“Migration flows are the central issue of our time” (Samuel Huntington, 2004).

“Ein Land das die Fremden nicht beschützt geht bald unter” (Johann Wolfgang v. Goethe).

“It’s just obvious that you can’t have free immigration and a welfare state” (Milton Friedman, 1978)

A specter is haunting Europe – the specter of nativism! The triumph of neo-liberal economics, the increasing influence of the EU in shaping national laws and policies, one of the largest immigration events since WWII has generated a massive re-alignment in European and American politics. The result is a rise in populist and radical right wing parties that threaten to undermine the very foundations of European politics by eroding the solidarity necessary to mount an effective social security state. There are also warning signs that some countries are turning into an authoritarian direction.

“Taking back control” is the new motto on which right political movements are making serious inroads into hitherto more centrist politics. Does immigration driven diversity trigger authoritarian moments? As societies are becoming more diverse, is social trust and social cohesion indeed undermined? What is the cement of society anyway? Are liberal multicultural policies replaced with stronger, more assimilationist policies – questioning the very liberal foundations on which modern states were supposed to be built?

This class casts a wide net. The arc ranges from basic explorations into what determines identity, via the challenges of immigration and its political consequences, the variety of political institutions and their relative capacities to squash ethnic conflicts, variations in forms of incorporation of newcomers, to questions of the viability of welfare states and trust in societies that are facing increasing diversity. This class examines the most important forces that are challenging the very foundations on which western societies are based.

**Required readings:**

Articles:
Most of the required readings are hyperlinked and can be downloaded directly. Some are book chapters that can be downloaded by going to the electronic course reserves at the library.
Course requirements:

1. **Participation** is crucial in this seminar. Students are expected to have read and absorbed each week’s reading assignment so as to enable them to meaningfully participate in each seminar. Participation counts for 15% of the total grade.

2. Each student will be assigned three weeks in which he/she will “lead the seminar”, i.e. the student will, in essence, take on my role. This means to give a concise overview of the weeks’ reading, place the readings into the larger context of crucial approaches, or issues in political science, to ask pertinent questions, and to engage other students in discussion and to answer their and my questions. This will count for 15% of the total grade.

3. Each student is required to **write one short paper** based on books, parts of books or articles provided in this syllabus (no longer than two pages) **Do not just repeat the argument in the book or article! Briefly** state the argument, but then go beyond it, placing it in the larger literature, and providing constructive criticism. Most likely, to make a convincing case you will have to quote or cite additional material. Examine 1) the plausibility of the argument, 2) the consistency of the argument, i.e. do other scholars agree/disagree with the claims and if yes, why, 3) if any, assess the empirical support of the argument. If not, what empirical data could be used to support the theoretical argument, 4) in what way does the argument “push the frontier” on any of your chosen topics, 5) provide an original critique and possible modifications, amendments, alternative hypotheses and additional original research questions. Each paper will count for 15% of the total grade.

4. October 29 is puzzle week. Students should, by then have developed a **research puzzle**, a **literature review**, and have unearthed **data** that they think should help them in answering the puzzle. This information will be presented orally to the class and counts for 15% of the total grade. One class will be devoted to the presentation of this crucial part of your research.

5. **Research paper**. Each student will have to submit a completed research paper by **Friday, Dec. 9, 2019**. This research paper will have to follow the “Edicts of Candler” and counts for 40% of
the total grade. For more information on how to write a research paper consult the last page of this syllabus.

Detailed reading assignments:

**August 20:** Welcome, introduction, discussion of syllabus, and puzzling puzzles


**August 27:** Where does it all come from? Economic structures and social values!


**September 3:** Between primordialism and constructivism: where does identity come from?


**September 10:**

Primordial constructions, or constructing primordialism?


**Symposium: Cumulative Findings in the Study of Ethnic Politics**

*Guest Editor: Kanchan Chandra, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2001)*, Only read Kanchan Chandra’s contribution starting on p. 7 and Stephen van Evera’s contribution on p. 20.


**The Welfare Queen Experiment** (1999) by F.D. Gilliam. Can be found here:

---

**September 17:**

Welfare for “us” but not for “them”!


---

**September 24:**

Redistribution, Sacrifice, and Identity:


**October 1:**

“It’s the culture, stupid, no?” – economic versus perceived cultural threat as drivers of anti-immigrant attitudes.


**October 8:**

Triggers of xenophobia, nativism and welfare chauvinism: can it happen “there” again, and maybe “here”?


Matthew McWilliams (2016) *The one weird Trait that predicts whether you’re a Trump supporter*. Politico Magazine. (January 17).


**October 15:** Getting a bit more complicated: how exactly should ethnic diversity affect public goods provision?


**October 22:** Immigration and the end of the welfare state? Between Recognition and Redistribution: The Liberal/Progressive’s Dilemma


Nasar Meer (2016) *The ties that blind us – the hidden assumption in the ‘new progressive’s dilemma:’ Comment in Will Kymlicka´s article: “Solidarity in Diverse Societies”*

Rainer Bauböck (2016). *Why liberal nationalism does not resolve the progressive’s trilemma: comment on Will Kymlicka’s article: “Solidarity in Diverse Societies*. Comparative Migration Studies.

Will Kymlicka (2016) *Rejoinder: From sociability to solidarity: reply to commentators*, Comparative Migration Studies

**October 29:** Pause: puzzle week and discussion of projects

**November 5:** Incorporating newcomers – between assimilation and multiculturalism

Ruud Koopmans (2013) **Muslim Immigrants and Christian Natives in Western Europe.** WZB: Mitteilungen,

Dutch prof warns no Western society has managed to fully integrate Muslims. The Nation, March 6, 2019.


**November 12:**

Reversing the causal arrow? Can the state/society CREATE trust in diverse societies?


Carolin Rapp (2016) **Shaping tolerant attitudes towards immigrants: the role of welfare state expenditures.** Journal of European Social Policy. 27: 40-56


**November 19:**

From national to post-national identity and back?


David Koyzis (2017) “**No Core Identity”**? The Impossibility of the State without a Soul. First Things.

**November 26:** Presentation of Research papers

**RESEARCH PAPER DUE: DECEMBER 9, BY HIGH NOON!**
Congratulations! You have come far; you are sitting in an “advanced” graduate seminar and you should be familiar with the conventions on how to write a research paper. All of you have taken POLS 7010. This is the time to remember what you learned in this class and to apply it right here. But just in case you don’t remember anything of POLS 7010 anymore (heaven forbid!) here are some pointers on how to do it in order to reduce the “B.S. factor”. Here are the steps you should follow, although not necessarily in this order, to write a logically compelling research paper and one that maximizes your chances of getting a good grade.

1) PUZZLE: This is a tough one. Your research must have a puzzle, if not, why do the research? If theory and praxis diverge, that is a puzzle; contested theories represent a puzzle; inconsistent empirical findings are a puzzle; etc.

2) RESEARCH QUESTION: At some point you should clearly state in the form of a question the objective of your research.

3) LITERATURE REVIEW: Here you are taking stock – what is it that others have written about your subject. This is the place for showing off how much have you have read and understood about the material and drop names.

4) THEORY: This is VERY important! Here you don’t drop names – after all this is the place where you present YOUR theory to the world, YOUR ideas, YOUR contribution.

5) UNIT OF ANALYSIS: What is the “unit” that you are examining? Is it elections, individuals, countries, etc.?

6) TEMPORAL AND SPATIAL PARAMETERS: Over what time period and what location are you applying your theory?

7) HYPOTHESIS: What is your hypothesis? Remember a hypothesis contains three things: first it indicates the object of observation, the dependent an independent variables, and the direction of their relationship. For example: “the more I’m feeding my cat, the fatter she gets”. “Cat” is the object of observation, “food” is the cause, cat getting “fat” is the effect, and the direction of the relationship is positive.

8) DEPENDENT AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: Which ones are they? How much do they vary?

9) PROCESS TRACING: Why should the cat get fat if feed a lot? If more calories enter her body that she can burn, her body will on the basis of biological processes begin to store the energy contained in the food in terms of fat. Process tracing should in detail describe the various steps how things move from cause to effect.

10) OPERATIONALIZATION OF CONCEPTS: Your hypotheses will contain concepts, i.e. names of things. You will have to translate these concepts into things that can be measured. It is crucial that you explain this metamorphosis from concept to measure as clearly as you can.
11) VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF MEASURES: Do the measures you use capture the concept they intend to reflect? Would repeated measuring yield the same results every time? Might there be systematic or random measurement error?

12) CAUSAL MECHANISM: How do you know that your argument is causal rather than correlational? Do you have endogeneity? Is your research design indeterminate?

13) FINDINGS: Are you accepting or rejecting your hypothesis?

14) LIMITATIONS: No research design is perfect. What are the limitations of yours?

15) CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS: What do these findings mean? How do they affect the reigning theories? Do they question them, or confirm them? What new questions do arise? Where does future research go from here?