

Book Reviews | International Relations

surroundings, good existence, good relations versus “the bad” that denotes war and crisis—“the uglier side of the elephant” (p. 18). The social construction of the good through social relationships—a normative, lived everydayness, a wholesome “being with respect”—“shapes people’s conscious and unconscious choices” (p. 4). According to Porter’s field research, for the Acholi people these social processes construct and reconstruct “the good” in the *life after rape*. They profoundly shape the meaning of life after rape.

The book’s chapters guide the reader through the deeply relational and social content of the justice and sexual violence nexus. Most interestingly, in this unique Acholi context, is how sexuality and love are uniquely defined and connect to local and transitional justice through particular social interpretations. “What is Acholi love?” (p. 76) Porter asks. Her research positions the meaning of sex, marriage, and rape within a specific setting of social belonging. She highlights the importance and context of community, kinship, and family as part of “extended social processes” (p. 41) and defines sex as “a social practice . . . of naturalising gender hierarchies” (p. 91). As such, she articulates the understanding and lived experiences of the Acholi’s “home people” contrasted with those of outsiders, the foreigners, “the people of human rights” such as NGOs. The push and pull between the “old” and the “new/foreign” (p. 128), the local and the distant in what defines rape, crime, right- and wrongdoing—how it is understood, experienced, judged, valued, transformed—remains central in Porter’s findings. Interview comments, such as “Rape never used to be there” or “Rape as a crime as it is talked about by NGOs did not exist prior to the war” (p. 174), underscore the struggle for meanings that the Acholi people experience.

The chapters unpack the definitions of coercion and consent, punishment and moral jurisdiction, and the differing roles of social actors (family, NGOs, and churches) within an environment steeped in tradition and social relationships. This environment sits counter to the disengaged, remote Ugandan state, the “long stick [that] does not kill the snake” (p. 141), and an equally deeply distrusted global judiciary, the International Criminal Court. As such, Porter places and explores rape and the harm it creates consistently within “the space between local solutions and more distant judicial systems” (p. 30). This space—between the state, judicial institutions, and the local—is defined by deep distrust of what justice is and who or what defines and receives it. Statements such as “There is not a true choice between peace and justice” (p. 68) or “If the court was fair, I would have taken him to court” (p. 156) are clear, empirical evidence of the lack of the judicial system’s perceived legitimacy.

Porter provides the reader with a unique understanding of “rape as the social” (p. 211) and of a resistance to the

commonly understood, individual victim–perpetrator binary. She allows for a look at alternative justice actors within a transitional context and at social harmony as an appropriate response and mechanism for reconciliation. She provides an intriguingly rich lens into a social and communal cleansing, hence, recovery after rape not only for the victim and the perpetrator but also for the community as a collective political and social unit—and its future. This lens is an incredibly instructive view into “extraordinary displays of both forgiveness and brutal violence” (p. 155).

Porter triangulates her interviews with the analysis of court documents, engagement with the activities of gender-based-violence working groups, discussions with men, and her participatory reflections. Her research design also benefits from local input by “a group of Acholi women from a non-research village” (p. 27). What is also critically important, however, is *how* Porter acknowledges her positionality as a Western scholar, looking in from the outside. With the self-aware claim that “I am a foreigner. An American foreigner” (p. 23), she articulates from very early on her efforts to recognize and understand the perennial outsidership of the researcher. Living for a decade in Gulu as part of the community, learning the language (an ongoing process), and framing her research as an “interexperience” or what “we experience together, yet, not in the same way” (23), Porter acknowledges the eternal dilemma of the foreigner’s bias, positionality, and partiality.

After Rape is a very important and thoughtful book about a very complex issue: How do we deal with the terrible things we do to each other? This is a book for anyone interested in understanding sexual violence beyond its universal script and beyond its “monolithic representations” (p. 31). It is a must-read for anyone interested in global politics, international law, global justice, or peace and gender studies. Its empirical richness and the unique knowledge it provides is thought provoking and most illuminating.

Citizenship in Question: Evidentiary Birthright and Statelessness.

By Benjamin N. Lawrance and Jacqueline Stevens., eds. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017. 287p. \$99.95 cloth, \$25.95 paper.

doi:10.1017/S1537592718000580

— Peter J. Spiro, *Temple University*

In the conventional view, citizenship is a binary whose dividing line is readily located. Although some citizenship rules are complex, they are approached in the manner of puzzles. A limited number of facts—when and where an individual was born and to which parents—is supposed to supply an answer. This seems especially apparent in the context of territorial birthright citizenship regimes (known as *jus soli*, or right of the soil), under which the place of

birth by itself establishes a citizenship claim. But even citizenship based on descent (*jus sanguinis*, or right of the blood) is governed by bright-line rules, typically contingent on the citizenship status of the parent. Citizenship laws put down precise metrics for citizenship determinations. When it comes to citizenship, you either have it or you do not.

Alas, it is not always so easy. Individual status determinations all imply evidentiary requirements. One has to show that one was born on this side of the border or that one's parents satisfied conditions for citizenship in order to descend. That requires documentation or other forms of evidence. In most cases, that evidence is easily produced. If you have a genuine birth certificate from a hospital in New York City, for example, you are not going to have much trouble demonstrating an entitlement to U.S. citizenship. If you are born to a hill tribe in remote areas of northern Thailand, you may.

It is cases like the Thai hill tribes that are the subject of this excellent and timely interdisciplinary collection, edited by Benjamin N. Lawrance and Jacqueline Stevens, which examines a range of contexts in which citizenship is put into question. *Citizenship in Question* looks at citizenship beyond the sanitized world of citizenship law. As Kamal Sadiq puts it in his contribution to the project, "state papers, documents, and formats tell us more about membership, nationality, belonging, and identity than formal rules alone" (p. 167). There are an estimated 40 million unregistered births every year (p. 35). Lack of documentation (or the refusal of states to recognize certain forms of documentation) gives rise to effective statelessness. "Without the proper state artifacts," Sadiq notes, "these individuals are unable to claim rights from the state, and they remain hidden from state welfare specifically designed to help them" (p. 173).

Unsurprisingly, the phenomenon is a greater problem in the Global South. Amanda Flaim recounts the difficult work of documenting members of the hill tribes living in physically inaccessible and culturally remote villages in northern Thailand. Government census surveyors sometimes fail to locate the isolated communities. When they do, communication is severely obstructed by language barriers. Some officials do their job the best they can in challenging circumstances; others are less dutiful. When individuals lacking birth or residency documentation attempt to establish their citizenship, the lack of evidence "must ultimately be bridged by beliefs" of adjudicating officials (p. 163). Polly Price describes effective statelessness caused by a lack of documentation in the Americas, a particular problem among indigenous populations. Alfred Babo addresses the political abuse of citizenship barriers in the Ivory Coast, where the concept of "ivoirité" is used to deny citizenship to individuals in the north of the country who are less likely to be able to demonstrate necessary national lineages. (Although it does not

implicate deprivations in the same way as other contributions, Sara L. Friedman's chapter on the documentary contortions incident to the migration of mainland Chinese women to Taiwan to marry Taiwanese men makes a fascinating contribution.)

The phenomenon is not limited to less-developed countries where state capacity is often lacking, however. Jacqueline Bhabha describes the citizenship plight of the Roma in Europe, many of whom lack birth and residency documentation. That evidentiary deficit enables discriminatory tendencies among state officials. Despite valid claims to citizenship, she writes, "state authorities persist in not crediting their documents or narratives as bona fide evidence of citizenship entitlement" (p. 53). Rachel Rosenbloom considers obstacles faced by borderland Mexican Americans in proving citizenship where birth occurs not in hospitals but with the assistance of midwives. "[A] birth certificate only has the power that it is accorded by the state" (p. 143); the State Department maintains a list of "suspect birth attendants" (at one point numbering 249) whose certifications of birth have to be validated by additional evidence. (The "racialized presumptions of fraud" [p. 133] bring to mind recent episodes involving passport denials to dual Yemeni-American citizens resident in Yemen.) Beatrice McKenzie adds a historical perspective, describing the extreme scrutiny to which Chinese immigrants were subjected in establishing their entitlement to entry rights. On the way to proving birth in the United States, for example, one Chinese American was asked 150 questions by U.S. immigration inspectors in an attempt to discredit a citizenship claim (p. 124).

The case studies in this volume present a significant human rights challenge. Many elements of the welfare state continue to be contingent on citizenship status, as of course are residency rights and insulation from deportation. There is clearly a citizenship ceiling in most of the world's countries today in terms of limited earnings capacity and social standing. Some of the authors have themselves worked as advocates for the putatively stateless individuals and communities about which they have written for the volume, which makes for an engaged perspective. But the material also presents a conceptual challenge to the naturalized perspective on citizenship. As Stevens puts it in her eloquent introduction, the case studies "reveal that we are not citizens in the ways we often imagine we are, as if we were born this way without the state, as though being born Portuguese or Pakistani is the same as being born with brown or green eyes" (p. 7). Citizenship is, of course, a construct, established and maintained by states. In some cases, denial of citizenship (through denial of necessary documentation) is a weapon. In other cases, it demonstrates the limits of state control.

The stakes are high, both in terms of the theory and the practice. Although citizenship no longer sustains the preemptory importance of an Arendtian

Book Reviews | International Relations

perspective—human rights now supplies a floor in the treatment of those who are stateless—it remains important. Citizenship is also increasingly arbitrary. Why should the child born in El Paso get U.S. citizenship when it is denied the child born in Juarez? But citizenship may be in trouble even on its own terms. Citizenship allocations may seem as neatly drawn as lines on the map of the world. As this volume demonstrates, there are many contexts in which they are hardly that.

Soldiers of Empire: Indian and British Armies in World War II. By Tarak Barkawi. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. 338p. \$74.99 cloth, \$24.99 paper.

doi:10.1017/S1537592718000580

— Brieg Powel, *Aberystwyth University*

The question of why humans fight has perplexed many over the centuries, with its multifarious implications for philosophers, social scientists, policymakers, and militaries alike. Napoleon Bonaparte championed the roles of glory and reward, once asking “Do you think that you would be able to make men fight by reasoning? Never. That is only good for the scholar in his study. The soldier needs glory, distinctions, and rewards.” For Tarak Barkawi, in his pathbreaking new study of the British Indian Army during the Second World War, the answer is more complex and less Eurocentric. It is also more rewarding, thanks to this study of a multiethnic imperial army that transformed itself over the course of the war.

In asking how soldiers are made and why they fight, Barkawi brings his globally sensitive approach to an army neglected in traditional narratives of the Second World War, the British Indian Army. Responding to such questions makes this book ideal for those that these questions interest, be they scholars of international relations, sociology, and history or political and military practitioners. Yet while historical and sociological in its focus, *Soldiers of Empire* is refreshingly difficult to pigeon-hole in any specific discipline, and thus its conclusions should be far-reaching. It is also a welcome correction to existing studies of soldier–state relations that rely exclusively on Western case studies, offering instead a glimpse at a truly global force wherein pleas of duty to father- or motherland would have had a somewhat hollow ring to their multicultural ranks. That a Western society, Britain, was at the heart of such a force and that the force was employed on European soil should raise questions for any advocates of a supposedly “Western way of war.”

At the book’s core is an account of the transformation of the Indian Army during the war, from an initial force of some 200,000 used for imperial policing to an army of millions that swept the Japanese from the dense jungles, steep hills, and dusty plains of Burma, perfected the art of combined arms warfare, and became pioneers in the practice of the air-supplied offensive. This is all the more

remarkable for its occurrence in an army of a colonized society that many believed would simply revolt and join the Japanese, and it challenges traditional answers to the question of why soldiers fight. Equally significant is the diversity of the rank and file, with its recruits from across the British Empire. These included East and West Africans, Gurkhas, Sikhs, Gujars, Pathans, the Welsh, Scots, and English from the British Isles, and more. In religious terms, there were Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs, Buddhists, Christians, and others, necessitating a baffling mix of 30 different scales of rations according to the various cultural and religious sensibilities (pp. 70–71). Barkawi also distinguishes between professional soldiers and wartime conscripts, revealing striking consistencies between the attitudes of professional prewar British officers and their Japanese counterparts on matters such as surrender (p. 269). Each of the various groups needed to be trained, formed into a single army, and motivated to fight the battle-hardened Axis.

Yet one of Barkawi’s main points of exploration is the army’s use of these ethno-racial categorizations. As the first part of the three-part book makes clear, many of the categories employed for Indian troops were products of the colonial administration and army’s attempts at divide and rule in the nineteenth century. The “martial races” approach of the British is given due criticism by Barkawi, although not without noting how the army should be seen as a productive social structure in itself. An army produces very particular forms of subjects and social groups, with an imperial army forced to do so without the discourses of “self” and “other” centered upon the nation common in mono-societal armies. Nevertheless, alternative self/other binaries proved fruitful to the Indian Army by, for example, playing different racially based units against each other to foster competition, and in recruitment through the Raj’s concentration of recruitment among minority populations. Socioeconomic benefits for soldier, family, and community accompanied such recruitment, helping ensure loyalty and the appeal of the army despite the war, social unrest, and the Bengal famine of 1943–44.

Indeed, whereas British troops in Burma were eager for demobilization and a return home, Barkawi finds that most Indian soldiers wished to remain in service well beyond the war (pp. 92–93). The book’s exploration of such a cosmopolitan army and, crucially, its place in wider politics and society should be instructive to scholars of multicultural societies far beyond military specialists.

The experience of combat on the individual and society is the focus of the second and third parts of the book. One of Barkawi’s major findings is that war itself is a distinct social structure, imposing a degree of change on human subjects and societies equal, to if not greater than, that achieved through deliberate training and disciplinary practices. “Army life involves common conditions and shared experiences” as Barkawi (pp. 67–68) reminds us,