 1.4.1.1 (Black men) relates to a gendered and racialised discourse of control.

Conducting research on internal controls of foreigners in the aftermath of the REVA-debate, left many officers hesitant to talk freely on this closely related topic. During the interviews, the police officers were reluctant to talk about control situations or terms of examples on a concrete level. This has been motivated by a cautiousness to not violate the Public Access to Information and Secrecy Act (SFS 2009:400). One police officer declined to participate in this study in reference to the secrecy act, where investigating border police work was perceived by him as violating the law. In that sense, the interviews mainly consist of abstract examples given by the interviewees. However, despite that the interviewees were well aware of the limits of the debate, and the legal boundaries that limited the opportunity to go deeper into individual controls, they still gave a rich material to analyse.

The reluctance to go into detail on internal controls of foreigners reflect what Oscar Pripp (2011) refers to as 'third presence' (tredje närvaro). This refers to how the interviewee turns to more diplomatic self-representations or avoid certain subjects due to a consciousness of an 'invisible public'. This was evident when police officers talked about the Secrecy Act and when the subject of discrimination and racism was brought up during the interviews, subjects that provoked counter-images and disclaimers from the interviewees. However, I had expected a greater constraint from them when talking about ethnic profiling. Here, even my own body was under interrogation, where one of the police officers took me as an example of someone 'suspicious'. Having an Indian heritage hence affected the interview setting in the sense that I was seen as part of the subject ('foreigners') I was

studying. This ties in to a postmodernist understanding of interview as method, the interview is seen as a journey in itself, which “leads to interviewing and analysis as intertwined phases of knowledge construction, with an emphasis on the narrative to be told to an audience” (Kvale 2007: 20). Hence, deviating from the epistemological assumption that knowledge is “already out there” waiting to be discovered.

## 4 Analysis: Controlling ‘the foreigner’

Internal controls of foreigners are a way of managing a population, and governing the movement within a nation. The police practices of internal foreigner controls are guided by the Aliens Act (SFS 2005:716), thus the police act within a legal framework when performing controls. A subject during the interviews is how the police officer Samuel perceives the internal controls of foreigners as an *assignment* given by the nation. The control practice thus becomes the police officer’s duty and responsibility to fulfil:

(...) I have a job that Sweden is telling me that I should attend to under a set of given conditions and with the support of the law. I’m still the one that somehow interprets how to do it and when to do it [the internal controls of foreigners].

While Samuel acknowledges this ‘responsibility’, he still emphasises his agency in conducting the controls as a matter of interpretation. This privilege of interpretation is depicted as enabled by the grey zones in the legislation, by the police officer Göran: “Legislation is often very much a greyscale, a grey zone and with a lot of interpretations, just because they [the politicians] have tried to weigh in so many different factors”. It becomes evident in the interviews that the police officers perceive their work as guided by a political and legal discourse, where the ruling party and supporting parties will affect the directives given to the Police Authority, and hence the individual police officer. This is exemplified by Göran, who depicts the police practices as dependent on how the political “wind blows”:

About a year ago, it was all like ‘now we’ll take it easy, it shouldn’t be so much [controls]. We should not upset people’. But now it’s been completely different. Now the border police get more resources and that depends on how the atmosphere has changed. Had it been massive criticism from the media and such about our controls today, we would never have gained the political support that exists right now with the increase of resources (Göran).

While the political discourse informs the practices of internal controls of foreigners, the police officer Christoffer talks about how politicians tend to criticize the police, although the politicians have “drafted the law that the police are working with”. He then follows up with “we should not engage in politics; we just adapt to policy”. However, while the law constructs the framework that guides the police in their work, it is important to emphasise that its up to the police to practice the law, and thus one could say that the police in some sense *are* the law, “[t]hey materialise it” (Ericsson 2006: 253, my translation). Yet it seems like the police’ understanding of internal controls of foreigners is characterised by an ambiguity of how to interpret and practice the law. While one of the police commissioners at the border police, Karl, clearly states that “outreach controls are illegal”, the definition of what is deemed as ‘outreach’ is unclear. As for example, Göran first states that their controls are “100 percent intelligence based” and not “pure outreach, just because – that’s forbidden!”, but later gives an example where ‘creating information’ by visiting ‘foreign’ stores is seen as a legitimate practice:

(...) when we’ve received information that there is something [going on], or that we ourselves have created information by visiting, for example, these foreign stores. We go in and we’ll shop a little bit for breakfast. Then we look: what kind of person is working here? And then we can see - they are so typical - they are dirty, worn clothes, they look alienated, they don’t belong there.

Even when the police provoke situations by “creating their own information” as suggested by Göran, they all agree that a control is never conducted without the police having a juridical ground for it, meaning a ‘reason to assume’. However, for several of the police officers, reason to assume is seen as a process, where provoking a control can be one way of initiating such a process. As an example, Samuel states that he might not have had enough of a reason to assume when he starts off a contact/control, but that he acquires his reason as the interaction progresses: “that’s usually what you do, you start a ball, the ball gets bigger and clearer and then you say ‘but now I have a reason to assume’”. ‘Reason to assume’ is further projected as “part of a puzzle” (Pontus) or a “thread you start to unravel” (Christoffer). This indicates an “a priori”-attitude toward the subject of control, echoing the police biased assessments addressed by Holmberg (1999) in what he



calls “the power of suspicion”. The police’s predetermined response both evokes and elicits the behaviour they expect to find in the suspicious body (Ericsson 2006: 256). The legal framework of internal control of foreigners leaves a grey zone for the individual police officer to determine what is deemed “reason enough”. Returning to how Göran delineates the ‘foreign store’ as a locus of control, he identifies the ‘dirty clothes’ as an example of estrangement, of someone not belonging. Such acts of misrecognition echoes Luis Althusser’s thesis on subjectivity, where the respectable citizen is produced in contrast to the dirty, misplaced, “worn” other (Althusser 1971; Iser 2013).

While the police are not allowed to carry out internal control of foreigners solely on the basis of a person’s perceived ‘foreign appearance’, name or language, the terminology does not forbid the police from building on a person’s appearance, but instead requires the police to build or strengthen their suspicion on ‘something else’ (Lars; John). What the additional “something else” might be is however left unidentified, yet “the foreigners behaviour and social interaction” are considered adding to “reason to assume” (Tillsynsrapport 2014: 14). One of the border police commissioner emphasises the uncertainty with ‘reason to assume’ as follows:

The legislation isn’t a problem, except what’s a good reason to assume? It’s very difficult since it’s a model that doesn’t exist in any other legislation. It’s quite unique to internal controls of foreigners. (...) I think it’s a bit unfortunate that it has a rigidity ... perhaps it would be easier for the individual to relate to [otherwise], and it’s in general difficult for us who’re the decision makers (Lena).

According to Lena, ‘reason to assume’ is unlike any other model within the police. This is reiterated by Simon, who states that the police have no burden of proof in foreigner matters (utlänningsärenden), “they can carry out a control and then it’s the [controlled] person himself who must prove his identity”. Hence, the Aliens Act not only provides no burden of proof on the police officer other than a ‘reason to assume’ that no one seems to be able to define, it also seems to stand as a model that deviates from other regulatory models within the police. The grey zones in policing are highlighted in the quotes of Lena and Simon, since they visualise the ambiguous relationship between the police and the law. These statements also capture how the law in itself demands of the police officers to make use of such grey zones, since it in itself is insufficient in guiding the individual police officers.

If not even a border police commissioner (such as Lena) understands how to make use of ‘reason to assume’ or the Aliens act, who is then supposed to practice such a policy correctly?

## 4.1 The Police gaze

While ‘reason to assume’ is the legal framework for internal controls of foreigners, that is the probative value that must be achieved for a control, the interviewees often refer to different tools to achieve such ‘reason to assume’. One such tool is ‘the police gaze’, through its discerning principles, such gaze is supposed to aid the police in distinguishing between the respectable citizens, and the criminal (Finstad 2000: 60-2). Yet, during the interviews, several of the police officers confuse the ‘reason to assume’ with the ‘police gaze’, as the dominant discourse for the controls is discerning deviating bodies in the Swedish setting. Rather, the police gaze is constructed as analogous with ‘reason to assume’, it is a gaze, a gut feeling (Christoffer), a ‘tough nose’ (busnäsa) with which one can “sniff it out, a tough” (buse) (Lars).

When you’ve seen this phenomenon a number of times, you’ll be trained to look for it here, you’ll see “oh well, here we have one of those”. If I go out there watching, I take a turn at the main station, I can almost say in advance that “that person probably doesn’t have a [residence] permit”. So I know what person I’m going to go after (Göran).

Göran’s statement resonates with how Ahmed (2000) sees the stranger as someone who is already recognized “a figure that is painfully familiar in that very strange(r)ness” (2000: 19). The police officer states that he is able to walk the main station hall and identify bodies out of place, further referring to the refugees as “a very special category, extremely easy to distinguish”. When asked to delineate how they can determine someone’s strangeness by just looking at them, all of the interviewees fall into the same line of reasoning:

It’s very vague and I don’t like to talk about gut feeling, but it’s a gut feeling, often you might not know what it was that made you react (...). You see a car in the corner of your eye and [think] “I should check that out” and you don’t always know why you do it. But it’s

a gut feeling that you follow. You've discovered something but you may not be aware of what you've seen (Christoffer).

The gut feeling hence allows the police to conduct a control without being aware of what initially sparked the reaction. Similarly, the police Pontus states that “you feel a buzz in the stomach”, a feeling you might share with your colleague that causes both to react “we both react, but we don't know what it is”. Hence, the police gaze does not only figure as an individual ability, but also function as a shared understanding within the police collective (Finstad 2000: 115-7; Görtz 2015: 97). Ana follows up on this issue, saying: “you state [to your colleague] ‘I got a feeling, I want to control this person’. It's never questioned, but you should trust that feeling, you should develop it”. As a shared practice, the ambiguity and vagueness is projected as accepted as part of a knowledge acquired through experience. What – or who – is perceived as suspicious is thus determined by the police officer's subjective interpretation based on experience or prejudice. One of the police officers does, however, question the grey zones when interpreting what is deemed “reason to assume”. Here, he differentiates between the information given by different police regions, stating that the information he got on internal controls of foreigners in Malmö differs from the information he gets in region North:

The description that we got in Malmö, it was good, but mentions that there has to be something more tangible - but what's that? An incredible amount of interpretation is included in that. (...) And it's then easily transferred so that the primary focus is put on ethnicity, language, and then trying to find a reason [to assume] (...) You've this person who you want to control, then you'll find a reason, it can be anything - he went to the right when he saw me, he turned around and looked nervous (John).

Even though John here questions how ‘reason to assume’ is used as a flexible framework, he repeats similar stories as the other police officers on how to spot suspicious bodies which privileges this ‘gut feeling’ over the standard of proof inherent in ‘reason to assume’. The interviewees depict the people they control as distinguishing themselves from the crowd, yet what makes them “stand out” is left undefined. Several of the police officers take the example of public transportation halls as places where ‘foreigners’ reside, and all share the belief that they are easy to spot since “they stand out significantly” (Göran), “they are confused”

(Christoffer), “they are nervous” (John), and “they have big bags” (Karl). All these behaviours function as deviations that strengthen the police officers’ suspicions, and figure as their demarcation lines between the foreigner and the Swedish citizen. One of the police officer’s says that you must work as a police officer for at least six months to get “the instinct” (Karl), that you need to “rehears for a long time” (Ana), while another officer views it as something you cannot avoid, “you get the gaze whether you want to or not” (Christoffer), as it is an inherent part of policing. When asked to give an example of the police gaze in practice, Göran illustrates it as follows:

You might just walk up to ‘test’ [the person], you lay your eyes at the person, who directly gets it “this must be the police” and you see it right away on the reaction, it’s an escape behaviour (Göran).

The police gaze captures the profiling practice in policing in that it delineates different ways of acquiring a sense of ‘reason to assume’. While such ‘gaze’ might be prevailing in other forms of policing, it becomes of particular relevance in the example of internal controls of foreigners since it often becomes synonymous with ‘reason to assume’. The fact that all police officers in this study, border police as well as community police, refer to ‘gut feeling’, ‘tough nose’ and ‘gaze’ as a knowledge that guides their work, but that is hard to explain needs to be emphasised. If such knowledge and experience are difficult to explain, it also implicates our ways of critically question, interrogate or explain such procedures that can guarantee the rule of law (See also Östlund 2013).

On the other side of the police gaze, several of the interviewees depict how they perceive that the criminal subject has its own ‘gaze’, a gaze that I have here termed ‘the cop gaze’. This refers to how the police perceive that ‘criminals’ manages to spot civilian police officers or even police officers off duty: “you walk around with the police gaze when you're off duty and somehow this exudes in the opposite direction, because police officers dress in a certain way at their leisure time and behave in a certain way as well. So there’s a cop gaze too” (Viktor). This is reiterated by Samuel who states “I think that just like I see those who are of interest to me, they see me even though I’m out shopping with the family - they can see that I’m police”. Whether the cop gaze is true or not, it becomes evident that the police

officers feel that they embody their profession, as police officers “behave” and “dress in a certain way”. As such, the police become a unified collective that are all equally identifiable similar to the unified category of ‘foreigners’. Similarly, if the police perceive someone as avoiding them, civilian clothes or not, that will immediately signify a criminal behaviour and provoke a control. And if the person who was “nervous” or “avoiding” the police is a citizen or has a residence permit, this behaviour is still deemed as reflecting a criminal behaviour: “is there anything else? He might have drugs somewhere, but we have not found it” (Göran), explaining that ‘they’ could have hidden drugs nearby, and that their nervousness is because “we [might] manage to find it”.

In that sense, the ‘cop gaze’ also becomes a feeling that is hard to grasp in words, since it is dependent on how the police perceive that they are subjected to someone else’s gaze. It does however visualise the delicateness of a control based on behaviour – the perception of an avoiding behaviour may provoke a control, as well as a perceived ‘confronting’ behaviour when met by someone else’s gaze. This too becomes problematic when relating back to the unique model of internal controls of foreigners as previously mentioned in relation to the Aliens Act. One may question whether the police gaze is the very embodiment of the grey zones inherent in foreigner controls, as this builds upon a gut feeling that is given precedence in the legal regulations. While no police officer manages to neither define ‘reason to assume’ nor make a distinction between the police gaze, it is seen as a legitimate practice on how to delineate suspicious ‘foreigners’ from citizens.

## 4.2 From Territory to Mobility

While policing as a form of social governance, arguably, can be seen as having moved beyond being an ‘exclusive state affair’ to now involve “governmental, supranational, market and voluntary agencies” (Peterson 2013: 15, my translation), borders have arguably developed in a similar dispersed direction. This section will examine how different agents have come to engage in constructing and reconfiguring borders and as such governing bodies within the nation (Ahmed 2000; Amore and de Goede 2008; Khosravi 2011).

A common denominator for the border police interviewees is how workplace controls are a recurring feature in their work, either in the shape of intelligence based controls, or structured controls in partnership with other governmental institutions such as the Fire and Rescue Service, the Swedish Tax Agency, and the Social Insurance Office. These concerted efforts can be on any authority's initiative, and hence does not need to be informed by any specific 'reason to assume' other than the prospect of finding someone in a collaborative effort:

Usually it's the fire department that wants to make a fire safety check. [It may be] the social insurance agency, if they have been tipped off on people working there who are reported as being on sick leave - then they go in first. The tax agency, if they get a tip saying this entrepreneur tampers with the taxes, then they go in and then the whole tail [of agencies] go after. Once we're inside, every authority focuses on their own work (Karl).

This resonates with how Peterson (2013: 14-5) depicts the police authority as dependent on other societal agents to maintain control and governance. Such societal agents can further, according to the interviewees, be found in shipping companies (Karl), public transportation personnel (Samuel), fellow citizens, compatriots (Göran) or even social media such as Facebook (John). One of the police officers outlined how the shipping companies, when reaching a harbour in region South, gathered all the individuals they assumed were refugees in the restaurant for the police to interrogate (Lars).

Another police officer talks about how the police in Trelleborg had developed a form of partnership with the shipping companies long before the carrier responsibility was extended to them with the new law that came into effect on 4 January 2016:

We've contact with shipping companies in Trelleborg in the sense that they tell us when the boat departs, how many prospective [non-EU citizens] are on board just to be able to plan how much people we'll bring. (...) It's a deal that the commander in Trelleborg has made with the shipping companies, there is nothing that has come down from the top, because it's the Trelleborg policemen attending to that bone. (...) Shipping companies have no obligation to do so, but they've embraced that we've to know this (...) And the police don't demand the shipping company to do that, they aren't included in the carrier responsibility (Karl).

The shipping company hence did not have any legal requirement before January 2016 to tip the police off, yet they have developed a relationship in which the police rely on the company to inform in order for the police to adjust their resources. For the police to initiate such collaboration with a shipping company echoes how transportation agents increasingly have become sites of intensified political struggles over issues of mobility (Amoore 2006; Vaughan-Williams 2009; Squire 2011: 15). Such partnerships need to be under scrutiny when interrogating the agency of performing border control practices outside of the realm of the state. It is here important to stress that transportation companies are required to conduct ID-controls on trains, ferries and buses when crossing the Swedish frontier since the law came into force in January 2016. It is noteworthy that while the police officers all gave very coherent statements during the interviews, in this legal matter, no one could with certainty describe neither the carrier responsibility under this new migration regime, nor what should be understood as an unregulated partnership with transporters or not.

Societal agents involved in border policing can be found in train personnel, where several of the police officers refer to such collaborations as an important part of police work, especially after the border controls at the frontiers were reintroduced. Lars here depicts the relationship as based on the stationmasters own profiling “we communicate with the engineer who has been in contact with the stationmaster on the train, and says “our feeling is that the carriage has many refugees”, and John describes how the relationship with the train staff is strengthened when the police are given reliable assessments. Such situations seem to “strengthen our understanding of each other, and I give them a couple of tips ‘are you doing like this and like this? How were you thinking there?’ We learn from each other (...)” (John). This behaviour hence constructs the train personnel as quasi-assistants in policing, where successful targeting of individuals leads the police to further instruct the train staff to enhance such profiling behaviour. While the train personnel are responsible to carry out ID-controls, they are not required to profile commuters. Göran further talks about more sophisticated methods in the train personnel’s distinguishing practices regarding suspicious bodies:

It has been some kind of advance notice when the train attendants... and sometimes there have been dialogue policemen on the trains, so you had something like an advance notice that “there is about 60 people on the train”, based on that they have bought a ticket with unknown identity, so to speak, they haven’t been able to identify themselves. That’s a hint that these people are likely to be in this category. It’s just to get a kind of preliminary idea of approximately how many people on the train that is of this category [illegal immigrants] (Göran).

The train staff is described as distinguishing between those who have identified themselves, and those with ‘an unknown identity’. However, the example given by Göran refers to the time period before the ID-controls were institutionalised, hence resonating with situational initiatives rather than institutionalised practice. This further reiterates how certain bodies are projected as suspicious not only by control institutions, but also by citizens (Ahmed 2000), while simultaneously reproducing ID-documents and personal identity number as the dominant frame of citizenship. Someone who either lacks or fails to present such documents risks being perceived as a foreigner and thus becoming a subject of control. This line of reasoning is common within policing; “You control everyone who cannot produce valid Swedish ID documents, that turns into an internal control of foreigners” (Pontus) and is further stated by Lars who concludes that controls on trains first and foremost are conducted on the basis of ID documents; “all must pass there and then you have a policeman standing and checking ID documents”. While this practice depicts ID documents as the dominant frame for citizenship when the police conduct their controls, it becomes evident that it is a method that has been picked up by other societal agents in their everyday work. This is even more evident in the light of the regulations on ID-controls, in which ID documents are the focus of the control (SFS 2015:1074).

Before the new law came into force, the train staff had neither any political requirements laid upon them to participate in internal controls of foreigners, nor any responsibility towards the police, yet they actively participated in governing the public transportation spaces in which they figure. This aligns well with how Vaughan-Williams claims that the borders are becoming “as mobile as the mobilities that are crossing them” (2010: 14-5). Hence, the mobility management functions unevenly in the ways it channels flows of people (Vaughan-Williams 2010; Copper and Rumford 2011). While the traditional borders are perceived as



easily identified based on the image of an explicit immobility and permanence i.e. in the form of ‘walls’ and ‘fences’, the mobile borders are diffused to the extent that they are no longer familiar, recognisable or detectable in the traditional sense (Rumford 2008b). This mobility management not only arises in the internal control conducted by the police, but is subtly diffused into an everyday practice when practiced by societal agents such as train staff or shipping company personnel as these groups traditionally have not been guided by any formal rules or laws, but worked on their own initiatives. With the new migration law in place, these actors are however responsible of carrying out ID-controls before allowing people to travel with them. Though this responsibility does not involve such actors partaking in actual profiling (SFS 2015: 1073; 1074). Such law does however institutionalise the dispersed nature of borders, where border controls reach beyond agencies of the state to also include other actors (Balibar 2002; Rumford 2013: 170; Cooper et al. 2014).

Internal controls of foreigners can also take place on airports. This is exemplified by Lars in how border controls are performed when an airplane arrives to Sweden from a country outside of the Schengen area, but not if the plane departed from within Schengen. Instead of a passport control in the latter case, the police elect to perform internal controls of foreigners after the customs checkpoint, often based on tips from other nations’ border police:

I think the hit ratio is much higher [than other places]. But that’s because you work on tips, where Arlanda sometimes gets calls from Italy. When I worked there were many Eritreans who came from Italy and then the Italian airport tipped Arlanda airport that “now twenty Eritreans are coming who probably do not have the right to be in Sweden” (Lars).

The Eritrean body thus fails to pass as a ‘trusted traveller’, to use Amoore’s conceptualisation, and thus fails to represent a trustworthy resemblance to the frames of belonging (Yuval-Davis et. al 2005; Amoore 2006; Pettersson 2013). The united police practices over national borders as in the case of the Italian border police can be seen as part of a larger historical practice of ‘risk pooling’. Different authorities group together to profile ‘high risk’ bodies, and to ensure that this body passes through the security checks. Amoore (2006: 342) states that for a ‘trusted traveller’, the biometric submission firmly ends the control, while for the untrusted

traveller, it marks the beginning of border negotiations (Amoore 2006). Hence, from the perspective of mobility management, a passport does not only signify national belonging, but for some through their passport, the border becomes ‘an acknowledgment of his status’ (Balibar 2002: 83). The passport control thus eloquently illustrates the polysemic character of borders, as the ‘trusted traveller’ and “the untrusted traveller” will have two different experiences of bordering (Rumford and Perkins 2015: 17).

Another border police officer diffuses the distinction between internal controls of foreigners and passport controls, in which he states that “even if we take out people [from the queue to the passport control], its a passport control, we’re allowed to do a control” (Karl). The police in the previous example said that the internal foreigner controls conducted at airports were only possible in cases where the passport control is not employed. In this instance, the border police use similar profiling practices in order to make the passport control ‘more efficient’. However, when asked to explain in more detail, Karl states that a regular passport control in airports is conducted in the ‘passport cage’, and constitutes a first line of control. A second line of control is only conducted when a passport control gives an indication in the system. Depending on the situation, these second line controls can involve everything from checking a visa to a full investigation into the reason the person has travelled to Sweden, the person’s financial situation etc. Hence, by profiling people in the queue to the passport control, the police skip the first line of control and jumps right into the second line of control. ‘If lucky’, the police officer tells me, the suspicious body is picked from the end of a long queue, and when cleared of any suspicion – able to move into the front of the queue, as if the border police are doing them a favour.

The experience of being picked out in the passport control at the airport is outlined by Shahram Khosravi in his book “The Illegal Traveller” (2011). Here, he illustrates the quasi-interrogation where he was stripped of his status as a Swedish citizen “because of my face” (2011: 97). While his blond fellow travellers were allowed to pass, Khosravi was left having to convince the border police of his legal status. Both bordering and policing are selective and targeted as shown both in Khosravi’s example, and the explicit selective targeting in the border control as explained by Karl. This illustrates the duality of the passport control as outlined by Balibar where some bodies end up entangled in the border practice, as the border

becomes a point of bodily encounter, a site he needs to (re)pass. At the airport, it's the first line control, the second line control, and the diffused lines in-between and outside of that which causes boundaries to be drawn even where they are not formally acknowledged (Balibar 2002: 83; Khosravi 2011).

When asked if there are any public places that are seen as free zones, one of the border police officers asks "is this a trick question?" (John). While there seems to be a common understanding among the police to "not actively work towards schools or hospitals" (Christoffer) or religious buildings "we would not go into a mosque or a church" (Lena), though there are no formal restrictions when it comes to public places in which controls may be conducted. This is stated explicitly by Christoffer who states that:

I can do [a control] anywhere. I can do it in a restaurant, for example. I can do it in a house, or in a car, in traffic - I [can] stop a car with people who have foreign nationality. It can take place in the city, on the street. It can be in almost any environment.

A control can thus take place anywhere; no space is inviolable. While airports have figured as a conventional border (control) sites (Vaughan-Williams 2009: 19, 23), the police narratives on internal controls of foreigners visualise how such policing isn't bound to a solitary space, but rather takes place whenever the police may encounter a subject they perceive as suspicious. In that sense, borders increasingly figure as mechanisms "to control mobility rather than territory" (Dürschmidt and Taylor 2007: 56, in Rumford and Perkins 2015:18). The mobility management can thus be seen as an inherent part of internal controls of foreigners. This is not the least evident when the police officers exemplified how they delineate suspicious or potential 'foreigners' from citizens. Here, bodily characteristics and behaviour are seen as guiding such suspicion, hence the control is shifted onto different bodies rather than fixed sites. In the interviews, three distinct themes were reiterated in relation to issues of bodies and mobility, as will be exemplified in the section on "embodied borders".

## 4.3 Embodied borders

Perhaps the most concentrated expression of mobile and mobility dependent borders, is the idea of the biopolitical border in which the human body itself is rendered a prime location of border control (Cooper & Perkins 2015: 15).

The biopolitical border signifies how the body has become a site for inscription for border politics, in how states control bodies and lives of populations through regulations, interventions and mobility management (Amoore 2006: 338; Vaughan-Williams 2009). This has been exemplified in the section “From territory to mobility” where airports, train stations and other public spaces all are sites where controls may be conducted, with the common denominator that they are all places with large flow of people.

Recurring in the interviews is how different characteristics are attributed to the ‘citizen’, constructing the ‘citizen’ as the ‘foreigner’s’ antithesis. While there is no explicit definition of who is deemed a ‘foreigner’ in the Aliens Act, it is however stated that the “foreigner refers to someone who is not a Swedish citizen” (RPSFS 2011:4 §1). While the legal definition distinguishes two categories: citizens and foreigners, the practical categorisation enforced by the police officers is broader. Here, there is also a distinction made between forms of acknowledged citizenry. The Schengen agreement constructs citizenship to also include Europeans, hence the ‘foreigner’ seems to only consist of third-country nationals, as the ‘foreigner’ is contrasted to both the ‘Swede’ and the ‘European’. However, it is important to emphasise that neither citizenship nor residence permit necessarily provides a position of ‘Swedishness’. This becomes evident when the interviewees’ touch upon suburbs, which several of the police officers depict as dominated by ‘foreign citizens’: “I was a community police in Tensta, Rinkeby, I thought it was really great to work with that particular environment and foreign citizens, it was almost like being in another country” (Göran). In this instance, the police officer uses ‘foreign citizen’ as a way to delineate Swedish citizens that they perceive as having various national belongings. The notion of the ‘foreign citizen’ is however also used by the same police officer when referring to people without legal permit to reside in the nation. Such statement produces an ambiguous politics of belonging, as the subjects living in the suburb are forced into the same category as the control

subjects, i.e. they are all ‘foreigners’ whether or not they have permission to reside in the country. Such portrayal also functions to disconnect such bodies from the Swedish context, as the suburb is projected as “another country”. The notion of suburbs as dominated by ‘foreign bodies’ fuels both an ethnified, but also a classed element of controls, thus constructing a classed dimension of belonging in the Swedish setting.

A dominant aspect of the interviews is how the police delineate ‘foreign’ bodies from Swedish bodies in the enactment of the internal controls. A recurring theme has been the police officers’ own differentiation between ‘similarity’ and ‘difference’, between ‘us’ and ‘them’ and between ‘Swedes’ and ‘foreigners’ as determining factors of whether an individual will be controlled or not. Relating back to ‘reason to assume’; appearance, clothing, and behaviour are deemed as characteristics that help substantiate a suspicion that someone is residing in the country without legal permit, which again constructs the body as the prime location for controls. The following sections are structured after the predominant discourses that the interviewed police officers articulate as guiding their suspicion, which will be exemplified through a racialized (gendered) and classed lens on bodily negotiations and discourses of suspicion.

#### 4.3.1 “You cannot carry out a control just because he’s black”.

Let us turn Ahmed’s question “how do you recognise a stranger?” on its head, and rather ask “how do you recognise a Swede?”. Where Ahmed (2000) sets out to challenge the assumption that the stranger can be anybody, in this section, I will demonstrate how the narrow frames of Swedishness allows the familiarity of the Swede and the foreigner to take a dominant position in the narratives on internal controls of foreigners. While the distinction of someone as *not belonging* can be seen as an act that sanctions the differentiation and enforcement of “this space”, one could say that the same applies when constructing fixed notions of belonging (Ahmed 2000; Yuval-Davis et al. 2005; Pettersson 2013). From the perspective of the interviewees’, there is a widespread perception that Swedishness is “reflected in one’s appearance” (Löfstrand & Uhnoo 2014: 77-8), constructing Swedishness as closely linked to whiteness. While this is articulated in different shapes, the most

explicit demarcation is made by Lars, who makes a distinction between different ‘white nationalities’:

It isn’t just that refugees come from countries other than where one can actually discern that they don’t look ethnically Swedish, that are white with this Swedish appearance. One can distinguish people from Russia who are also white, you can see that this is no Swede, and Baltic [person] and so on. Ethnic groups have different appearances and it’s difficult to get away from that.

In a similar line of thought, several of the police officers claim to be able to discern a specific ethnic Swedish appearance. In the above quotation, Lars goes as far as asserting to be able to distinguish different ‘shades’ of whiteness and further states that it is a reference that is hard to get away from when performing controls. While he makes a distinction between Swedish whiteness, Russian whiteness, white people from the Baltics, other police officers use the same line of reasoning between Swedish whiteness and Finnish whiteness (Christoffer), or Norwegian whiteness (Lars).

There is an interesting duality in the perception of the Swede. Among the eleven interviewees, only four officers deny the presence of ethnic profiling within the practice of internal controls of foreigners. All of them have high positions within the border police. Yet, while they state there is no ethnic profiling, they still refer to a very exclusive and cohesive whiteness as a reasonable frame for Swedishness when conducting controls, thus leaving non-white bodies as potential control subjects. One of these four border police officers explains it as follows:

When we stand here in Sweden, blond, blue-eyed, light-skinned, tall - typical Vikings – it’s clear that there’s an element, or perception, that there’s an ethnic profiling. “You only take those who are dark-haired, dark-skinned, really dark-skinned, those who do not have blue eyes”. It’s almost an inevitable argument. (...) it’s still one factor of all the pieces of what we’re trying to put together in border control, or in the internal control of foreigners (...) and clear as hell that you wouldn’t think “that man there, the blonde, bluest eyed of all, actually comes from Syria, and the man has no right to be here”. That may be the case, but what are the chances? They’re very small. The chances are much greater that the dark man over there is from Syria and without permit to be in Sweden (Samuel).

The police officer narrates Swedishness in line with the dominant discourse where whiteness is deemed at the core of Swedishness (Mattsson 2005; Lundström 2007; 2014; Habel 2012). This normative construction of Swedishness is dependent on its distinction from the (non-white) *other*. The stereotype of a blonde, blue-eyed, tall, white body - a “typical Viking” - seems to become the only existing identity frame for the authentic Swede. Such excluding mechanisms further feeds into a discourse of an exclusive belonging in the Swedish context. One of the non-white police officers reiterates a similar assessment, yet takes herself as an example: “let’s say that you want to profile everyone who’s Swedish, will you profile me then? As a police officer, you don’t do that, because a Swedish person doesn’t look like I do, you see that straight away” (Ana). She continues with an example where she was subjected to an internal control of foreigners at an airport, saying it was “fun” to experience the other side of the control practice. While this police officer falls outside the realm of Swedish whiteness, she still falls inside the scope of a European belonging. This resonates with the polysemic character of borders, as they can mean and symbolise “different things for different people: security or suppression, walls or bridges, barriers or turnstiles” (Rumford & Perkins 2015: 17), or as in this case, a “fun experience”.

Returning to the example of Samuel, the white body is not projected as a suspicious subject, similar to Viktor’s experience: “if I meet someone on the streets who looks obviously Swedish, I don’t get the idea of conducting an internal control of foreigners” and continues that many police officers feel like they are not allowed to use appearance as an input value “and then how are you going to build a suspicion?” (Viktor). This does not only confirm ethnic profiling as the dominant discourse of suspicion, but also visualises the police officer’s inability to perceive anything but race/ethnicity as a demarcation of citizenry. Christoffer further states that if you control a person who appears to “have an African origin, or a person who has his appearance in the Nordic region”, it is a greater chance that the former person lacks citizenship or a residence permit. The subject of controls is thus constructed through policing as a practice of differentiation on ethnic basis.

When asked if ethnic profiling can be seen as an inherent tool in internal controls of foreigners, several of the interviewees gave conflicting answers. Here, several of the police officers took “a black man” or “a man with African appearance” as a point of departure when explaining how you are not allowed to

control someone just because he is black/African. This was reiterated in different constellations, and while they all state that “you cannot carry out a control just because he is black” (Karl) or “there goes an African, let’s check him – we are not allowed to do that, and its not done like that either” (Lars), the black man becomes the natural source of reference to depict a suspicious body. Yet, despite such examples, a majority of the police officers still concluded that internal controls of foreigners are comprised of an ethnic profiling. An explanation given by one of the border police officers is that appearance is still given as part of ‘reason to assume’, hence the legal framework inadvertently allows for ethnic markers to figure as a demarcation between citizens and ‘foreigners’:

I think that it survives and not the least because we still have it in our regulations where it’s allowed, or where appearance is taken as an [example] ... and thus ethnicity [becomes] a reason for controlling someone (Lena).

Taking the regulations on internal controls of foreigners as an example thus visualises both the individual as well as institutional practices of ethnic profiling in policing ‘foreigners’. Swedishness as synonymous with whiteness became even more evident when the border police Samuel equated my appearance with the suspicion that triggers the police gaze. He started off by referring to me in third person, stating how “she’s not Swedish”, and followed up with what could be called a “nationality bingo”: “Where does this girl come from? Does she come from Italy? Does she have the right to be in Sweden or does she come from Świnoujście [Poland] or something like that?”. Hence, the interview turned into a puzzlement of my belonging: “Since you talk Swedish fluently, then a piece of the puzzle fades away”. When the pieces of the ‘foreign’ puzzle did not fit, I could finally be perceived as Swedish. However, he still felt the need to emphasise that if someone would “look like you do” and lack the “perfect Swedish”, then that would not in theory give a ‘reason to assume’, but in practice provoke questions like “what the hell, how did you get here? Where do you live?”. This would in turn be enough pieces to lay the puzzle of suspicion.

While the police officer claimed that my ‘language skills’ legitimised my Swedishness, he constantly returned to his gut feeling, and in his gut feeling, my appearance did not resonate with Swedishness. He explained this along the lines “if



we would go back to thinking that we're animals", then profiling of others is based on "pure survival instinct". Hence, when Samuel profiles others, he is "not judging" me or them, but just stating the obvious: "I don't value. But this is so damn charged so it's hard to talk about it because 'oh well, then you're a bit racist when you think like that'. – I'm just stating it!". In a similar vein, Khosravi writes about how he, in a meeting with police officials was made into an example of unbelonging. Here, his name, black hair, and accent were all characteristics that made the police officials depoliticize his body and deny his civic rights as a Swedish citizen (Khosravi 2006: 287). While Khosravi was attributed a middle-eastern belonging, Samuel was referring to me as either Polish or Italian, hence keeping his frame of reference to the European union and in that sense attributed me a position of neither belonging or unbelonging. Preserving an europeanness about me further kept me out of the categorisation of the 'foreigner', since such category has proven to target third-country nationals (cf. Hansen 2000). In the end of the interview, I stated my Indian heritage and assumed that Samuel would review his presumed gut feeling, yet he saw this as a confirmation that police officers are "good at identifying anomalous behaviour". Hence, my non-whiteness was equated with suspicion and inconsistent belonging.

While Khosravi and I deviate in how our bodies are perceived and racialized in the Swedish setting, the gendered dimension of bordering and policing is important to stress, as this permeates all of the interviews. The 'foreigner' is consequently referred to as an abstract 'he' or 'him', restricting the control subject to a male discourse. Gender thus becomes a repetitive and iterative practice of boundary-making in the interviews, and a way of establishing a suspicious subject (Aradau 2015: 70; Butler 2004). Khosravi's and my experience of profiling thus differs in how our bodies are racialized, but also the gendered aspects of policing. While ethnicity can be seen as the most crucial marker of belonging in the Scandinavian context (Christensen 2009; Pettersson 2013), it is the intersecting markers of masculinity and ethnicity that dominate the police officers profiling.

When asked if the police officers could discern any tendencies in the people they control, all but two police officers stated that young men from the age of 15-35 are the most frequently controlled group. When asked about internal foreigner controls on women, the interviewees either responded that they "have never thought about it" (Pontus) or that the lack of control on women are because of "cultural

issues” (Christoffer). The cultural aspect is not explained to any further extent, however, Göran explains this ‘culture’ by referring to how Mongolian women are an exception to such culture:

One exception I would say, it’s the Mongols we have had quite a lot of here in Stockholm, where it’s probably evenly distributed. They’ve no such tradition that women should stay at home or be passive, but both genders seem to be just as active.

The homogenised culture Göran refers to essentialises female ‘foreigners’ other than Mongolians as submissive and home-bound. Women are further depicted as impossible to work towards, as you are “not allowed to detain them just like that”. When asked to clarify, Göran states that “You can detain a woman, but you cannot detain a woman with a child”. This gendered practice thus causes women and children to be collapsed into one category, denying women any agency or subject position outside of motherhood. The gendered dimensions of controls thus construct the control subject to a male discourse. It is thus important to stress how masculinity and ethnicity nurtures a discourse of suspicion. This further feeds into how policing by typology constructs certain groups as less suspicious than others (whites and/or women). This also signals how non-white men figure in an already pre-determined figure of suspicion, since whiteness is constructed as the frame of reference for the citizen.

#### 4.3.2 “The rental units, that’s where the problems are”.

It seems to be a recurring theme among the police offices to depict crime and the suspicion of foreigners as based on class, and geographically cantered to the suburbs. Even though the interviewees agree that controls are more efficiently conducted in cities, and especially hubs of public transportation, suburbs have come to stand out as a topic during the interviews. While several of the police officers refer to clothing as a tool for profiling suspicious bodies, this is projected in two different ways – clothes that are perceived either dirty and worn out, does, on certain bodies, provoke suspicion. Another theme arising is how two of the police officers remark on a specific suspicious dress code for certain suburbs. Though they

work in two different police regions, the language and profiling is strikingly similar. One of the police officers talks about the way certain people dress in Gottsunda, a suburb in Uppsala that he compares to Rinkeby in Stockholm and Rosengård in Malmö, suburbs that are often portrayed as ‘problem areas’.

[W]e talk about a Gottsunda uniform. It’s the younger guys with Adidas sweat pants, with these white stripes along the sides. And I can say it’s often fairly correct when we get jobs in Gottsunda, like a car fire or whatever and you talk to any witnesses, it is usually the type of clothing that you get out of the witness: “black Adidas pants with white stripes”. It is something that they live by in Gottsunda, “this is our dress code”. Its a bit like how Hells Angels have their vests, they also have their attires, [just like] different hooligan firms have their clothes (Lars).

This raises two important issues: first, the ‘Gottsunda uniform’ is deemed as a lifestyle, as something “they live by”. The young males wearing Adidas pants thus become a homogenous group of suspicious bodies. Second, when comparing this perceived ‘uniform’ and ‘lifestyle’ to networks like “Hells Angels” and “different hooligan firms”, the police officer explicitly reiterates discourses of criminalisation. According to one of the police officer’s operating in region South, there is also a “Rosengård costume”. As its counterpart in Gottsunda, this too consists of Adidas clothes. The police officer goes on to state that such clothing could be “an entrance to a reason to assume” (Viktor). This Rosengård costume is further depicted as something that might “strengthen the [police officer’s] gut feeling”. While he states that a control may only be carried out in relation to the suspicion of a crime, the Rosengård costume is still deemed one of the building blocks to make use of when evaluating a “reason to assume”. Let us just pause here for a moment and consider how clothing that is presumed to signal belonging, clothing that allegedly embodies two Swedish suburbs can cause a reason to assume that that very body is out of place. This lies well in line with how Amoore (2006: 338) depicts the ‘enemy within’, the outsider inside that both signals a geographical belonging while at the same time being displaced. This thus becomes an evident example of how race/ethnicity, gender and social class all intersect and “produce markers of belonging and unbelonging” (Pettersson 2013: 419, my translation), no matter if you signal a clear belonging as in the case of Gottsunda (uniform)/Rosengård (costume).

While Gottsunda and Rosengård are projected as figuring in a discourse of suspicion, one of the police officers still marks a distinction dependent on class, where condominiums are projected as a 'good area' and the rental unit area as the 'bad area':

Rosengård consists of many different areas (...) The rental units, that's where the problems are. There are some streets, there are areas with condominiums - they are beautiful. But the problems found throughout Rosengård, it's just that these youth gangs, they hang around (Karl).

Later in the interview, Karl mentions how the police officers in Rosengård work in harsh circumstances, and have changed the windows of the police station to armoured glass. While there is no point to belittle the need for such precautions, it is still important to reflect upon how the police officer depicts the locals living in this area in homogenising and criminalising terms – stating that “the generation that is now, it is consumed, there is no possibility of turning back (...) it's a state within a state, they have their own rules, their own laws and they don't want to get involved with the laws of Sweden” (Karl). Such discourses of desubjectification is reiterated by Göran, who states that it is unnecessary to conduct controls in suburbs like Tensta or Rinkeby and search for someone who deviates, since “it is really hard to see someone who does that there (...) its just a huge crowd of people who have a foreign appearance”. Rather, profiling is something that you carry out in the city. In this line of thought, profiling seems to be defined as a distinguishing practice between white bodies and non-white bodies, since the police officer perceives a “crowd of people with foreign appearances” to be too homogenic to be able to distinguish subjects to control. Thus, the suburb is an important example on how ethnicity and class are intertwined and cannot be separated in the case of internal controls of foreigners. It also resonates with how some bodies come to embody collectives, while other bodies are perceived as individuals, which in this line of thought is evident from how the suburb is equated with 'foreigners'. This narrative further constructs some areas as “safe zones” in the sense that citizens who fit in the imaginary of the Other indirectly are encouraged to stay in a neighbourhood where they do not 'stand out'. The segregated structure of society creates an apartheid-like

situation where those deviating from ‘Swedishness as whiteness’ are treated as potential threats when they leave their ‘safe zones’, i.e. the suburbs.

While an attributed social class can work as restricting mobility, class can also figure as enabling mobility. This is not least evident when one of the police officers mentions more affluent areas as ‘free zones’ from internal control of foreigners. In his line of reasoning, “nothing happens [there] officially” (Viktor), yet it is unclear what this actually signifies and what an unofficial action could be in this context. This is articulated in even more explicit terms by another police officer that states that a valid debit card could figure as proper identification when lacking other papers: “then at least you have something on the bank” (Pontus). This resonates with how Johnson and Jones identify how there is an assumption that “there should not be a border for these wealthy executives” (2014: 3), with the consequence that those who are perceived as “wealthy executives” gain their mobility on the expense of others, hence reaffirming the idea that there is, and should continue to be, a border for groups of individuals. While having a debit card isn’t the same thing as being a wealthy executive, it does visualise the economic aspect of borders and bordering.

However, discourses of class are not articulated unanimously, as seen in the above cited examples. This is also reflected when class was brought up more explicitly by the interviewer, where several of the interviewees disidentified with socioeconomic structures at large. The subject was predominantly raised in relation to ‘freeriding’ in the subway, which several police officers refer to as a good indicator of non-citizenship or criminality. The police have the right to conduct controls when a suspected crime has been committed, such as freeriding in the subway as this is seen as a particular reason to assume. Göran however goes as far as stating that this also give rise to a justifiable reason to assume, since “a large share out those who freeride lacks a residence permit. They fall into a special template, a profile”. When asked if freeriding could also indicate socioeconomically vulnerability among citizens, rather than standing as a symbol of non-citizenry, Göran declared that Stockholm “is not a socioeconomically vulnerable area really”. This line of thought is shared by Pontus who sees socioeconomic vulnerability as a ‘bad excuse’ for freeriding, and rather sees freeriding in the subway as an indicator that a person does not respect neither rule nor law, and hence are more inclined to commit other crimes as well: “you have

deviated from the way the law is designed and behave immoral in a sense, if you think that the law is morality”. He then goes on to state “I think that democracy is really good, I see the reason why we need to pay for the subway (...) if you don’t agree on that point and freeride, then you are not a real democrat either according to me”. What becomes clear is that the police officers consider class as without importance in theory, yet in practice draws on classed dimensions as a strong indicator of suspicion. Class further highlights the dispersed nature of border(ing), as affluent areas are projected as free zones, hence class can both enable mobility and immobilise, depending on one’s socioeconomic position in the border regime (cf. Balibar 2002; Amoore 2006).

While ethnic profiling is acknowledged as a tool in internal controls of foreigners by the majority of the police officers, class is deemed as without importance in theory, yet figures as a strong indicator of suspicion in practice. Similar traits of distance between theory and practice was raised when when issues on discrimination and racism are brought to the table, where such tendencies were disclaimed. When Lars reflects upon racism, he states that it is a societal problem in the sense that the concept is misused. With the example on controls of unaccompanied refugee children, he says that they often play the “racist-card”: “they hardly know any Swedish, but they know the word racist”. He then follows up with a reflection on how racism as an issue is represented in society:

I think it is tragic that a refugee can come to Sweden to receive the image of the Swedish police would be racists, when [the refugee] in fact committed a crime and are taken into police custody. That it would be only because they’re immigrants, not that they’ve committed a crime. It’s not very common, but it happens and I think that’s pretty sad that even when they’ve only been in Sweden for six months, they’ve got the picture that it’s the way it works here.

Racism thus becomes a question of interpretation. Racism is further explained as one of two sides of reality, where one side says that racism is widespread in society, and the other says that Sweden is one of the most tolerant countries in the world, hence “it depends on your own view, which side you want to be on, or your opinion on the issue, and I generally think that we’re tolerant in Sweden” (Lars). While racism is depicted as an either-or explanation, discrimination is seen depicted in more ambiguous terms. Here, both Christoffer and Samuel make a distinction

between intent and outcome in terms of discrimination. Since the aim is to find people who are not entitled to reside in Sweden, “the purpose of the law is not to discriminate”, according to Christoffer. He goes on to say that the practice can lead people who are controlled to feel discriminated against, however he puts an emphasis on the purpose of the control as non-discriminatory:

I do not feel that they're discriminated against just because they feel discriminated. But the boundary between them is also very difficult, I understand that the experience itself is correct and accurate, and you can't argue with the feeling of being discriminated (...). However, the purpose of the control isn't to discriminate, it never is.

Samuel refers to the intent of the law in a similar vein, yet acknowledges that it is a problem that people feel discriminated against. To avoid such situations, correct documentation of internal controls of foreigners and education are mentioned as tools to make sure “that we do not end up in a position where we run the risk of discriminating against people, or that people feel discriminated against”. While Samuel acknowledges the risk of discrimination, he still discards its existence, stating that “I don't think we're there and don't think there is any risk that we will end up there at the moment” (Samuel). In such instance, as racism is projected as an explanation model one can choose, and discrimination as dependent on intention, then the suspicion that guides the police officers in their profiling stands beyond criticism, since intent supersedes outcome.

## 5. Conclusion

This thesis has examined how discourses of suspicion are reproduced in police narratives on internal controls of foreigners. A key focus has been how the police deploy internal controls of foreigner, and the process in which they delineate ‘foreign’ bodies from Swedish bodies in the enactment of such controls. Through internal controls of foreigners, the police officers make use of categorisations of dangerousness or suspicious behaviour in order to legitimise a *reason to assume* that the subject does not have the legal right to reside in the country. Throughout the police narratives on ‘reason to assume’, it becomes evident that this practice is both too vague to put into words, and hence too abstract to maintain rule of law. Rather, ‘reason to assume’ becomes synonymous with silent knowledge and a gut feeling. The legal framework has left grey zones for the individual police officer to fill in with their own interpretations of suspicious bodies, which are often built upon a ‘gut feeling’ or ‘police gaze’. In this manner, the internal controls of foreigners are guided by a knowledge that not even the police officers can put into words.

Through the analysis, I have shown how internal controls of foreigners are not bound to a solitary space, but can take place whenever the police encounter a subject they perceive as potential ‘foreigners’. This lies in the nature of such controls, since all policing may evolve into a foreigner control. However, the interviews highlight how the reason to assume that someone is a ‘foreigner’ is highly dependent on an exclusive imaginary of Swedishness, constructing the Swedish citizen as white, blonde and blue eyed. The exclusive frames of belonging narrated by the police officers further sanction non-white bodies as the prime subject of suspicion. This does not only confirm ethnic profiling as the dominant discourse of suspicion, but also visualises the police officer’s inability to perceive anything but ethnicity as a demarcation of citizenry. Suspicion is thus produced through a differentiation on ethnic basis, where those failing to adhere to the frames of (white) belonging risk being subjected to controls. Non-white men thus figure in an already pre-determined figure of suspicion, while whiteness is constructed as the



frame of reference for belonging. It is also important to stress that the regulations that guide the internal controls of foreigners' mention appearance as an input value, hence nurturing an understanding of Swedishness as an essential category that you may dis/embody. The regulations on internal controls of foreigners thus visualise how ethnicity becomes a marker of suspicion for both the individual and as institutional practices of policing. Following the results from this study, the Aliens act and the regulations that guide the controls of foreigners should be seen as discriminatory in itself, rather than merely in their enactment.

That police officers profile predominantly on ethnic markers has been widely acknowledged in previous research, yet this study adds another layer to such controls, visualising how ethnicity does not stand alone as a marker of suspicion, but that it is dependent on a gendered and classed construction of the 'foreigner'. The gendered dimensions of controls thus construct the suspicious subject as a non-white male, hence masculinity and ethnicity co-construct a typology of suspicious bodies.

Discourses of suspicion are further reiterated through a classed dimension of controls. While the police officers consider class as without importance, in practice, a classed dimension stands as a strong indicator of suspicion. Class highlights the dispersed nature of borders, as non-white bodies in suburbs are not only deemed suspicious, but also criminalised along the lines of Hells Angels and hooligan firms. The suburb is represented both as an area of suspicious bodies, and at the same time as a place too homogenic for the police to be able to distinguish subjects to control, since everyone there 'look the same'. Thus, the suburb is an important example on how ethnicity and class are intertwined and cannot be separated in the case of internal controls of foreigners. This representation further constructs the suburb as a "safe zone" in the sense that citizens who fit in the imaginary of the 'foreigner' indirectly are encouraged to stay in a neighbourhood where they do not 'stand out'. Those deviating from 'Swedishness as whiteness' are thus treated as potential threats when they leave their 'safe zones', i.e. the suburbs. Affluent areas are on the other hand projected as free zones from controls, thus class both enable mobility and immobilise depending on ones' socioeconomic position. Hence, the police (re)produce discourses of suspicion through a ethnified, classed and gendered typology that constructs the non-white male from the suburb as a pre-determined suspicious subject.

## 6. Bibliography

- Althusser, Louis (1970). Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses, in *Lenin and Philosophy, and Other Essays*, London: New Left Books 1971, 127–188.
- Ahmed, Sara (2006). *Queer phenomenology: orientations, objects, others*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Ahmed, Sara (2000). *Strange Encounters: Embodied others in post-coloniality*. London: Routledge.
- Amoore, Louise (2006). Biometric borders: Governing mobilities in the war on terror. *Political Geography*, 25, 336-351.
- Amoore, Louise & de Goede, Marieke (2008). *Risk and the war on terror*. London: Routledge.
- Anthias, Floya (2002). Beyond feminism and multiculturalism: Locating difference and the politics of location. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 25(3), 275-286.
- Aradau, Claudia; Coward, Martin; Herschinger; Thomas, Owen D. and Voelkner, Nadine (2015). Discourse/Materiality in: *Critical Security Methods: New Frameworks for Analysis*. Aradau, Claudia, Huysmans, Jef, Neal, Andrew & Voelkner, Nadine (eds.). London and New York: Routledge.
- Balibar, Etienne (2002). *Politics and the other scene*. London: Verso.
- Balibar, Etienne (2005). Difference, Otherness, Exclusion, *Parallax*, vol. 11(1), 19-34.
- Bergström, Göran & Boréus, Kristina (eds.) (2005) *Textens mening och makt: metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys*. 2., [omarb.] uppl. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Bowling, Ben; Parmar, Alpa and Phillips, Coretta (2003). Policing Ethnic Minority Communities. In: *Handbook of Policing*, av T Newburn, 528-55. Devon, UK: Willan Publishing, 2003.

- Bryman, Alan (2008). *Social research methods*. 3. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Butler, Judith (1999). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. 10th anniversary edn. New York and London: Routledge.
- Butler, Judith (2004). *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London: Verso.
- Casas-Cortes, Maribel; Cobarrubias, Sebastian and Pickles, John (2016). 'Good neighbours make good fences': Seahorse operations, border externalization and extra-territoriality. *European Urban and Regional Studies*. July 2016 vol. 23(3), 231-251.
- Cooper, Anthony, Perkins, Chris and Rumford, Chis (2014) The Vernacularization of Borders, In: *Placing the border in everyday life*. (eds.) Reece Jones, ed. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Crouch, Mira and McKenzie, Heather (2006). The logic of small samples in interview-based qualitative research. *Social Science Information* 45:483–99.
- Crowley, John (1999). The politics of belonging: Some theoretical consideration, In A. Geddes and A. Favell (eds), *The Politics of Belonging: Migrants and Minorities in Contemporary Europe*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Davies, Charlotte Aull (2008). *Reflexive Ethnography: A guide to researching selves and others*. London: Routledge.
- Ekman, Gunnar (1999). *Från text till batong. Om poliser, busar och svennar*. Stockholm: EFI, Ekonomiska Forskningsinstitutet, Handelshögskolan, 1999.
- Ericsson, Urban (2006). Den belägrade Andra och undantagstillståndets förtryck: Erfarenheter av etnisk diskriminering i möte med polisen In: *Om välfärdens gränser och det villkorade medborgarskapet* Edited by: Paulina De los Reyes. 249-281 SOU: Fritzes, Stockholm.
- Fassin, Didier (2006). The Biopolitics of Otherness: Undocumented Foreigners and Racial Discrimination in French Public Debate. *Anthropology Today*, 17(1), 3-7.
- Fassin, Didier (2011). Producing Borders, Producing Boundaries. The Governmentality of Immigration in Dark Times. *The Annual Review of Anthropology*, 40, 213-226.
- Finstad, Liv (2000). *Politiblikket*. Oslo: Pax.

- Foucault, Michel (1971). Orders of discourse (Inaugural lecture delivered at the Collège de France), *Social Science Information/Information sur les sciences sociales*, 10(2).
- Foucault, Michel (1972). *Archaeology of knowledge*, New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, Michel (1991). Politics and the study of discourse, In: Burchell, Graham; Gordon, Colin and Miller, Peter (eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Foucault, Michel (2002). *Archaeology of knowledge*, 2nd ed. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.
- Foucault, Michel (2003). “*Society Must Be Defended*”: *Lectures at the Collège de France 1975–76*. Translated by David Macey. London: Allen Lane.
- Foucault, Michel (2010). Säkerhet, territorium, befolkning: Collège de France 1977-1978, Tankekraft, Stockholm.
- Glover, Karen S. (2009). *Racial Profiling: Research, Racism, and Resistance*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Goodey, Jo (2006). Ethnic Profiling, Criminal (In) Justice and Minority Populations, *Critical Criminology*, Volume 14(3): 207-212.
- Görtz, Daniel (2015). *Etnifierade polispraktiker: hur etnicitet görs i polisens vardag*. Diss. Lund: Lunds universitet.
- Habel, Ylva (2012). Challenging Swedish Exceptionalism? Teaching while Black. In K. Freeman och E. Johnson, eds. *Education in the Black Diaspora: Perspectives, challenges and prospects*, Routledge.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1981). Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns [The Theory of Communicative Action]. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1990). Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit: Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft [The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society]. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Hall, Stuart; Critcher, Chas; Jefferson, Tony; Clarke, John; Roberts, Brian (1978/2013). *Policing the Crisis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hansen, Peo (2000). *Europeans only?: Essays on identity politics and the European Union*. Diss. Umeå : Univ., 2000.

- Holdaway, Simon (2008). Some Recent Approaches to the Study of Race in Criminological Research. In: *Ethnicity and Crime: A Reader*, av B (red.) Spalek, 32-53. Glasgow: McGraw Hill, 1996/2008.
- Holmberg, Lars (2003). *Policing Stereotypes. A Qualitative Study of Police Work in Denmark*. Berlin: Galda + Wlich Verlag, 2003.
- Howarth, David R. (2007). *Diskurs*. 1. uppl. Malmö: Liber.
- Hübinette, Tobias and Tigervall, Carina (2009). To be Non-white in a Colour-Blind Society: Conversations with Adoptees and Adoptive Parents in Sweden on Everyday Racism, *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 30(4), 335-353.
- Lundström, Catrin (2007). *Svenska Latinas: ras, klass och kön I svenskhetens geografi*. Diss. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.
- Lundström, Catrin (2014). *White Migration: Gender, Whiteness and Privilege in Transnational Migration*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Huysmans, Jef (2006) *The politics of insecurity: fear, migration and asylum in the EU*, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Hydén, Sofie; Lundberg, Anna (2004). *Inre utlänningskontroll i polisarbete - mellan rättsstatsideal och effektivitet i Schengens Sverige*. Malmö: IMER/Malmö Högskola, 2004.
- Interpellation 2013/14:349. Inre gränskontroller. 13 March 2013.
- Interpellation 2014/15:9. Den polisiära EU-operationen Mos Maiorum. 9 October 2014. Available at: [http://www.riksdagen.se/sv/Dokument-Lagar/Fragor-och-anmalningar/Interpellationer/Den-polisiara-EU-operationen-M\\_H2109/](http://www.riksdagen.se/sv/Dokument-Lagar/Fragor-och-anmalningar/Interpellationer/Den-polisiara-EU-operationen-M_H2109/).
- Iser, Mattias, "Recognition", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2013 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.). Available at: <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2013/entries/recognition/>>.
- Johnson, Corey and Jones, Reece (2014). Where is the border? In: *Placing the border in everyday life*. (eds.) Reece Jones, ed. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Ju2015/02002/PO. Regleringsbrev för budgetåret 2016 avseende Polismyndigheten, Justitiedepartementet.
- Kempa, Michael and Singh, Anne-Marie (2008). Private security, political economy and the policing of race: Probing global hypothesis through the case of South Africa. *Theoretical Criminology*, 12(3), 333-354.

- Khosravi, Shahram (2006). Territorialiserad mänsklighet: irreguljära immigranter och det nakna livet. I: de los Reyes, Paulina (red.) Om välfärdens gränser och det villkorade medborgarskapet. Stockholm: Edita Sverige AB.
- Khosravi, Shahram (2011). *Illegal Traveler: An Auto-ethnography of Borders*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kvale, Steinar (2006). Dominance through interviews and dialogues. *Qualitative Inquiry*. 12 (3).
- Kvale, Steinar (2008). *Doing interviews*. 1. ed. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Larsson, Samuel and Sundahl Djerf, Lina (2015). Antalet asylsökande minskar. *Sveriges Radio*, 17 December 2015. Available at: <http://sverigesradio.se/sida/artikel.aspx?programid=83&artikel=6327842>
- Leander, Peter (2014a). *Skyldig tills motsatsen bevisats? En granskning av polisens inre utlänningskontroller*. Stockholm: Arena Idé.
- Leander, Peter (2014b). *Efter Mos Maiorum. En granskning av polisens arbete med inre utlänningskontroller*. Stockholm: Arena Idé.
- Lemke, Thomas (2000). Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique. Unpublished paper presented at the Rethinking Marxism Conference.
- Mattsson, Katarina (2005). Diskrimineringens andra ansikte – svenskhet och 'det vita västerländska'. In de los Reyes, P. and Kamali, M., *Bortom Vi och Dom: Teoretiska reflektioner om makt, integration och strukturell diskriminering*, eds. SOU 2005: 41.
- Neal, Andrew W. (2008). Goodbye War on Terror? Foucault and Butler on Discourses of Law, War and Exceptionalism, In: Dillon, Michael & Neal, Andrew W. (eds.) (2008) *Foucault on politics, security and war*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- O'Dougherty, Micheal (2006). Public relations, private security: Managing youth and race at the Mall of America. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 24(1), 131-154.
- Palmgren, Mai (2009). The Nordic Colonial Mind. In Keskinen, Suvi., Touri, Salla., Irni, Sari and Mulinari, Diana., eds. *Complying with colonialism: gender, race and ethnicity in the Nordic region*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp.35-50.

- Peterson, Abby & Uhnö, Sara (2012). Trials of Loyalty: Ethnic minority police officers as 'outsiders' within a greedy institution. *European Journal of Criminology*, 2012: 354-369.
- Peterson, Abby and Åkerström, Malin (2014). Introduction to the Special Issue "Policing Ethnicity: Between the Rhetoric of Inclusion and the Policies and Practices of Exclusion". *Social Inclusion*, 2014, Vol. 2(3), 1-4.
- Pettersson, Tove (2013a). Att hantera anklagelser om rasism i polisarbete. i *Den sorterande ordningsmakten*, av Abby Peterson, Malin Åkerström och et al, 125-148. Malmö: Bokbox Förlag.
- Pettersson, Tove (2013b). Belonging and Unbelonging in Encounters Between Young Males and Police Officers: The Use of Masculinity and Ethnicity/Race. *Critical Criminology*, Springer.
- Polissamordningen (2015). Sverige deles in i sju nya polisregioner. Genomförandekommittén för nya Polismyndigheten. <http://polissamordningen.se/nyhetsarkivet/1372141235>.
- Pripp, Oscar (2011). Reflexioner och etik. I: Kaijser, Lars & Öhlander, Magnus (red). *Etnologiskt fältarbete*. Lund: Studentlitteratur, p.65-84.
- Rikspolisstyrelsen (2014:14). Tillsynsrapport Inre utlänningskontroller. RPS Tryckeri, Stockholm.
- RPSFS 1986:3 FAP 273-1. Rikspolisstyrelsens föreskrifter för polisens befatning med den inre utlänningskontrollen.
- RPSFS 2011:4, FAP 273-1. Rikspolisstyrelsens föreskrifter och allmänna råd om Polisens inre utlänningskontroll.
- Rumford, Chris (2013). Towards a Vernacularized Border Studies: The Case of Citizen Borderwork, *Journal of Borderland Studies*, 28:2, 169-180.
- Rumford, Chris (2012). Towards a Multiperspectival Study of Borders, *Geopolitics*, 17:4, 887-902.
- Sollund, Ragnhild (2010). Canteen Banter or Racism: is there a Relationship between Oslo Police's Use of Derogatory Terms and their Attitudes and Conduct towards Ethnic Minorities?, *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention.*, 2010: 8 (1): 77-96.
- SFS 2005:716. *Utlänningslagen*.
- SFS 2006:97. *Utlänningsförordningen*.

- SFS Förordning (2015:1074). om vissa identitetskontroller vid allvarlig fara för den allmänna ordningen eller den inre säkerheten i landet.
- SOU:JU 2012:16 (2014). *Redovisning OPI4. Polisens uppdrag enligt utlänningslagstiftningen (gränspolisfrågor)*. Promemoria 2014-03-14. Genomförandekommittén för nya Polismyndigheten. Available at: [http://www.polissamordningen.se/filer/Arbetsmaterial\\_och\\_beslut/Projektrapporter/OP\\_14\\_Utl%C3%A4nningslagen.pdf](http://www.polissamordningen.se/filer/Arbetsmaterial_och_beslut/Projektrapporter/OP_14_Utl%C3%A4nningslagen.pdf). Last accessed: 2016-08-05.
- Svensson H., Anna; Mattsson Pontus and Magnusson, Örjan (2016). Ygeman: Uppmot 80 000 asylsökande kan utvisas. Sveriges Television Nyheter, 27 January 2016. Available at: <http://www.svt.se/nyheter/inrikes/tiotusentals-asylsokande-ska-avvisas>.
- Squire, Vicki (2011). Politicizing Mobility, Mobilizing Politics, In: *The Contested Politics of Mobility: Borderzones and Irregularity*. Vicky Squire (ed.). Hoboken: Taylor & Francis.
- Uhnoo, Sara (2013). 'Inom den egna plåtbubblan' - polisen och etniska minoriteter. In: *Den sorterande ordningsmakten*, edited by Abby Peterson och Malin Åkerström, 69-95. Malmö: Bokbox Förlag.
- Uhnoo, Sara, och A Peterson (2011). Utvärdering om diskriminering, trakasserier och särbehandling med utländsk bakgrund inom polismyndigheten i Västra Götaland. Göteborg: Polismyndigheten i Västra Götaland. Göteborgs universitet: Sociologiska institutionen, 2011.
- UNHCR, (2015). *Opening remarks 66<sup>th</sup> session executive committee high commissioners programme. 15 October 2015. António Guterres, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees*. Available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/admin/hcspeeches/56122bd76/opening-remarks-66th-session-executive-committee-high-commissioners-programme.html>
- UNHCR, (2016). *Observations by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Regional Representation for Northern Europe on the draft law proposal on Restrictions of the possibility to obtain residence permit in Sweden*. Available at: [http://www.unhcrnortherneurope.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/Documents/PDF/Sweden/Observations\\_by\\_the\\_United\\_Nations\\_High\\_Commissioner\\_for\\_Refugees\\_Regional\\_Representation\\_for\\_Northern\\_Europe\\_on\\_the\\_draftLaw\\_proposal](http://www.unhcrnortherneurope.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Documents/PDF/Sweden/Observations_by_the_United_Nations_High_Commissioner_for_Refugees_Regional_Representation_for_Northern_Europe_on_the_draftLaw_proposal)



[\\_on\\_restrictions\\_of\\_the\\_possibility\\_to\\_obtain\\_a\\_residence\\_permit\\_in\\_Sweden\\_100316.pdf](#).

- Vaughan-Williams, Nick (2009). *Border politics: the limits of sovereign power*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Vollmer, Bastian A. (2016). A Hermeneutical Approach to European Bordering, *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*.
- Winther Jørgensen, Marianne & Phillips, Louise (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage.
- Yin, Robert (2009). Analytic Generalization. In Albert J. Mills, G. Durepos, & E. Wiebe (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research*. (pp. 21-23). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Young, Jock (1999). *The exclusive society: social exclusion, crime and difference in late modernity*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira; Anthias, Floya & Kofman, Eleonore (2005). Secure borders and safe haven and the gendered politics of belonging: Beyond social cohesion, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol.28 (3), p.513-535.
- Östlund, Emil (2013). Polisens sökarljus. Etnicitet som urskilningsfaktor i det operativa polisarbetet och hur den legitimeras. i *Den sorterande ordningsmakten, Studier av etnicitet och polisiär kontroll*, av Abby Peterson, Malin Åkerström. Malmö: Bokbox Förlag, 2013.

## Appendix 1. Themes during the interviews:

### BAKGRUND

- Födelseår / Född och uppvuxen /
- Jobbade du med något annat innan du blev polis?
- Hur länge har du varit verksam som polis?
- Kan du beskriva en 'vanlig' dag/arbetsvecka?

### ARBETSPLATSKLIMAT

- Vilka jobbar inom gränspolisen? /din polisenhet?
- Fördelning män/kvinnor
- Personer med utomeuropeisk bakgrund?
- Spelar detta någon roll vilken representation som finns på arbetsplatsen? Vilka för/nackdelar kan i så fall finnas?

### IUK: HUR?

- Skulle du kunna beskriva en inre utlänningskontroll för mig? Hur utförs en sådan?
- Hur ofta skulle du uppskatta att du utför en sådan kontroll inom ramen för ditt arbete?
- Vad är dina erfarenheter av att göra inre utlänningskontroller? Finns det något särskilt viktigt att tänka på? Kan du ge ett exempel på när du utförde en sådan?
- Krävs det någon särskild utbildning för att utföra en sådan kontroll? Rätt utbildning för att kunna förhålla sig till utlänningslagen?
- När gör polisen en inre utlänningskontroll? I vilket sammanhang?
- Vilka kontrolleras? Tendenser i könsfördelning/åldersfördelning?
- Ett återkommande verktyg som dyker upp i polisforskningen är **polisblicken**. Är det något du känner igen?
- Den definition som jag sett är att man tränas till att uppfatta sådant som är avvikande från det normala. Hur polisen lär sig särskilja personer som är polisiärt intressanta. Känns det bekant? Vad är det för urskiljningsfaktorer som gör att någon uppfattas som avvikande?

### ANLEDNING ATT ANTA

- Utifrån föreskriften om R209, ”Anledning att anta”, vad kan en sådan anledningen vara?
- Hur kan ”utländskt utseende” som är en sådan urskiljningsfaktor i denna föreskrift tolkas?

Exempel?

- Hur vägleds polisen av de olika riktlinjerna i arbetet kring inre utlänningskontroller?
- På vilket sätt anser du att dessa riktlinjer är tillämpningsbara i arbetet med inre utlänningskontroller?
- Finns det situationer där ni tillåts att frångå dessa riktlinjer, eller dessa riktlinjer inte ses som tillräckligt vägledande? Exempel?
- Hur vanligt är det med tipsbaserade inre utlänningskontroller? Finns det något särskilt som karakteriserar dessa tips, är det specifika situationer/personer? Kan du ge ett exempel på en sådan?

### **PLATS**

- Har ni några speciella tankar kring platser där kontroller utförs?
- Finns det vissa platser där kontroller utförs i högre utsträckning än andra?
- Platser som är mer 'effektiva' än andra?
- Finns det vissa platser/frizoner där inre gränskontroller inte utförs? Exempel?

### **EFTER KONTROLL:**

- Vad händer med personerna som stoppas efter att ni har kontrollerat dem (person med ID-handling/person utan ID-handling)?
- Berättar ni varför ni gör ID-kontrollen?
- Hur blir ni bemötta av de som blir kontrollerade? Hur bemöter ni de som kontrolleras?
- Vad händer om ni har kontrollerat någon som är svensk medborgare eller som har rätt att uppehålla sig i landet? /.../ Hur reagerar personer när de blir kontrollerade?
- När skriver man en händelserapport? Skulle du notera om du kontrollerade en svensk medborgare?
- Hur ofta skulle du säga att en kontroll ger en träff? Hur hanterar polisen en situation när en 'felaktig' kontroll har skett? Exempel?

### **POLITISK DISKURS - POLISAUTONOMITET**

- Upplever du att ni har politiska krav på er? Hur upplever du de politiska direktiv som ställs till polisen?
- På vilket sätt har ditt arbetet med inre utlänningskontroll sett ut/förändrats på något annat sätt de senaste åren?
- Hur mycket tolkningsutrymme upplever du att du har utifrån polisens direktiv i det operativa arbetet?

### **ETNISK PROFILERING**

- Skulle du säga att etnisk profilering är ett verktyg i inre gränskontroller? Varför/varför inte?
- I anslutning till REVA skrev många medier om inre utlänningskontroller på basis av etnisk profilering, hur ser du på detta?
- Finns det en risk för etnisk diskriminering i arbetet kring inre utlänningskontroller?
- Upplever du att det finns motsättningar i kraven på inre utlänningskontroller och risken för etnisk diskriminering?
- Vissa forskare menar att balansgången mellan att utföra en inre utlänningskontroll och att vara etniskt diskriminerande är hårfin, och att en kan fråga sig om lagen i sig är diskriminerande. Hur ser du på ett sådant resonemang?

### **POLITISK RESPONS**

- Hur upplever du den politiska respons ni får kring ert arbete gällande inre utlänningskontroller? Vad är dina tankar kring responsen ni får?
- Hur upplever du de direktiv som ges kring inre utlänningskontroller som finns i dagens läge? Finns det några problem med dessa?
- Upplever du att den lagstiftning och de riktlinjer som finns kring inre utlänningskontroller är tillräckliga?

**Finns det något du vill tillägga som vi inte har pratat om? Något annat du vill tillägga innan intervjun är klar?**