

IMMIGRATION AND THE RESHAPING OF EUROPEAN POLITICS

Charlotte Cavallé (cc1933@georgetown.edu)
School of Foreign Service - Georgetown University

Spring 2018

Time:	W 12:30 – 3:00 pm	Classroom:	ICC 210B
Office hours:	T and Th 5-6 pm (or by appointment)	Office:	ICC 504

Attributes: Diversity-Global, SFS/IPEC Supporting Courses, SFS/IPOL Electives, SFS/PECO Supporting Courses, SFS/RCST Western Europe, X-List: GOVT

1 Overview

1.1 Topics Addressed

In recent decades, immigration has transformed the demographic composition of many developed democracies. In countries like Great Britain, France, Sweden and Austria, around 1/4 of individuals between the age of 15 and 54 was either born in a foreign country or has parents who were born in a foreign country. The overwhelming majority of this group has ties to countries outside of Western Europe. Such ethnic and cultural diversity is the result of approximately three cumulative postwar migration processes namely:

- Guest workers programs in the 1960s and 1970s followed by family reunification
- Waves of refugees in the 1990s following the end of the USSR and the Balkan wars
- EU enlargement, especially since 2004: in 2015, the UK counted 831 000 Polish-born residents, a jump of almost 750,000 compared with the 2004 count.

Mass migration has, and is, profoundly reshaping European politics. Anti-immigrant populist parties, politically nonexistent in the 1980s, are now part of the electoral landscape in nearly all Western European countries. Their share of legislative seats has tripled, from less than 1 in 25 seats on average in the 1980s, to more than 1 in 10 in 2016. Even in countries without many populist representatives (e.g. France or the UK), ideas advocated by the radical right, such as the “assimilation of Muslims” or the need to take back “control of national borders,” have moved to the center of the policy debate.

Immigration and ethnic diversity have implications beyond the immigration attitudes of non-immigrant majority groups. Immigrants can become citizens and affect political outcomes through their vote. State institutions, in turn, shape immigrants’ political incorporation (e.g. naturalization, decisions to vote or mode of political engagement). Immigration can affect policy-making beyond border and immigration control: ethnic diversity and generous social policies rarely go hand-in-hand, raising concerns about the future of the Welfare State in Europe.

To better understand how immigration is re-shaping Western European politics, this seminar will examine issues such as:

- The nature and determinants of migration flows (with a special emphasis on political determinants)

- The social and political incorporation of immigrants, whether it varies across countries and why that might be the case
- The nature and determinants of anti-immigrant sentiments within the native-born population.
- The relationship between migration flows and stocks (i.e. ethnic diversity) on the one hand, and the native population’s political behavior on the other
- The rise and evolution of radical right parties, and how they have affected domestic and EU politics
- The emergence - or lack thereof - of an immigrant/minority voting block
- The relationship between ethnic diversity and social solidarity and what this means for the future of the welfare state
- How receiving secular countries accommodate an immigrant population increasingly stereotyped as being first and foremost Muslim (with a special emphasis on France)

1.2 Objectives

The overall objective of this seminar is to develop skills and acquire knowledge that will enable students to critically engage with immigration-related debates as they apply to European politics. Three types of skills will be emphasized:

Rewording. One goal of this seminar is to learn how to turn ubiquitous and overarching statements about immigration into tractable research questions. For instance, the statement “People vote for the radical right because they are racist/xenophobic“ can be reworded as follow: “Why is it that the same person will appear to be motivated by xenophobic motives in one election and not in another?” Or, to put it differently: “Under what conditions does anti-immigrant sentiment shape an individual’s political behavior, at the expense of other political motives -such as partisan loyalty or economic ideology - ?”

Describing. High quality description of what is going on is key: another goal of this seminar is to learn how to look for data on immigration and how to critically evaluate this data. To what extent does the data successfully capture the phenomenon being discussed (e.g. “assimilation” / “integration”)? Can this data be used to make comparisons across countries and across time?

Theorizing. The third goal is to develop causal statements about the world: What does it mean to say that immigration is *re-shaping* European politics? What are the causal mechanisms and causal pathways that pundits and researchers have in mind when they make such claims? Can researchers find ways to test these causal statements? Such causal statements are very hard to make, you will be encouraged to treat them with all the care and attention they deserve.

1.3 Prerequisites and Caveats

This seminar is primarily designed for graduate students and advanced undergrads. An undergraduate-level understanding of statistics and micro-economics will be very useful. If you have never taken such courses, no worries. What you mainly need is an interest in making causal claims about the world based on data: bring this enthusiasm to class and we will work from there.

Please be aware that this is a reading-intensive seminar. You are expected to read and discuss around 200 pages each week, usually in the format of 4 to 6 journal articles and book chapters. You will also need to complete short class assignments based on the readings and aimed at fostering participation. If you do not read, you will get little out of the class. Not only will the quality of discussion suffer, but so will your grade: **participation and participation-related assignments represent more**

than half of the final grade.

This seminar mainly examines Western European politics with a strong focus on France, Germany and Great Britain. We will examine issues pertaining to mass political behavior, party systems, political institutions and policy-making both at the domestic and at the EU level. As a result, important topics will not be covered such as the effect of migration on sending countries, an in-depth review of immigration and refugee law, the effects of immigration on domestic labor markets, on health outcomes and on crime, or an in-depth review of the massive literature on immigrant incorporation. Due to time constraints, this class also does not cover homegrown terrorism in Europe and urban riots. Finally, I have left out the recent refugee crisis and its implications for domestic and EU politics. **However, keep in mind that any of the above issues can be the topic of your final paper. I will be more than happy to guide you in your readings and give you extensive feedback.**

I have designed the syllabus to expose you not only to seminal or classic books and papers on immigration, but also to innovative arguments and research designs. This means that we will, once in a while, have readings that only focus on the United States, not Europe. When doing these readings, you are encouraged to think in systematic ways how this US research can shed a new and fruitful light on the situation in Europe.

2 Evaluation

2.1 In Class Assignments and Class Participation (20 + 20 + 20 = 60 %)

Class participation is central to this seminar. Weekly assignments are designed to foster high levels of participation. Please note that a written assignment full of great insights cannot replace successful incorporation of these insights into class discussions. The bottom line: assignments and participation will be graded as a whole.

Class attendance and weekly readings (20 %): Attendance is mandatory. You need to come to class having done the readings and prepared to discuss them in depth. When reading the assigned papers and preparing for class, you should have the following issues in mind:

- A parsimonious summary of the argument
- Contradictions and agreements between the readings
- Conceptual fit between the theory and the data
- The quality of the empirics
- Important methodological questions about the validity of the empirical claims made in the assigned papers.
- Policy implications, either explicit or implicit, of the readings. Under what conditions, if any, are those implications likely to apply? Under what conditions might these implications be obsolete?
- What are the assumptions implicitly made by the authors (e.g. assumptions about how politics work, who are immigrants, what politicians might want, etc...)? Do these assumptions differ across readings?

Write your answers to these questions down and bring these notes to class. You can also draw on your colleagues' reaction pieces (see below). Just make sure to give them credit when you mention their ideas! And most importantly: **write down any clarification question you might have, there are no dumb questions in this seminar.**

Reaction pieces (RP) (20 %): You will be asked to write **6** short reaction pieces. RPs are supposed to be critical, analytical and original assessments of the week's readings. For example, you can highlight the advantages and drawbacks of a given reading on empirical and/or theoretical grounds; suggest avenues for improved research; or discuss how readings of a given week complement or conflict with other knowledge or debate from previous weeks.

The main purpose of these RPs is to engage critically and creatively with the week's readings and to raise the issues that will be discussed in class. Summaries of readings should be kept to a minimum. Suggested length: about 600 to 700 words. RPs will be shared with others using the online class website. Please click on the collaboration tab and paste your RP in the correct shared google doc. *Please post your RP before 6 pm on the Wednesday before class.* **Since the main purpose of the RPs is to improve the quality of class discussion, late RPs will not count.**

To help you write you RP, I have, for each week, written small overviews of how the readings fit together (see below). I have also posted examples of reactions pieces I have written when I was a first year MA student (Files > Assignments > Reaction piece examples). I have added some comments to help you understand the goal of the exercise. These examples are not a template to follow, you are free to write you RP as you wish.

Three memos on three selected quantitative papers (20 %): Each student will have to write a four-page (max) memo on three of the starred (***) readings. The memo should be 40-60 % summary (research question, empirical predictions, empirical test, findings and implications) and 60-40 % discussion (you can also include suggestions for improvements or next steps). Please submit the memo on the Sunday (midnight) preceding the week in which the paper is being read.

The goal of this exercise is to practice summarizing a scientific argument. We will cover how to do this in class (see also the document made available on Canvas). Here are a few key points to keep in mind:

Summarizing a scientific paper does not mean writing a shorter version of this paper by selecting "summary sentences". It means re-writing the argument in a way that non-specialists might understand. Many students fail to grasp the difference between the two. The first memo will consequently be a practice memo. When grading, I will weigh memo 2 and 3 more heavily (especially memo 3).

Scientific reasoning usually follows the same template:

1. Research question / empirical puzzle (Why more here and less there? Why don't we observe X when we expect it to be there? Why we observe Y, when we don't expect it to be there?)
2. Answer / Theory (answer to the question)
3. Empirical predictions (If the theory is right then what should one observe in the world?)
4. Data and empirical tests (Let's collect data to test these empirical predictions)
5. Results (Is what one observes in the data in line with the empirical predictions?)
6. Scope condition (What is it that these empirical tests can and cannot tell us about the world?)

Summarizing a scientific paper means not only listing all the above but also **succinctly and efficiently** explaining why the puzzle is interesting, why the theory provides an answer to this puzzle, why the empirical prediction naturally follows from the theory, why the results align with the prediction, etc...

2.2 Final Assignment (40 %)

Students can either do a research proposal OR a critical review of the literature starting from a policy-relevant question:

Option 1: Research proposal. The proposal should identify why a given issue is important, articulate your central hypotheses or arguments, review the most salient academic literature, describe the type of evidence to be explored, suggest methods for its exploration, and speculate about likely findings and conclusions. It is due on the last day of reading period. The proposal should be 15 to 20 pages long (around 5,000 words, exclusive of references, tables, and figures). You should think of this assignment as a research project short of the actual field work or data analysis.

This option is recommended if you are interested in writing a thesis related to immigration. This final assignment will give you an opportunity to learn how to design a research project, as well as test whether one of your ideas can work as a thesis topic.

Option 2: Critical review of the literature. The critical review starts from a policy relevant theme and seeks to evaluate existing work aimed at addressing this question. **The review should go well beyond the in-class readings.** In grading the review, I will consider how successful you have been in identifying the relevant key contributions. The review should critically evaluate existing work based on theory and methods; identify gaps in the literature; and propose how future research can best proceed to expand systematic knowledge. Examples of possible review questions are:

- Does immigration negatively affect the income of low-skill native workers?
- What does the evidence say about ethnic residential segregation in the UK? Has it increased or decreased?
- How might one go about improving the labor market outcomes of second-generation immigrants in France?
- Does the presence of immigrants influence foreign policy?
- What role did immigration play in the Brexit?
- What can [country Z] learn from [country Y] with regards to [outcome X]?
- Should the EU maintain free movement of people?
- Should access to citizenship be made easier? Pros and cons?

You should have chosen a research or review topic by week 9. I will be meeting with students during that week to discuss topic proposals. You are expected to send a one page overview of your topic ahead of our meeting. **Week 12 will be dedicated to presenting your topic to the class and discussing it with your peers.**

3 Administrative details

Office Hours: Office hours are on Tuesdays and Thursdays after 5 pm. I ask that you sign up using the spreadsheet available on Canvas (Announcements).

Emails: I only answer work-related emails after 7 pm. Emails should be limited to 1) setting up office hours outside of the weekly slots mentioned on Canvas, 2) emergencies. If you have questions regarding something *already mentioned in class* such as paper format or final paper due dates, please

check the syllabus and the Canvas discussion board, or email your peers before emailing me.

Class website (Canvas): For issues and questions that might benefit everyone in the seminar, I strongly encourage you to use the website discussion forum. I will answer questions posted on the discussion board every day from Monday to Friday, before 9 am. I will check it once on Sunday around 2 pm.

How to submit and name memos and final papers: Email me your memos and final papers. Please give the following title to your document : [YOUR FIRST INITIAL + LAST NAME] - [RP1-6/memo1-3/final] for [SEMINAR DATE].

Grading: late RP submissions will not count toward the final grade. If you turn your memos or final paper late, you will lose a full grade in 24h increments. If I have any doubts, I will use *turnitin* to detect potential plagiarism for written assignments. Please make sure that, while writing, you properly attribute original text from other sources. There are many guides available online on source citation (e.g. <http://www.plagiarism.org/citing-sources/cite-sources/>).

Important deadlines:

RPs should be posted online before 6 pm on the Wednesday before class. Memos should be sent to me before the beginning of the week (Sunday midnight) when the reviewed paper is assigned. Final papers are due at the end of the reading period.

- *Week 1 (01/11). Introduction*
Pick your RP group (group 1 or 2). Pick 3 papers to summarize and discuss (only pick among the papers marked with a ***).
- *Week 2 (01/18). The Regulation and Management of Immigration in Europe (I)*
NA
- *Week 3 (01/25). The Regulation and Management of Immigration in Europe (II)*
RP 1 group 1.
- *Week 4 (02/01). Models of Immigrant Incorporation (I)*
RP 1 group 2
- *Week 5 (02/08). Models of Immigrant Incorporation (II): Changes and Consequences*
RP 2 group 1
- *Week 6 (02/15). Anti-Immigrant Sentiments: The Material Threat Hypothesis*
RP 2 group 2
- *Week 7 (02/22). Anti-Immigrant Sentiment: the Role of Identity*
RP 3 group 1
- *Week 8 (03/01). Immigrant Incorporation: the Role of Identity*
RP 3 group 2
- *Week 9 (03/15). The Rise of the Radical Right*
RP 4 group 1. Set up meeting to discuss final paper topic, send me a brief overview ahead of our meeting.
- *Week 10 (03/22). The Political Consequences of the Rise of the Far Right*
RP 4 group 2. Meetings to discuss paper topics
- *Week 11 (04/05). Immigration and Social Solidarity*
RP 5 group 1
- *Week 12 (04/12). Presentation of paper topics*
Share a 1 page memo of your paper topic ahead of the class. Read your peers memo and come to class with questions. Come ready to briefly present your topic (7 min max).

- *Week 13 (04/19). The Political Incorporation of Immigrants*
RP 5 group 2
- *Week 14 (04/26). Islam: A Challenge?*
RP 6 group 1 and 2
- Last day of reading period: **Final paper due**

4 In Class and Outside of Class

As a member of the SFS faculty, I unequivocally support and will defend your right to pursue knowledge and be treated with respect and dignity regardless of your identity, origin and political orientation. As a political scientist, a French citizen, a British national and a foreigner living in the United States, I have accumulated knowledge and experiences that I am very happy and eager to share with you, would you feel the need. In this divisive political climate, I hope you will feel safe reaching out to me with your concerns.

5 Readings

Main Reference:

I recommend you buy the following book:

- Massey Douglas S., Jorge Durand, and Nolan J. Malone. 2002. *Beyond Smoke and Mirrors: Mexican Immigration in an Era of Economic Integration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Other readings are either available in PDF format on Canvas (Files > Readings > Week 1, 2, 3...) or as ebooks through the GU library.

6 Seminar Schedule

– Week 1. Introduction

- We will go over the syllabus and discuss class objectives, readings and assignments.
- I will also provide a brief overview of the history of immigration in Western Europe, focusing on post-WWII migration.
- Finally, I will introduce the “social scientist’s tool box”, i.e. a set of concepts and frameworks that we will use repeatedly throughout the class.

– Week 2. The Regulation and Management of Immigration in Europe (I)

This week we examine the (perceived) gap between immigration policy goals (less immigrants) and outcomes (more/too many immigrants). Messina and Massey provide some possible answers. Massey reviews the structural (especially economic) factors that shape the size and timing of migration flows from one country to another. Messina emphasizes the domestic factors that make it difficult for receiving countries to minimize these flows. Massey et al is a detailed overview of immigration flows from Mexico to the United States. This case study emphasizes the role of politics in generating the belief that there is a mismatch between policy goals and outcome.

The Massey et al. book is an easy read, the book is written for a general audience.

- Massey, Douglas S. 1999. “Why Does Immigration Occur? A Theoretical Synthesis.” in C. Hirschman, P. Kasinitz and J. DeWind (eds) *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. pp 34-52. **[OR read chapter 2 in Massey et al. 2002]**
- Massey Douglas S., Jorge Durand, and Nolan J. Malone. 2002. *Beyond Smoke and Mirrors: Mexican Immigration in an Era of Economic Integration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. Chapters chap 1-3-4-5-6.
- Messina, Anthony, 2007. “Immigration and State Sovereignty” (Chapter 4) in *The Logics and Politics of Post-WWII Migration to Western Europe*, Cambridge University. **Available as an ebook through GU library**

– Week 3. The Regulation and Management of Immigration in Europe (II)

This week, we examine factors that affect (or try to affect) the gap discussed in week 2. Goodman discusses policies aimed at addressing the gap generated by family reunification. Rhus (2014) and Peter discuss some of the political determinants of labor migration flows. We conclude with a focus on the specific challenges of regulating and managing legal migration *within* the European Union (Favell, Rhus 2015, Peters 2015). We will rely on Favell to discuss the relevance of Massey’ et al’s analysis (see week 2) for understanding immigration in Europe today.

- *** Peters, Margaret E. 2015. “Open Trade, Closed Borders: Immigration in the Era of Globalization”, *World Politics*, 67:1, pp. 114-154
- Favell, Adrian. 2008. “The new face of East-West migration in Europe”, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34 (5), pp.701-716.

- Rhus Martin. 2016. “Is unrestricted immigration compatible with inclusive welfare states? The (un)sustainability of EU exceptionalism.” Centre on Migration, Policy and Society Working Paper No. 125. University of Oxford.
- Rhus Martin. 2014. *The Price of Rights: Regulating International Labor Migration*. Princeton University Press. Chapters 3 and 4. **Available as an ebook through GU library website**

Recommended:

- Goodman, Sara Wallace. 2011. “Controlling Immigration through Language and Country Knowledge Requirements,” *West European Politics*, 34: 2, pp 235-255

– **Week 4. Models of Immigrant Incorporation (I)**

This week, we examine how countries incorporate immigrants. First, we note one pattern common to all Western democracies: since the end of WWII, immigrants’ civil and social rights have become increasingly equal to that of citizens (Guiraudon). Then, with Brubaker and Favell, we turn to important variations in full inclusion, focusing on citizenship (political rights) and multiculturalism (“cultural” rights) in Germany, France and Great Britain.

- Brubaker Rogers. 1992. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Chap TBD
- Favell, Adrian. 2001. *Philosophies of Integration: Immigration and the Idea of Citizenship in France and Britain* (2nd Edition). New York: St. Martin’s Press. Chap TBD

Recommended:

- Guiraudon, V. 2002. “Including Foreigners in National Welfare States: Institutional Venues and Rules of the Game.” in B. Rothstein and S. Steinmo (eds.), *Restructuring the Welfare State: Political Institutions and Policy Change*. Palgrave Macmillan US. pp 131-151.

– **Week 5. Models of Immigrant Incorporation (II): Changes and Consequences**

In week 4, we examined similarities and differences across countries in the rights granted to immigrants. This week, we (briefly) examine if these differences affect immigrants (lecture and class exercises). The readings focus on how immigrants, in turn, affect host countries, focusing first on reforms in citizenship law with an emphasis on Germany (Ferwerda and Benhabib). With Entzinger, we turn to the rise and demise of multiculturalism in Europe, focusing on the Netherlands. The rejection of multiculturalism is often tied to the rise of the far right in Europe. Geddes and Guiraudon document how the European Union has reacted with one specific policy tool: anti-discrimination policies.

- *** Ferwerda Jeremy. 2015. “Benefits and Ballots: Explaining Party Preferences on Citizenship Policy.” Unpublished Manuscript.
- Benhabib Sheyla, 2004. “Democratic iterations: the local, the national, and the global” in *The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents and Citizens*. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 5, **Available as an ebook through GU library website**
- Entzinger H. 2014. “The Rise and Fall of Multiculturalism: The Case of the Netherlands.” In: Joppke C., Morawska E. (eds) *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States. Migration, Minorities and Citizenship*. Palgrave Macmillan, London

- Geddes Andrew and Virginie Guiraudon, 2004. “Britain, France, and EU Anti-Discrimination Policy: The Emergence of an EU Policy Paradigm” *West European Politics*, Vol. 27 (2)

– **Week 6. Anti-Immigrant Sentiments: The Material Threat Hypothesis**

This week, we shift to the non-immigrant majority and its reaction to immigration: why are some people opposed to immigration and some people are not? The readings focus on one line of reasoning, namely the claim that those who oppose immigration the most are those who stand to lose (in material terms) from the presence of immigrants. We distinguish between immigration’s effect on wages (Hainmueller and Hiscox, Malhotra et al.) and its effect on taxes and social benefits (Hainmueller and Hiscox, Cavaille and Fermwerda). Alba and Hopkins examine the conditions under which the “native” population will be more (or less) likely to experience immigration as a threat.

- *** Malhotra, Margalit and Mo. 2010. “Economic Explanations for Opposition to Immigration: Distinguishing Between Prevalence and Magnitude.” *American Journal of Political Science*. 57: 391-410.
- Hainmueller Jens and Michael Hiscox. 2010. “Attitudes toward Highly Skilled and Low-skilled Immigration: Evidence from a Survey Experiment.” *American Political Science Review*. 104(1). p 61-84
- Richard Alba. 2012. *Blurring the Color Line: The New Chance for a More Integrated America*. Harvard University Press. Chap 2 and 3. pp 21-89
- *** Hopkins, Daniel J. 2010. “Politicized Places: Explaining Where and When Immigrants Provoke Local Opposition.” *American Political Science Review* 104 (1):40-60.

Recommended:

- *** Cavaille Charlotte and Jeremy Ferwerda. 2017. “How Distributional Conflict over In-Kind Benefits Generates Support for Anti-Immigrant Parties.” *unpublished manuscript*

– **Week 7. Anti-Immigrant Sentiment: the Role of Identity**

The previous week, we covered literature on how individual economic experiences can affect anti-immigrant sentiment. In practice, many individuals who support immigration belong to groups exposed to its costs and many who oppose it do not seem to be directly affected. In week 7, we explore concepts that can help understand this disconnect, namely social identity (Sniderman and Hagendoorn, Brewer) and social status (Massey and Lamont).

- *** Sniderman Paul M. and Louk Hagendoorn. 2007. “Identity” in *When Ways of Life Collide: Multiculturalism and Its Discontents in the Netherlands* Princeton University Press.
- Brewer Marilynn B. 2001. “The Many Faces of Social Identity: Implications for Political Psychology.” *Political Psychology*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 115-125
- Massey Douglas. 2007 “How Stratification Works” in *Categorically unequal: The American stratification system* Chap 1, read up to page 18 - stop at “spatial boundaries”.
- Lamont Michele. 2000. *The Dignity of Working Men: Morality and the Boundaries of Race, Class, and Immigration*. Harvard University Press. Chap TBD

– **Week 8. Immigrant Incorporation: the Role of Identity**

This week, we continue our exploration of identity and status concerns. We examine how some of the mechanisms described in week 7 can help understand identity dynamics not only among the “native” majority but also among immigrants and their offspring. Akerlof and Kranton provide some theoretical background. Duderija reviews ethnographic data on. Addida et al. is an attempt at studying majority and minority identity concerns jointly.

- Akerlof George A. and Rachel E. Kranton. 2000. “Identity and Economics.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 115(3): 715- 754. [There is a book version of this article]
- Duderija Adis. 2007. “Literature Review: Identity Construction in the Context of Being a Minority Immigrant Religion: The Case of Western-born Muslims,” *Immigrants & Minorities* 25:2, 141-162
- Adida Claire, David Laitin and Marie-Anne Valfort. 2014. “Muslims in France: identifying a discriminatory equilibrium.” *Journal of Population Economics* 27(4): 1039-1086

– **Week 9. The Rise of the Radical Right**

After having spent week 6 and 7 on the “demand” for anti-immigrant policies, we turn to one of its political manifestation, mainly support for the far right. Kitschelt and McGann, as well as Kriesi et al, provide an overview of the long-term structural factors behind the emergence of the far right in Europe. Betz is an important addendum to some of the claims made by Kitschelt with regards to the far right’s “winning strategy”. Sniderman et al. provides Dutch survey data to further support this claim.

- Kitschelt, Herbert, and Anthony J. McGann. *The radical right in Western Europe: A comparative analysis*. University of Michigan Press, 1997. Chap 1
- Kriesi, H., E. Grande, R. Lachat, M. Dolezal, S. Bornschieer and T. Frey. 2006. “Globalization and the transformation of the national political space: Six European countries compared,” *European Journal of Political Research*. 45(6):921-956.
- Betz HG 2016. “The Revenge of the Plouc: The Revival of Radical Populism Under Marine Le Pen in France” in Kriesi, Hanspeter, and Takis S. Pappas, eds. *European populism in the shadow of the great recession*. Ecpr Press, 2015.
- Sniderman Paul M. Michael Bang Petersen, Rune Slothuus Androne Stubager. 2014. “Flash Point: The Ideological Bases Of Anti-Immigration Politics ” in *Islam, Western Europe, and the Danish Cartoon Crisis*. Princeton University Press

– **Week 10. The Political Consequences of the Rise of the Far Right**

In week 9, we have mostly focused on how structural social changes have reshaped the political preferences of the electorate, affecting in turn the incentives of politicians. This week we examine whether this bottom-up account of political change needs to be complemented by a top-down story: what role do far right politicians (or politicians who espouse far-right ideas) play in explaining political change? According to Hopkins and Bursztyjn, they play a large role, activating anti-immigrant sentiments and changing social norms. Mudde examines the political achievements of far right parties in power and offers a nuanced picture of the political consequences of the rise of the far right. The article by Ford and Goodwin examines some of these political processes in one specific case: Brexit.

- *** Hopkins, Daniel J. 2010. “Politicized Places: Explaining Where and When Immigrants Provoke Local Opposition.” *American Political Science Review* 104 (1):40-60.
- *** Bursztyn Leonardo Bursztyn, Georgy Egorov, and Stefano Fiorin, Georgy Egorov, and Stefano Fiorin. 2017. “From Extreme to Mainstream: How Social Norms Unravel.” NBER Working Paper No. 23415
- Mudde Cas. 2013. “Three decades of populist radical right parties in Western Europe: So What?” *European Journal of Political Research* 52(1): 1-19.
- Ford Robert and Matthew Goodwin. 2017. “Britain After Brexit: A Nation Divided.” *Journal of Democracy*, Volume 28, Number , pp. 17-30

– Week 11. Immigration and Social Solidarity

This week we examine the claim that immigration is undermining support for the welfare state. Alesina and Glaeser is a straightforward version of this claim: if immigrants are poor, then they will be perceived as over-represented among welfare recipients and support for these social benefits will go down. This is because the native majority has a natural inclination to only help people “who look like them.” Shayo, drawing on some of the theories discussed in week 7 and 8, argues that this “inclination” is not natural but the result of identity concerns that need to be theorized. Larsen and Dejgaard, as well as Sniderman et al, provide evidence that contradicts Alesina and Glaeser’s famous argument. In addition, Sniderman et al argue that it is not immigration that undermines support for the welfare state, it is the welfare state that might undermine pro-immigrant sentiment. With Roemer, we examine another way in which immigration can undermine the welfare state without directly effecting mass support for the welfare state.

- *** Alesina, Alberto, and Edward L. Glaeser. 2004. *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe: A World of Difference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Chap 6 pp 133-182
- *** Shayo, Moses. 2012. “A Model of Social Identity with an Application to Political Economy: Nation, Class, and Redistribution.” *American Political Science Review* 103 (2):147-74.
- Larsen, Christian Albrekt, and Thomas Engel Dejgaard. ”The institutional logic of images of the poor and welfare recipients: A comparative study of British, Swedish and Danish newspapers.” *Journal of European Social Policy* 23(3): 287-299.
- Sniderman Paul M. Michael Bang Petersen, Rune Slothuus Andrune Stubager. 2014. “The Covenant Paradox” in *Islam, Western Europe, and the Danish Cartoon Crisis*. Princeton University Press

Recommended:

- John Roemer, “Why the poor do not expropriate the rich: an old argument in new garb.” *Journal of Public Economics* 70 (1998), 399-424. [**Read pp. 399-403 and 414-417 to get the intuition and results try to grasp the basic idea of the model**]

– Week 12. Presentation of Paper Topics

No readings. Come prepared to present and discuss your paper topics.

– **Week 13. The Political Incorporation of Immigrants**

This week we discuss the factors that affect the political participation of immigrants (Dancygier et al. 2016, Garbaye). A powerful factor is the decision by politicians to target immigrant as a distinct electorate. Dancygier (forthcoming or 2013) discusses some of the trade-offs involved in such strategy. Lee questions the existence of immigrants as a distinct electorate and lays the conditions for such electorate to emerge. Finally, Vernby examines the consequences of an increase in immigrant turnout.

- *** Dancygier Rafaela, Karl-Oskar Lindgren, Sven Oskarsson and Kare Vernby. 2016. “Why Are Immigrants Underrepresented in Politics? Evidence from Sweden” *American Political Science Review* 109: 703-724.
- Dancygier Rafaela, *Dilemmas of Inclusion: Muslims in European Politics* - Introduction manuscript OR Dancygier R. 2013. “The left and minority representation: the Labour Party, Muslim candidates, and inclusion tradeoffs.” *Comparative Politics* 46(1):121
- Garbaye, Romain.2002. “Ethnic Minority Participation in British and french Cities: A Historical-Institutionalist Perspective.” in *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. 26(3):555-70.
- *** Vernby, Kare, 2013. “Inclusion and Public Policy: Evidence from Sweden’s Introduction of Non-citizen Suffrage,” *American Journal of Political Science*. 57: 15-29.

Recommended:

- Lee, Taeku. 2008. “Race, Immigration, and the Identity-to-Politics Link.” *Annual Review of Political Science*. 11: 457-478

– **Week 14. Islam: A Challenge?**

In this final week, we will discuss the specific challenges raised by immigrants’ religious background. Zolberg and Woon discuss this issue by comparing the US and Europe. Fetzer and Soper examine cross-national differences in how Islam is accommodated, tracing these differences back to different institutional legacies of church-state relations. Bowen is a detailed overview of France’s concept of “Laicite”, which makes it specifically unfit to accommodate public manifestations of religious belonging.

- Zolberg, Aristide R. and Long Litt Woon. 1999. “Why Islam is like Spanish: Cultural Incorporation in Europe and the United States.” *Politics & Society* 27(1): 5-38.
- Fetzer, Joel S and Soper, J Christopher, 2007. “Religious institutions, churchstate history and Muslim mobilisation in Britain, France and Germany” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33(6), pp 933-944.
- Bowen, John R. 2007. *Why the French Don’t Like Headscarves: Islam, the State, and Public Space*. Princeton: Princeton University Press; chap.2-3-4-5 pp 11-127.