Description:
This course examines normative questions raised by citizenship and immigration. The first half of the course highlights different models for political community and how those models affect our views on membership status in such communities. We will cover the main philosophical theories for how citizenship ought to be ideally conceived: classical liberal, classical republican, communitarian, cosmopolitan and post-nationalist theories. The second half of the course covers various philosophical considerations that can be brought to bear on the issue of immigration. We will cover the key philosophical arguments that advocate either more or less restrictive policies: arguments on the acceptable criteria that may be used in deciding who to admit, on how much weight the preservation of national culture should hold, on the moral desirability and practical feasibility of “open borders”, on whether and to what extent receiving nations should mitigate the “brain-drain” on sending nations and on the priority immigration reform should take with respect to other reforms that might be deemed to “cause” mass migration (global poverty, weak international institutions, etc).

General objectives:
(1) Further develop critical thinking, argumentation and writing skills and apply them to the issues of citizenship and immigration. (2) Fully understand the basic elements of dominant argumentative positions regarding citizenship and immigration and how they work (or are supposed to work) before attempting to criticize them. (3) Engage in lively yet respectful debate about controversial issues. (4) Clearly understand and articulate the differences between the main models for thinking about citizenship. (5) Clearly understand and articulate the different ways persons seeking entry into a nation-state are classified (refugees, economic immigrants, etc), how these differences may affect their moral claim for entry and the controversies surrounding how we define these categories.

Features relevant to this course being taught as a Sophomore Seminar: This course lies at the intersection of political philosophy and political science. We will tackle two main issues that impact one another—citizenship and immigration—from different normative perspectives. Citizenship is examined from Classical Republican, Classical Liberal, Communitarian, Post-nationalist and Cosmopolitan perspectives. Immigration is examined from the perspective of those who articulate a case for more closed borders (civic republicans, liberal nationalists, cultural preservationists / communitarians, etc…) as well as from the perspective of those who advocate more open borders (cosmopolitan liberals, liberal egalitarians, global-demos Rawlsians, etc…). My hope is to get students to see that citizenship and immigration are controversial precisely because (regardless of what they see in the popular media) there are very good positions to be articulated on either side. This course brings together two issues that are typically isolated from one another (at least in the normative literature) and asks students to investigate how our views on what the category of citizenship means might impact our views on immigration and why (as well as vice versa). I imagine that the course will spur quite a bit of rigorous dialogue not only because this is a relevant contemporary topic but also because I will be asking them to construct their own views in writing and in-class discussion. Although my writing assignments are not currently reflected in the syllabus, I plan on having 3-5 short summaries assigned throughout the course to help them focus on constructing and representing the arguments of an assigned position, as well as a final paper.

Expectations: This syllabus will let you know my expectations. However, I am also interested in knowing about you and what your expectations for class are. Please take a moment to fill out the note card on your desk with the following: (1.) Name, year, major (if known) and relevant interests—academic or otherwise. (2.) Prior experience in philosophy, political science, formal logic, mock trial, pre-law or debate (if any). (3.) Most importantly: Your expectations for this class.

Attendance and Participation: Attendance and participation jointly make up 10% of your grade. There will be a sign-in sheet passed around during each class. It is your responsibility to sign in (signing for others violates the academic integrity policy). If you have to miss a day due to illness, family emergencies or academically relevant conflicts, please e-mail me in advance and let me know. Please also e-mail me whenever you miss class due to other reasons as well. Always come to section having thoroughly read the assigned readings. We will be discussing the readings with structured questions and free discussions; both methods require familiarity with the text and active questioning.

Extensions: Extensions will not normally be granted. But, if you feel there are extenuating circumstances that merit an extension, please let me know. As always

Assignment Grading: Philosophical writing and thinking are different from the writing and thinking you do for other classes. Philosophical writing focuses on clarity, succinctness and the construction of sound arguments. For guidance please read Jim Pryor’s online essay “How to Write a Philosophy Paper”. When writing you need to express yourself very clearly, as I can only grade what you write on the page. Even if you know a theory or argument well in your head, I can only grade what you write (there is no way to evaluate what someone intends to write but fails to clearly express). Philosophical thinking is concerned with the argumentative clarity, coherence and defensibility of a particular position. You will be graded on how well you defend your views (whatever they may be) not the content of your views. That being said, there are better and worse ways to construct arguments, so please read the
Discussion Questions: I distribute discussion questions each week to help you focus on the most salient issues within the readings. We will not always get to every question in class. I encourage you to think about the questions that we do not get to after class and re-read the material with them in mind. Doing so will help you on assignments. You can also come to office hours to discuss any questions that we don’t get to in class.

Texts:
- Course-pack containing assigned articles (available at Kalamazoo College bookstore).

Additional texts that highly inform the content of this course (I may end up using readings from these):
- Gibney & Hanson (eds.), *Immigration and Asylum: from 1900 to present* (3 vol. topic specific encyclopedia with helpful entries for students on technical notions; good resource but expensive!). ABC-CLIO Press. 2005.

Readings:
Week 1: *Greek and Roman models of citizenship, historical development of a category and contemporary revival.*

Week 2: *Walzer’s classic works on Citizenship.*
(6) Michael Walzer, “Membership”, in *Spheres of Justice*, Basic Books 1983, pp. 31-63. (Coursepack)

Week 3: *Contemporary models part I: Communitarian, Lockean Liberal and Rousseauian Republican citizenship.*
(8) Gerard Delanty “Communitarianism and Citizenship”, in *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*.
(10) Richard Dagger “Republican Citizenship”, in *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*.

Week 4: *Contemporary models part II: Cosmopolitan and post-national citizenship.*
(13) Saskia Sassen “Towards Post-National and Denationalized Citizenship”, in *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*.
(14) Andrew Linklater, “Cosmopolitan Citizenship”, in *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*.

Immigration:
Week 5: *Refugees, asylum seekers, immigrants—why the definitions matter.*
(21) After these readings, listen to: “Public Ethics Radio: Episode 11, Christopher Heath Wellman on Immigration” (35 minutes: http://publicethicsradio.org/2009/11/01/episode-11-christopher-heath-wellman-on-immigration/). (online)

Week 6: Arguments for limits part I: national culture, national economies and freedom of association.

Week 7: Arguments for “open borders” part I:

Week 8: Arguments for limits part II:
(29) David Miller, “Why Immigration Controls are not Coercive: A Reply to Arash Abizadeh” Political Theory. (Coursepack)
(32) Gillian Brock, “Immigration” in Global Justice, 2009, 190-219; 212-19 is footnotes. (Coursepack)

Week 9: Arguments for open borders part II:
(34) Arash Abizadeh, “Democratic Legitimacy and State Coercion: A Reply to David Miller” Political Theory 38, 1, 2010 (Coursepack)
(37) Rainer Bauböck “Citizenship and free movement” in Citizenship, borders, and human needs Rogers Smith (ed.) 2011 (Coursepack)

** I have intentionally left one week blank in order to allocate space for the midterm and the final exam.

Possible additional readings: