



\*דוגמא זו קצרה במקצת מהמבחן המקורי\*

## Nationalism and Anti-Immigrant Movements

by Ivan Light

from *Society*, January/February 1999

1. Nations differ in the prominence they award their political, economic, cultural, and racial interests. In Germany, the law virtually excludes fully acculturated, German-born Turks from citizenship, but the same law expedites the naturalization of just-arrived non-German-speaking *volksdeutsch* from Russia or Poland. This contrast suggests that German nationalism sets high priority upon the continuity of Germany's ethno-racial stock and its dominant phenotypes\*. Culture does not matter nearly as much as does phenotype in Germany. In Israel, in contrast, defending dominant phenotype counts for nothing in national immigration policy. Instead, Israeli nationalism seeks maximum immigration, but religion (not phenotype) determines the fitness of immigrants for citizenship: only Jewish immigrants are acceptable, and all Jewish immigrants are awarded immediate citizenship. However, Israel expects total and swift Hebraization of all immigrants, a tough policy of total cultural assimilation. Discouraging immigration, France nonetheless permits the naturalization of fully assimilated aliens; however, it rejects cultural pluralism among new citizens. All citizens must become wholly and exclusively French. French means having cultural continuity with the past, so one cannot be French who does not speak French as his or her native tongue. This demand is compatible with France's long-standing "mission to civilize," a cultural interest of the French nation. Thus, both Israel and France impose cultural tests of fitness for naturalization, and these tests suggest that cultural interests outrank phenotypical ones in these states.

---

\* phenotype: the outward appearance of a person due to genetic make-up

2. The United States and, especially, Canada have long conceived of immigration as an economic resource and have promptly admitted to full citizenship unacculturated individuals, who, moreover, because of policies of multiculturalism, are released from any obligation to learn English. Additionally, the United States and Canada currently have immigration policies that are virtually color-blind. These are liberal policies, in the sense that they ignore the conservative interest in cultural and phenotypical continuity of the nation. Do these liberal policies mean that North American states crafted immigration policies without regard to perceived national self-interest? Such is the usual claim of anti-immigrant critics. However, the legislative history of immigration debates puts that idea to rest. When one examines the actual congressional debates that accompanied U.S. immigration legislation, one finds that hard-headed and often naked self-interest is and always has been the supreme arbiter of immigration policy. In effect, the behavior of these North American states simply shows that on this continent, policy makers have ranked the nation's and the nation-state's economic and political interests ahead of any cultural and racial interests.

3. When the United States abandoned the national origins quota system in 1965, thus opening the door to immigration from Latin America and Asia, a liberal action, several nationalistic reasons prevailed. First, and arguably most important, the United States was then wading into an unpopular war against North Vietnam, an Asian adversary. In the context of the domestic Civil Rights movement, a domestic policy crisis of that decade, the U.S. State Department concluded that liberalization of immigration policy was a top-priority foreign policy issue. Competing with the communists for world leadership, the United States simply had to clean up its racist international image. For political reasons, the United States could not accept the opprobrium of a racist immigration law in the context of world condemnation of segregationist civil society. Secretary of State Dean Rusk bluntly told Congress that foreign policy required a color-blind immigration law, and Congress gave him that law. Second, labor force projections showed that



catastrophic shortages of engineering and medical personnel would materialize unless the United States opened its doors to foreign engineers, doctors, and nurses. These projections were well founded. Currently, about a third of our medical personnel and engineers are foreign-born. Were it not for these immigrants, many of them non-white and non-Christian, the economy and health care systems of the United States would be in much worse shape than they are, bad as that current situation is. In this sense, a liberal immigration policy was arguably in the national self-interest of the United States and of the American nation.

4. One can legitimately object that "this is now, that was then." True, whatever national purposes immigration laws may once have served or been intended to serve, a critic can always claim that they outlived that purpose and now undermine the nation's interest. Such claims give rise to anti-immigrant social movements. Anti-immigrant movements arise when citizens sense that immigration no longer serves national self-interest and has become a bad deal for the recipient country. This turn of events is nowhere clearer than in Germany, which welcomed guest workers to participate in building its postwar economic miracle. No one complained about too many foreigners in 1955. However, with the miracle completed and the country facing slower growth, ordinary Germans began to feel that the economic benefits of guest workers no longer outweighed the cost to the nation's ethno-racial and phenotypical continuity. Indeed, many declared that immigration's economic impact, once a benefit, had become adverse because guest workers took jobs from Germans instead of making it possible for Germans to obtain better jobs, as had originally been the case. When in 1989 reunification dumped cheap East German labor on already saturated West German job markets, it became harder than ever to make a case for the continuing economic benefit provided by non-German workers, who appeared, indeed, to have the better of the immigration bargain. Under these circumstances, Germany's anti-immigrant movement and the right-wing parties affiliated with it threatened to take control of the

government away from the mainstream parties on this issue.

5. When immigration policies are reviewed, the final judgment depends upon what motivates voters and policy makers, who often hold different conceptions of national self-interest. If voters are wholly indifferent to phenotypic or cultural continuity in their society—a rare state of affairs—they will evaluate immigration laws strictly on economic, political, military, and even humanitarian grounds. Even conservative voters become pro-immigration when they perceive overriding economic and political benefits of immigration that compensate the perceived racial and cultural costs of immigration. Conservatives can make a trade-off. In conservative countries, liberal immigration laws arise when enough conservatives agree that the nation's interest demands immigration even at some inconvenience to the phenotypical and cultural continuity of the population. In a society like Germany, whose population stresses racial and cultural continuity, many voters are conservative in this sense. Only very substantial economic and political benefits will induce German voters to open the doors to foreigners and immigration. And, should those benefits diminish in perceived value, the nation's doors slam shut quickly. Conversely, in societies like Canada and the United States, whose voters are by European standards unusually materialistic, slight economic and political benefits will justify pro-immigration policies.

6. Even in North America, one must from time to time ask whether immigration laws still make nationalist sense under current conditions, or whether they have outlived their utility. The answer depends in part upon our evaluation of what have been the economic and political costs of this immigration. For decades, there was no sign of any such cost. In the 1980s, social science research in the United States began for the first time to turn up some evidence of limited and sector-specific job competition between immigrant workers and native blacks and Latinos. Additionally, as Governor Pete Wilson's reelection campaign in California made very clear to everyone in the United



States, research has universally concluded that illegal immigrants take slightly more in state-supported medical and educational services than they contribute to California in taxes. True, the immigrants provide a useful and ubiquitous low-wage labor force in farm, factory, and home. Were they excluded in the interest of cultural and racial continuity, California would pay an economic price. Nonetheless, these recent reports suggest that immigration's domestic economic effects are not completely positive anymore. There is some basis for claiming that the economic effects only became negative in the 1980s. These changes certainly weaken the electorate's conviction that current immigration is in the national self-interest of the United States. Under the circumstances, the baseline conservatives find fewer compensations for the perceived racial and cultural costs of immigration.

7. Even with these damaging changes, there still remains some case for existing U.S. immigration laws. First, the United States still needs Asian engineers and health professionals for the very reasons anticipated in the 1965 legislation. The United States still does not produce enough of these personnel to fill critical domestic needs. Second, as assassinations and peso devaluation make clear, Mexico is teetering on the verge of political and economic collapse. To restrict Mexican immigration now would increase the political turbulence within Mexico, increasing the likelihood of civil war and Guatemala-style repression on the southern border of the United States. Mexicans are also quite sensitive to the racist implications of California's Proposition 187 and of anti-immigrant talk elsewhere in the United States. A new Mexican government, arising from the chaos of a failing government might well be anti-U.S. in spirit. Arguably, immigrant competition in the job and housing market is a sacrifice California must make to reduce that political risk to the United States.

8. If we now ask who sees which side of this debate, an important fact comes to light. Whether in Europe or North America, policy makers have superior access to the international picture. That is, balancing

indignant conservative voters, who worry about ethnocultural and phenotypical continuity, and economic and foreign policy issues, they look for the supreme national interest at stake in immigration policy. If they cannot act upon that supreme national interest, restrained by domestic politics, at least they think about what it might be. This international perspective permits policy makers to sacrifice pawns when necessary, obtaining the greater national interest by surrendering the lesser. Conversely, voters generalize the national interest from their own perceived cultural, racial, economic, or political interest. They think that immigration harms the country just because it harms them, their region, or their race or diminishes their culture's dominance. In a way, immigrant-bashing citizens must take this perspective because they are otherwise open to the objection that their parochial interest should be sacrificed in the greater national interest. Of course, nations must sacrifice pawns, but no one wants to be that pawn.

9. We again and again encounter the spectacle of nationalistic politicians trying to hold anti-immigrant movements at bay. From the politicians' point of view, the anti-immigrant movement often reverses national priorities, sacrificing long-term national interests to the transitory, partial interest of some ethno-racial group or region. For example, a senator might plausibly believe that having enough engineers and doctors is worth some decline in cultural and phenotypical continuity. Conversely, at the grass roots, people see their personal, their ethno-racial, and their regional interests most clearly and can hardly be induced to contemplate the political and economic interests of the whole nation. If an immigrant has taken Smith's job, or the jobs of people like Smith, Smith's probable political response is anti-immigrant protest, even if that protest undermines the stability of a friendly government or jeopardizes his nation's access to foreign-trained engineers. One Smith makes no difference. However, if enough Smiths come forward, politicians must redefine national self-interest to Smith's shortsighted advantage – or be replaced by others who will.



## Questions – Nationalism and Anti-Immigrant Movements

1. According to this text, what interest is prominent in the immigration policies of the U.S. and Canada?

\_\_\_\_\_ (Answer in **ONE** word.)

6 pts

2. Give one example from the text of other kinds of interests in other countries.

Country: \_\_\_\_\_

Interest: \_\_\_\_\_

4+4  
pts

3. Why did the United States encourage immigration in the 1960's?  
(Give 2 specific explanations.)

1. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

12 pts

**SUB-TOTAL**



4. a. Besides the United States, what country exemplifies a change in its people's attitude toward immigration? (Be certain to give a country and **not** a state in the U.S.A.).

\_\_\_\_\_

4 pts

- b. Describe this change. (Fill in the blanks to complete the sentence):

The people's attitude changed from \_\_\_\_\_  
to \_\_\_\_\_.

6 pts

- c. Name one specific condition in that country which led to this change. (Answer in **one** sentence).

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

5 pts

5. Why does the author mention German and North American voters in paragraph 5?

- a. To explain the differences between conservative and liberal voters
- b. To show how different people's values affect their immigration policies
- c. To emphasize the similarities between their points of view on immigration
- d. To demonstrate the circumstances under which their policies will be similar

6 pts

**SUB-TOTAL**



6. Read paragraphs 6-7.
- a. Give 2 arguments in favor of immigration.  
(Be specific!! "Economic or political reasons" is not enough!)
- i. \_\_\_\_\_ 4+4 pts
- ii. \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Give 2 arguments against immigration.  
(Be specific!! "Economic or political reasons" is not enough!)
- i. \_\_\_\_\_ 4+4 pts
- ii. \_\_\_\_\_
7. What are the "changes" referred to in the first line of paragraph 7?
- a. changes in numbers of foreign workers
- b. changes in the economic consequences of immigration
- c. changes in the United States' immigration laws
- d. changes in American public opinion
- 7 pts
8. According to the writer, why do politicians and voters often have opposing points of view concerning immigration policy?  
(Fill in the blanks to answer this question).
- Politicians tend to see \_\_\_\_\_;
- while voters tend to see \_\_\_\_\_.
- 10 pts
- SUB-TOTAL**



9. When will citizen protest influence the immigration policy of politicians?

6 pts

10. What is the result of successful citizen protest?

a. Immigration policy will be redefined according to national interest.

b. No actual change will take place in immigration policy.

c. The government will benefit from the change in immigration policy.

d. Immigration policy will be changed according to local interests.

7 pts

11. What is the author's main purpose in writing this article?

a. to analyze the reasons behind different countries' immigration policies

b. to argue that immigration policies should be based on economic and political benefit

c. to explain why nationalism and anti-immigrant movements usually co-exist

d. to claim that every country has a basic right to determine its own immigration policies

7 pts

**SUB-TOTAL****TOTAL**

## Nationalism and Anti Immigrant Movements

### KEY

1.	economic / money / financial/ self-interest / political / national <b>DO NOT ACCEPT: "CULTURAL"</b>	(par. 2) 6 pts
2.	<b>Germany</b> – phenotype / racial / ethno-cultural / ethno-racial <b>Israel</b> – religion / cultural assimilation / Hebraization <b>France</b> – culture and / or language / must become "French" /cultural continuity  (4 points for country 4 points for interest)	(par. 1)  8 pts
3.	i. political reasons / to improve its racist international image / the U.S.A. wanted to seem liberal / foreign policy required a color-blind immigration policy /  <b>****GIVE 1/2 CREDIT IF THEY ONLY WRITE: VIETNAM WAR</b> (Without elaboration, this is a WEAK answer.)  ii. economic reasons / shortage of engineering and medical personnel / labor shortage	(par. 3)          2 x 6 = 12 pts
4	a. Germany  b. positive / welcoming immigrants / economic... negative / rejecting immigrants / ethno-cultural  c. reunification saturated the job market / economic benefits of guest workers no longer outweighed the cost to the nation's ... continuity / reunification of West and East Germany / economic growth slowed-down / the miracle was completed / immigrants took jobs from Germans	a = 4 pts  b = 6 pts       c = 5 pts  15 pts
5.	to show how different people's values...	(par. 5) 6 pts

National and Anti Immigrant Movements KEY

6.	<p>a. (2 out of 3 possible answers)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-the immigrants provide a (useful and ubiquitous) low-wage labor force</li> <li>-USA still needs Asian engineers and health professionals</li> <li>-political risk with Mexico / Mexican chaos would lead to anti-American sentiment / To restrict Mexican immigration now would increase the political turbulence within Mexico..../A new Mexican government...might be anti-U.S. in spirit</li> </ul>	(par. 6-7)  4 + 4 pts
	<p><b>DO NOT ACCEPT:</b> Mexico is teetering on the verge...collapse (without further elaboration) / Mexicans are also quite sensitive...United States</p>	
	<p>b. (2 out of 3 possible answers)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-(limited and sector-specific) job competition</li> <li>-illegal immigrants take slightly more in state-supported medical and educational services than they contribute to California in taxes (MUST INCLUDE THE WHOLE THING)</li> <li>-racial and cultural costs / racial and cultural continuity</li> </ul>	4 + 4 pts
7.	changes in the economic consequences ...	(par. 6-7) 7 pts
8.	<p>the big picture / the international picture / the national benefit / interest of the state / the political and economic interests of the nation</p> <p>Their own situation / personal interests / their own perceived cultural, social, economic or political interest / domestic / local / ethno-racial / parochial interests</p> <p style="text-align: right;">2 x 5 pts =</p>	(par. 8)  10 pts
9.	when enough citizens come forward / when politicians feel threatened / when the politicians feel they will be replaced	(par. 9) 6 pts
10.	immigration policy will be changed	(par. 9) 7 pts
11.	to analyze	(whole text) 7pts