

One of the first things that really caught my attention about Mudde's presentation was that he categorized a wide variety of ideological stances as far right and radical right. Generally, this made me think one of two things; either my own perspective of ideological stances and their place on the political spectrum, or his view was skewed. For example, he referenced that wanting to limit immigration was an inherently far right view. To evidence this statement, he referenced previous generations' views on immigration and how most Americans generally accepted more immigration before 9/11. However, I would disagree with his overall claim that 9/11 and refugee terror caused a normalization of a far-right view on immigration. Firstly, most critiques of the immigration levels in America are against illegal immigration which has increased in substantial amounts over recent years. Secondly, America takes in the most legal immigrants per capita in the world and with the recent surge in illegal immigration over the southern border, even Democrat leaders are calling it a crisis. However, Mudde asserted that this was due to normalization of the far-right view against immigration to preserve culture and whiteness, as he stated. He continued, stating that even Democrat politicians are being forced to take upon these far-right views because of the normalization of this view enacted by the incorrect framing of the issue. Mudde explicitly said that wanting a closed border was a far-right view. This statement made me question if a border was open (which he is saying is the natural belief of people unaffected by far-right propaganda) is it even a border at all? Furthermore, with the recent illegal immigration surge (and its effects), many Americans have begun favoring border control. I would attribute this to raised taxes, crime near the border, the fentanyl crisis, and the free housing being used by illegal immigrants in major cities, not far right propaganda. On a different note, I appreciated Mudde's humility in admitting that his perspective is exactly that, a perspective and not an empirical truth. Before this statement he asserted his claims with a sense of certainty that made me feel unsure about his neutrality in

approaching his studies. With my dwindling characters I will end with this: he has made me genuinely consider a proportional voting system as a possible solution to modern American polarization. We may see that polarization is fueled by the two-party system.