The word ‘terror’ has become a fixture in the political dialogue and political climate worldwide. Countering efforts rest atop the priorities of governments and intelligence agencies alike, with Western Europe finding itself amidst concerns of heightened recruitment in its neighborhoods. Yet terrorism is not an entirely spontaneous or isolated concept, but rather emerges from another essential and infinitely complex process: radicalization. The latter exists as the central component to recruitment and the terror act; its examination and analysis is critical to counter-terror efforts. Rising concerns sparked the birth of the Expert Group on Violent Radicalization (EGVR) of the European Commission, a key factor in its mission being “Giving policy advice and identifying new research areas required into the phenomenon of violent radicalization and terrorism.” The goal of this study lies therein: to venture into the research of radicalization through exploring its relationship with ever-present anti-immigrant sentiment in Western Europe. The findings reveal not only a positive and significant correlation between the two trends, but a further result that as the proportion of Muslims increases, this correlation decreases in strength and significance.
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Introduction

Western Europe today faces a troubling and challenging convergence of the old and the new: of the old concept of immigration; of an utterly new population demographic and the threat of radicalization. The nations comprising the EU-15 have certainly experienced waves of rising anti-immigrant sentiment in the past, and particularly since the early 1970’s. Yet it is now, in the face of a sizeable and rapidly expanding immigrant Muslim population, that such a wave seems to be mounting with new significance. What makes the current climate in the European Union so divergent from the past, however, is not simply antagonistic sentiment, but also an apparent growing radicalization of these very immigrant populations. As the threat of terrorism continues to rest at the top of the European political agenda, so rise warnings of the radicalization and potential recruitment of immigrant youths. Given the complexity of the notion alone, formulating methods of countering it proves exceedingly difficult.

Embarking on this process demands a far more thorough comprehension of the variety of factors surrounding radicalization. This study thus seeks to further the understanding of this trend by examining the relationship between anti-immigrant sentiment in Western Europe, and the radicalization of the Muslim immigrant population within those nations. In taking a closer look into a particularly interesting case, that of the United Kingdom, this issue and its implications gain depth. It is rather clear that sentiment alone is not the direct cause of radicalization; there are countless factors—political, historical, social, and socio-economic—that work collectively to breed this phenomenon. The question is whether antagonistic sentiment does indeed help to drive such radicalization, already bubbling within the immigrant enclaves of Western Europe.
The primary issue explored herein, a radicalization of the Muslim population, itself has implications of a magnitude that cannot be overstated. Beyond the result of an even wider gap between these populations and their European environments, lies that which has sparked unprecedented concern worldwide: terrorism. When considering the process of terrorist recruitment, one inexorably linked to radicalization and terror, the significant role of radicalization is underscored. Several approaches to recruitment exist in the terrorist literature: Taarnby asserts that terrorist recruitment in Europe is in fact a process that occurs from the ‘bottom-up,’ and claims that the process is not necessarily defined by a member actively seeking out recruits, but rather by the will of radicalized and ‘spontaneously formed’ groups (Taarnby 2005). Somewhat conversely, Ethan Bueno de Mesquita contends that terror groups conduct active and specifically designed recruitment of particular individuals, forming a more ‘top-down’ structure (BDM 2005). In either of the two scenarios, and indeed in any case of religiously affiliated terror, radicalization exists as the essential ingredient. This truth only further reinforces the relevance of and need for extensive study in this realm. Unfortunately, the broader literature concerning anti-immigrant sentiment and radicalization is lacking, in that it represents a relatively unexplored and undeveloped field.

In examining correlations between anti-immigrant sentiment and radicalization, this study finds that the two do in fact have a positive and significant relationship. An auxiliary and rather surprising finding is that as the percentage of Muslims residing in a nation increases, this effect decreases significantly; a lower proportion of Muslims residing in a population thus experiences a stronger and more significant correlation between anti-immigrant sentiment and radicalization. These results can be better
understood alongside a relevant background; namely, Western Europe’s recent immigration history, its current demographic and state of sentiment, and the concept of radicalization itself.

A brief history: Immigration in Western Europe post-WWII

The cultural and historical contexts in which both anti-immigrant sentiment and radicalization occur are fundamental to a more complete understanding of them. As the history of pre-WWII Europe is embodied more by emigration than immigration, it is pertinent here to focus on the period since 1945. Post-WWII immigration across Europe can largely be defined by a sharp increase in the need for labor, and a resulting recruitment of foreign labor to satisfy the demand. Randall Hansen, in his paper, “Migration to Europe Since 1945: Its History and its Lessons,” points out the trend in the search for foreign workers followed by Germany and the majority of Europe: looking first to Southern Europe, and then to Turkey and North Africa. Guest worker programs were set up across Europe; the term “guest” is significant in itself, highlighting the assumed temporary nature of these workers. Germany’s policy, for example, presumed that the presence of guest workers would correspond precisely to the availability of jobs, and would thus diminish with the decrease in demand. The early 1970’s brought a similar circumstance in several Western European countries, namely, a growing population within a slowing economy, and a resulting attempt to halt immigration. As workers no longer had confidence in having an easy return to their host country, many chose not to return to their native residence.
Former colonial nations have a slightly different history, as they were able to capitalize on large pools of colonial labor (whether this was a deliberate action or one resulting from a true lack of other options is up for debate). The case of the UK is unique in that Britain, in the midst of the post-WWII labor-demand period, granted citizenship to all colonial British subjects.¹ When immigration-halting legislation was enacted in the early 1970’s, it is estimated that approximately 1 million migrants had moved to the UK (Hansen 2003). In France, the flow of immigrant workers quickly proved insufficient, prompting companies to turn to Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria, and a large influx of workers from the latter.

Though there is indeed much variation between nations, they all experienced a general trend of halting immigration between the years of 1971 and 1973, and consequently found themselves ‘trapped’ with an immigrant population (Hansen 2003). An unavoidable demand for family reunification highlighted the permanency of this situation. Though foreign workers were always victims of a degree of discrimination, their assumed temporality guarded them from becoming a ‘national problem.’ The UK was likely the first to experience the politicizing of the immigration issue, most evidently manifested in the 1958 race riots (Hansen 2003). As Hansen suggests, this may be attributed in part to a rather migration-friendly political environment and disregard for native workers’ expressed concerns. We see here developing a form of xenophobia closely tied with elements of the economy and employment. Within the same context, a fitting example of the developing role of the right wing in anti-immigrant sentiment can be observed. In a series of speeches portraying the ‘evil and threatening immigrant,’

¹ For further detail on this subject, see UK case study.
Enoch Powell, a conservative Shadow Cabinet member, managed to gather substantial working-class support. Such manipulation of common fears about immigration, as will later be discussed, became a consistent trend of the right wing across Western Europe.

Anti-immigrant sentiment in Western Europe thus has its roots largely grounded in economic issues. This often remains the explanation for such antagonistic sentiment; however, the changing international environment of the past decade—particularly since September 11th—brings the adequacy of this explanation into question.

**The unprecedented demographic: Immigration in Western Europe today**

The demographic found in Western European nations today is both surprising and essential to the context of this study. Immigration is by no means a novel issue for the nations that today comprise the European Union. The post-WWII era ushered in waves of non-national residents, and the consequent birth of nationalized discourse about the latter. Yet population statistics today reveal the EU facing an unprecedented demographic situation; one in which Western Europe, now quite familiar with the fundamental issue of immigrant assimilation, faces a challenge. In its August 2006 report, Eurostat estimates 25 million non-nationals (defined as persons who are not citizens of the country in which they reside) living in the EU-25 in 2004, a figure that amounts to approximately 5.5% of the population. The most significant fractions of this immigrant population were found to be concentrated in France, Spain, Germany, the United Kingdom, and Italy. The proportion of Muslims residing in these nations has not been expressly determined; however, common estimates place the figure between 15 and 20 million—a number expected to double by the year 2015 (Kupchan 2004).
The subsequent finding of the Eurostat report is of equal significance. This pertains to age structures, which are shown to vary considerably between national and non-national populations. The latter is said to be composed of a majority of young adults – 41% between the ages of 20 and 39 – in contrast to a figure of 28% amongst the national population. A parallel dimension of this finding is in the proportion of the population over 65, being 17% of the national group compared to just 9% of non-nationals. As Charles Kupchan notes in his paper, “Immigrants Change Face of old Europe,” if demographic trends proceed as forecasted, by 2050 Europe will have 75 pensioners for every 100 workers, and an even more concerning ratio of 1 to 1 in some nations (Kupchan 2004). This statistic exists as clear support of what has become a widely accepted truth, that Europe’s national population is facing a rather serious replacement crisis.

In contrast, the European Muslim population has been found to be increasing at a startling rate; in fact, the National Intelligence Council expects the Muslim population in Europe to double by 2025 (Leiken 2005). This, placed alongside an aging European population, paints a rather clear picture of Europe’s likely future demographic.

An additional factor that is absent in the Eurostat report should be mentioned for a more comprehensive understanding. Official accounts of immigrant populations within the EU function much like Eurostat, in referring only to residents holding foreign citizenship as immigrants. However, this measurement is lacking when taken in light of the reality of immigration in Europe today. Neglected is the fact that a substantial portion of ‘immigrant’ populations in the EU today is in fact second and third-generation immigrants holding valid EU citizenship. It is precisely this group that is most relevant in
today’s discussions of integration, anti-immigrant sentiment, and challenges to the EU.

Leiken elaborates on this very issue, writing,

As a consequence of demography, history, ideology, and policy, Western Europe now plays host to often disconsolate Muslim offspring, who are its citizens in name but not culturally or socially. In a fit of absentmindedness, during which its academics discoursed on the obsolescence of the nation-state, Western Europe acquired not a colonial empire but something of an internal colony, whose numbers are roughly equivalent to the population of Syria. Many of its members are willing to integrate and try to climb Europe's steep social ladder. But many younger Muslims reject the minority status to which their parents acquiesced. A volatile mix of European nativism and immigrant dissidence challenges what the Danish sociologist Ole Waever calls "societal security," or national cohesion (Leiken 2005).

The biggest concern is thus one not only of ‘traditional’ and general immigration, but of an enormous immigrant population that seems to be European only by law.

Savage supports this claim and notes that while these Muslim populations are often considered synonymous with the concept of “immigrants” itself, a very large proportion of them indeed holds European citizenship and will pass it onto their children. What makes this issue further worth studying is that much of these groups, centered in poor areas of large cities such as the banlieues of Paris and Tower Hamlets of London, seem to identify more strongly with Islam than with the society they live in (Leiken 2005).

**The State of Sentiment across Western Europe and the Right-wing effect**

The unprecedented and largely Muslim immigrant population residing in Western Europe today has, at the very least, propelled the issue into the forefront of political and social debate. A truly comprehensive measurement of the degree of anti-immigrant
sentiment within a country’s population—whether quantitative or qualitative—is highly
difficult to accomplish. Response bias in opinion polls, lack of consistency in surveys
over time, avoidance of ethnic-based questions, and poor documentation of race-
associated offenses all work to obscure the true state of sentiment in a nation. The
creation of such antagonism is obviously rooted in a variety of sources, among them
economic and unemployment conditions of the nation and the socioeconomic status and
background of the individual. Yet there exists a broader and significant trend in which
this sentiment has its roots: this is defined by a strengthened presence of and support for
anti-immigrant right wing political parties, appearing alongside generally increased anti-
immigrant sentiment. Precisely what kind of causal relationship the two trends have is
debatable and not necessarily relevant for the purposes of this study; what is most
significant is that they appear alongside one another and are likely mutually reinforcing.

The general mood of a population can be inferred through the appearance of such
telling social phenomena. The events of September 11th, followed by the Madrid and
London bombings, introduced a novel element of fear into the immigrant discussion and
propelled it into the rhetoric of right wing parties. Auxiliary signs of this phenomenon
can be observed currently across Western Europe: the Netherlands, once considered the
most liberal European country, has put into use a video entitled “Coming to the
Netherlands” in screening potential new immigrants. Naked women relax at the beach
and gay men share a kiss—these are only a few of the images used to determine whether
potential immigrants can accept such liberal, Western values. There is little doubt that
Muslim immigrants are the target audience of this process. Along the same lines,
Germany is considering new citizenship tests questioning views on women’s rights, Israel’s right to exist, arranged marriages, and the like (Corbett 2006).

A rather substantial body of literature exists on the relationship between antagonistic sentiment and the right-wing parties of Europe. Lubbers, Gijsberts and Scheepers find through empirical study that “Cross-national differences in support of extreme right-wing parties are particularly due to differences in public opinion on immigration and democracy (Gijsberts 2002). Elizabeth Ivarsflaten, in testing three grievance mobilization models, further finds that “No populist right party performed well in elections around 2002 without mobilizing grievance over immigration.” The use of issue of immigration was in fact the only common factor amongst all parties (Ivarsflaten 2006).

Zimelis, in his paper “Anti-Immigration in Western Europe: Power of Symbols,” argues that the problem of immigration has been dominated and manipulated by the political right; the result is a focus on the issue across all political fronts and thus, on mainstream sentiment. The issue of immigration offers an opportunity for policy makers to utilize current conditions and their own preferences to define and draw attention to a problem.

In order for this to be possible, there must be a distinct presence of policy entrepreneurs as well as ‘opportunity windows’ to propel the issue into the center of public concern. Given the importance of policy preferences and debate in elections, these opportunities are generally further exploited during the pre-election period. Zimelis cites such documented cases of increased anti-immigrant rhetoric and sentiment before local elections in Germany in September of 2004, in Sweden before parliamentary elections in
March 2003, and before presidential elections in Saxony, France in April of 2002. The identities of prominent right-wing players and parties across Western Europe are all but clandestine; some of the most significant are as follows:

- Austria: Jorg Haider; Austrian Freedom Party (FPO)
  Susanne Riess-Passer; FPO
- France: Jean-Marie le Pen; Front National
- Netherlands: Mat Herben; Pim Fortuyn List, Livable Netherlands
- Belgium: Frank Vanhecke; Flemish Block
- Denmark: Pia Kjaersgaard; Danish People’s Party
- UK: Nick Griffin; British National Party
- Switzerland: Christopher Blocher; Swiss People’s Party
- Germany: Republican Party, National Democratic Party, Union of German People
- Italy: Umerto Bossi, Gianfranco Fini; National Alliance, Northern League
- Norway: Carl Hagen; Progress Party
- Portugal: Paulo Portas; Popular Party

The actual rhetoric used to politicize the issue of immigration is noteworthy as well, as it is the tool that largely drives the right wing’s effect on public opinion. Zimelis’ study reveals key words such as “history,” “motherland,” “alien,” “us,” and “they,” used repeatedly and symbolically in developing public sentiment around the issue. Representative examples can be found across Western Europe, such as the more direct case of Germany’s Republikaner Party and France’s Front National’s use of the slogan, “Eliminate unemployment, Eliminate immigration,” and the popular right-wing French phrase, “France: love it or leave it.” The use of harsh and sometimes radical language by
these right wing policy leaders forces attention to be drawn to the issue, and capitalizes on public doubts or fears.

An additional critical aspect noted herein is the scope of the effect generated by right wing parties. The radical right wing leaders mentioned above are often seen as being representative of the political extreme of anti-immigration views; yet the right wing helps to “dictate the terms in which the issue is debated with other politicians” (Zimelis 2003). Indeed, opinion polls divided by political affiliations show strong anti-immigrant sentiment across all political fronts. This truth is reinforced by the persistence of the right’s anti-immigration programs in center-right policy. Zimelis cites the case of France, where even after Chirac’s 2002 win, the interior ministry has promoted anti-immigrant policy to win Front National voters. The Netherlands provides another example, wherein the radical Pim Fortuyn immigration policies continue three years after his death. This effect shows that though sentiment can be swayed by particular terrorist actions or the like, it is far more deeply rooted in other factors.

Stemming out of this right-wing effect is what can generally be called a move to the politicization of immigration. Buonfino justly argues that securitization has become a primary discourse type of immigration in the Europe. Working on analysis of a variety of relevant data forms, she explains that “Through the effect of the mass media on society and on the relations of power and resistance, immigration as a threat and a security concern has become the hegemonic discourse type in government policy” (Buonfino

---

2 The ability to dictate the issue politically largely stems from the public fears that are exploited, which no government, right-wing or otherwise, can afford to ignore.

3 An auxiliary point should be noted, as it has further significance for my study: the political institutions in much of Western Europe make swift change a near impossibility, explaining the lack of change in immigration parallel to right wing demands. Further, sentiment, by its inherently different nature, rarely runs parallel to formal legislation. Thus it is not anti-immigrant legislation, but sentiment itself, which is the most relevant variable to employ.
The power of the securitization of this issue is difficult to gauge precisely, but can be somewhat inferred from an intriguing bit of data: in comparing estimated and actual numbers of foreign-born residents, the 2002-2003 European Social Survey finds that the number of immigrants people think are in a country consistently exceeds the real figures (Eurostat 2003).

**The other half of the equation: the concept of radicalization**

Events such as France’s 2005 banlieue riots, immigrant rioting in Brussels in 2006, the murder of Dutch filmmaker Theo Van Gogh, and the Madrid and London bombings, exist as the more blatant displays of radicalization within Muslim populations of Western European nations. As cited in a paper of the Center for Immigration Studies, the Dutch Intelligence Service AIVD reports that Islamism has become “an autonomous phenomenon” in the Netherlands, and hints at this trend occurring among Muslim youth across Europe (Leiken 2005). The British M15 Security Service has similarly issued a public warning about ‘the radicalization of Muslim youth in Britain,’ and reported more than 2,000 British-based Islamic terrorists planning attacks. Within this caseload are 200 identified terrorist networks involving at least 1,600 people (BBC News). Though such intelligence reports are indeed telling, the concept of radicalization remains somewhat abstract and exceedingly difficult to measure. The process itself can be described as beginning with “The emergence of anti-integration tendencies and the desire to disengage from the host society. It continues with hostility towards the host society, rejection of the principles and institutions of liberal democracy, and the growing acquisition of violent attitudes, all of which make victims a potential target for recruiters” (Stemmann 2006).
An increased and potentially dangerous identification with Islam among these Muslim populations can thus manifest in many forms: a generally radical mindset, small-scale violence and rioting, and of course the all too familiar large-scale terror attacks. Still, thorough record of such factors is either classified or unknown, and so the true nature and degree of radicalization is not easily quantifiable.

In her study “Countering Radicalization: Communication and Behavioral Perspectives,” for the Clingendael Centre for Strategic Studies, Pressman focuses on precisely this issue, and suggests that attitudes of the majority population may exist as a barrier to integration and thus push the population towards radicalization. This is exactly what my study seeks to examine. It is quite safe to assume that communication between the native and the immigrant population largely determines the general environment surrounding immigration, and that this environment has potential to either breed or halt radicalization. A study of the strength of the relationship between anti-immigrant sentiment and radicalization (here manifested through more large-scale violence) can thus bring us one step closer to an understanding of the reality unfolding in Western Europe today.

An additional and complementary approach to the causes of radicalization stems from an essential facet of the concept: religion. Fingers are often pointed generally at ‘radical Islam,’ though it is select ideologies that are most significant. Among those is the basis of Jihadi philosophy, Salafism. It is vital to note that Salafism itself is not inherently political and violent, but calls for cultural rupture with Europe. It is, as with all religious movements, most problematic at its most extremes—in this case, that of ‘fighting Salafism.’ Salafism is most generally defined by a ‘Desire to practice Islam exactly as it
was revealed by the Prophet,’ and “Operates through informal networks…They mobilize in social networks created out of personal relationships and shared beliefs” (Stemmann 2006). Uses of publications, lectures, and social networking in mosques and elsewhere are characteristic methods of Salafist mobilization (a parallel characteristic is a quite pronounced social cohesion amongst recruits). As Stemmann notes in The Middle East Review of International Affairs, “The European cells of these groups have become one of the main threats to Europe’s security;” further– and perhaps more importantly, he articulates,

The transition from Salafism to terrorist militancy is easy given the radicalization that accompanies integration in the Salafi community. Support for the justification of terrorism, rejection of integration in host societies, and the creation of an Islamic State in Europe are all ideas shared by those who adopt Salafism as their system of values and behavioral model (Stemmann 2006).

The ideological facet of radicalization is critical in its study, but is hardly simple to trace; shifts to more dispersed terrorist groups and cells post-9/11 obscure this even further.

I have thus far focused on radicalization on a group level, that which is the concentration of this study. However, it would be negligent to omit mention of radicalization on the individual level as well. The process of radicalization on a grander scale undoubtedly must begin with that of the individual; such analysis, however, enters further into the realm of psychology, and is thus largely beyond the scope of this study. Substantial work has been done in examining profiles of the individual terrorist, in search of an explanation as to who might be susceptible to such extreme radicalization and why. The bulk of this literature focuses on that which inherently draws questions pertaining to the individual: suicide bombers. Perhaps one of the most comprehensive studies on the
subject is that of Pedahzur, Perlinger, and Weinberg. In sampling 819 Palestinian terrorists, they outline certain profiling characteristics, including having a religious education and ideology, being unmarried, and being from a lower social class (Lester 2004). Further, they find this individual to be overly integrated into his or her society, a statement that by all accounts is not descriptive of immigrants in Western Europe. Such examinations of the individual terrorist are of great significance to the field of terrorism itself, yet they fall short in shedding light on the European side of the problem. Palestinian suicide terrorists, largely the foci of this body of work, come from a very particular context— one rather different than that of the immigrant communities in major Western European cities. In any case, accumulation of data and analysis of individual cases is an important complement to a study of the European problem.

Research Design

In investigating the relationship between anti-immigrant sentiment and radicalization of immigrant populations in Western Europe, this study employs anti-immigrant sentiment as the independent variable, and radicalization as the dependent variable. As previously mentioned, no measurement can fully grasp the state of anti-immigrant sentiment in a nation, as there may often exist a difference between reported attitudes and actual behavior. A thorough opinion survey, however, is quite revealing, and is the most consistent and reliable measurement available for the purposes of this study. Many, however, fall short in their utility. An example of such is The Pew Global Attitudes Project, who in a survey publicly released in August of 2006 questioned non-Muslims and Muslims alike on a variety of pertinent subjects, including concerns about Islamic extremism and perceptions of ‘the other.’ A study of this nature is of great
potential to my work; unfortunately, it spans only four European nations, and thus cannot be used to shed light on the EU as a whole.

In this field, it is the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) that has completed the most comprehensive and useful work. The primary task of the organization is described as the following:

To provide the Community and its Member States with objective, reliable, and comparable information and data on racism, xenophobia, Islamophobia and anti-Semitism at the European level in order to help the EU and its Member States to establish measures or formulate courses of actions against racism and xenophobia.

I employ specifically the EUMC survey, “Majorities’ attitudes towards Migrants and Minorities,” published in March of 2005. The study was initiated in 2003 with the aid of a research team from the University of Nijmegen in the Netherlands, and set out to conduct a major data analysis of a combination of the 2003 European Social Survey and the 2003 Eurobarometer Survey. Of the four reports, I use the data of Report II, which holds findings from the 2003 Eurobarometer on majority attitudes towards minorities in the EU-15 and compares them to Eurobarometer surveys of 1997 and 2000. 4

The results of the EUMC survey were produced through a series of five questions and statements relating to sentiment. Each individual element, as well as the term used to incorporate it into my completed dataset, can be viewed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistical Label</th>
<th>Question/Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4 An important adjustment must be noted: in their report, the EUMC separates East and West Germany, and Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The former is done, as explained in Appendix 5 of the report, “Due to large differences in political and economic developments that took place after the Second World War, as well as the vast differences in economic and demographic circumstances that still exist between East and West Germany today.” However, in order to make this data compatible with all other variables used in this study, I aggregated the values for East and West Germany, and those for Great Britain and Northern Ireland, weighting the figures appropriately by population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resistance</th>
<th>• Is it a good thing for any society to be made up of people from different races, religions, or cultures?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limits</td>
<td>• There is a limit to how many people of other races, religions, or cultures a society can accept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Opposition to civil rights (opp_civilrights)  | • Legally established immigrants from outside the EU should have the same social rights as the (NATIONALITY) citizens.  
|                                               | • Legally established immigrants from outside the EU should have the right to bring members of their immediate family in (OUR COUNTRY).  
|                                               | • Legally established immigrants from outside the EU should be able to become naturalized easily.       |
| Repatriation                                  | • Legally established immigrants from outside the EU should be sent back to their country of origin if they are unemployed.  
|                                               | • Legally established immigrants from outside the EU should all be sent back to their country of origin. |
| Conformity                                    | • In order to be fully accepted members of (NATIONALITY) society, people belonging to these minority groups must give up such parts of their religion or culture which may be in conflict with (NATIONALITY) law. |

These five categories work together to yield a more comprehensive view of anti-immigrant sentiment held by nationals of the EU-15. In order to grasp the collective effect of these components, I generated a single term entitled \( antim \) through factor analysis to be used in my regressions.

To address the measurement of the dependent variable, radicalization, I draw on the RAND-MIPT Terrorism Knowledge Base. This database, building since April of
2001, is divided into the RAND Terrorism Chronology Database and the RAND-MIPT Terrorism Incident Database. For my purposes, I employ the latter. Since my intent is to examine the effect of anti-immigrant sentiment on radicalization, it is necessary to look at terror incidents during the period following the record of anti-immigrant sentiment (herein recorded by Eurobarometer in 1997, 2000, and 2003). I thus examine terrorist incident data for the period of 1998-2000 for the 1997 Eurobarometer survey, of 2001-2002 for the 2000 survey, and 2004-2005 for the 2003 survey. Accordingly, the RAND definition of terrorism is considered, and is stated as the following:

Terrorism is violence, or the threat of violence, calculated to create an atmosphere of fear and alarm. These acts are designed to coerce others into actions they would not otherwise undertake, or refrain from actions they desired to take. All terrorist acts are crimes...This violence or threat of violence is generally directed against civilian targets. The motives of all terrorists are political, and terrorist actions are generally carried out in a way that will achieve maximum publicity.

The RAND-MIPT database includes ‘terrorist incidents,’ ‘injuries,’ and ‘fatalities.’ In order to be able to conduct a proper comparison between nations, the adjusted variables incidents/population, injuries/population, and fatalities/population were used.

Additional relevant variables were also included to generate a more thorough analysis, and to avoid omitted variable bias. These consist of unemployment (as a percentage of the total labor force), welfare spending (as a percentage of GDP), and the percentage of Muslims in the population.

In supposing that the level of anti-immigrant sentiment has a particular relationship with the percentage of Muslims in the population, I incorporate an interaction term entitled antimmus (antim x % Muslim) into the analysis as well.
Postulations

Prediction I) Increased anti-immigrant sentiment will have an overall positive effect on radicalization, acting to drive the trend further. An environment of antagonism towards non-nationals, particularly Muslims, creates further isolation of that population from mainstream European society. Events of the last several years suggest that Muslims of Western Europe are (collectively) reacting to such failed integration not by stronger attempts at assimilation, but rather by stronger identification with Islam.

Prediction II) I expect that the percent of Muslims in a nation will affect the strength of this relationship. It seems likely that those nations with a higher proportion of Muslims will experience a strengthening of this effect.

Remaining Issues

The most apparent limitation of this study is causality. As previously articulated, both anti-immigrant sentiment and radicalization are complex phenomena, whose roots are numerous and only partially understood. Moreover, neither phenomenon can be said to have a fixed or common instigation. There are two primary elements that work to temper this problem. First, my study was initially structured to resolve this problem as much as possible, in examining terrorist incidents occurring only in the period after recorded opinion polling. Second, anti-immigrant sentiment is largely explained, as previously discussed, through the presence of right-wing party propaganda. In largely accounting for rising waves in anti-immigrant sentiment, this factor further mitigates the issue of causality.
This study, while indeed seeking to examine the causal relationship between the two trends, more generally examines whether the two have a positive relationship. It is important to reiterate that I do not purport that anti-immigrant sentiment is the sole causal mechanism of radicalization, (as my inclusion of control variables makes clear), nor that the concept can be simplified to one such relationship. There is no question that anti-immigrant sentiment is a generally negative trend. Generating any type environment of exclusion and ‘otherness’ of immigrants only creates more profound divisions within a nation. Yet one can only understand the collective nature of radicalization through dissecting the many elements by which it is created. If sentiment does indeed play even a marginal role in driving radicalization, the international community must modify its counter-efforts accordingly.

A final problem faced herein is the lack of adequate data. No research endeavor can be said to have perfect data; this particular study, however, is of a field that is only in its infancy of data collection. Europe’s history of relative unwillingness to collect ethnically or racially oriented data makes such an analysis far more difficult to implement. In its 2006 report, “Annual Report on the Situation regarding Racism and Xenophobia in the Member States of the EU,” the EUMC brought attention to this problem. Covering the full year of 2005 and all 25 Member States, the report finds pronounced and increased discrimination against minorities in the housing, education, racist crime, and legal sectors. What is perhaps most significant, however, is their finding of lacking or a complete absence of data on discrimination. As the EUMC highlights, most Member States have deliberately sought to exclude statistics based on any ethnic or national origin, making it difficult to gather any conclusions on racial discrimination. An
extension of this is the failure of most such nations to document or collect any data on incidences of racial crime or discrimination (EUMC 2006). Given the utterly insufficient records of racial violence, rioting, and the like, the optimal choice for this analysis is the use of terrorism data. Though the RAND-MIPT database is quite extensive, terrorists who are radicalized in one nation may carry out attacks in another. This study may consequently underestimate the magnitude of such radicalization within the European Union. Still, the pressing need of advancement in this realm makes it necessary to take whatever initial steps possible, even if doing so means using relatively ‘imperfect’ data.

**Findings and Implications**

The implementation of this study yields results that clearly support the prediction that anti-immigrant sentiment is positively correlated with radicalization as measured by terrorist incidents. To view the strength and significance of this relationship, a series of robust regressions were run incorporating unemployment, welfare spending, the percentage of Muslims in the population, and the interaction term \( anti-immigrant sentiment \times \% Muslim \) with the dependent variable \( \text{incidents/population} \) and the independent term \( \text{antim.} \). Table 1 shows findings revealing a positive and significant correlation between the independent and dependent variables, anti-immigrant sentiment and radicalization as measured by incidents/population. Regressions involving injuries or fatalities per population proved insignificant in effect, (with t-statistics of .75 and .92, respectively), likely because of the increased number of possible outliers involved. Casualties can obviously reflect the success or gravity of an attack, but do not reflect the actual number of attempts at terror acts, which is the variable of interest herein. Ideally, a
measurement of radicalization would include all such attempts, regardless of their magnitude.

The second finding of this study adds fascinating and quite unexpected depth to its general results. Though this finding was generally aligned with my initial prediction, an interesting divergence was found. The average value of \( \% \) Muslim (the total percentage of Muslims in a nation), proved insignificant in and of itself. However, an examination of the interaction term, \( antimmus \), sheds light on the nature of the relationship between anti-immigrant sentiment and radicalization. This sentiment has a consistently positive and significant correlation with the dependent variable, incidents/population. Yet the magnitude of this relationship varies depending on the percentage of Muslims residing in a nation. As the percent of Muslims in a given nation decreases, the degree of anti-immigrant sentiment has an increasingly strong (and significant) effect on terrorist incidents. Correspondingly, as the proportion of Muslims increases, anti-immigrant sentiment has a significantly lesser effect on radicalization as measured by terrorist incidents. The marginal effects according to changes in the proportion of Muslims can be viewed in table 2. At the extremes, with 1% Muslim in the population, anti-immigrant sentiment has the effect of 5 terror incidents, while at 8% the number of incidents drops to .97. There is not sufficient data herein to propose a reliable model for predicting numbers of incidents, yet this result is indeed significant in a more qualitative sense, and will be discussed alongside additional implications.

Four primary implications can thus be deduced from these findings: further insight into the phenomenon of radicalization itself, useful future data collection, the very important role of the greater moderate Muslim community, and the potential for large-
scale terror. The phenomenon of radicalization is clearly a product of several collective factors; precisely which elements work to produce this reaction necessarily varies according to the specific context in which it is taking place. Historical consequences, relevant legislation, discrimination in labor and housing sectors, and the like have an undeniable (though not entirely understood) effect on why and how radicalization and terror occur. Yet such factors have not been seen to produce substantial and escalating radicalization in other nations of the world (the United States, while representing a different cultural context, seems to have immigrant response that is more consistently one of assimilation). The thread that seems to run through all nations of Western Europe is a parallelism of anti-immigrant sentiment and radicalization, in varying degrees.

Antagonistic sentiment towards immigrants and minorities is an anciently perpetuated reality, and culturally harmful in all cases. Yet knowing that it does indeed help drive radicalization provides more insight into the temperament and state of certain immigrant communities in the EU. Most simply, it seems that perceptions (and the environment generated by them), do indeed have an effect on this frightening trend. These EU nations cannot afford to even momentarily stall efforts to understand and counter radicalization, particularly considering the aforementioned demographic. More thorough and consistent evaluations of sentiment (both of nationals towards immigrants and vice-versa) can profoundly help governments to understand the climate in their respective nations and reevaluate how to improve it accordingly. Correspondingly, a change in the political dialogue and rhetoric of these European governments can have enormous potential in creating an environment ripe for countering radicalization.
An extension of this, and a more subtle result underlying this study as a whole, is the true significance and potential of data collection in this field. The subject of radicalization, as previously articulated, is one whose complexity may exceed the usefulness of political analysis. Yet, this phenomenon is by nature in pressing need of analysis and countering efforts. It is of great importance to understand and then choose the most useful and appropriate methods of data collection; the findings revealed here provide a small window into this question. The results suggest that improved data collection on sentiment of both nationals and non-nationals, and especially that on racially associated violence and discrimination, is of great potential. Having a consistent and timely record of the various elements that comprise radicalization—of rioting, of all scales of relevant violence, and even some form of discourse analysis—can lay the foundation to a far more comprehensive understanding of this exceptionally concerning trend. Most importantly, the focus on radicalization provides a necessary basis for analysis of the often debated and exceedingly vast concept of terrorism.

The reasons and implications behind the second finding, (that the correlation becomes stronger and more significant as % Muslim decreases), cannot be stated with absolute certainty, but a specific and likely postulation can be made. The presence of a larger group, in this case a larger immigrant Muslim community, seems far more likely to bring with it a substantial sense of cohesiveness amidst that community. Playing an important role in this cohesiveness is the existence of family ties, social organization and normalization, a less profound sense of ‘otherness,’ and in the better cases, political mobilization. These factors collectively result in more options for the members of the community to stay connected to society. A larger group and the resulting forms of
‘support systems’ may thus work to temper the effect of antagonistic sentiment. It is most important to evaluate these findings within the relevant and current context, that of modern day Western Europe. Though the public most often hears stories of radical Islamism, the majority of these large Muslim populations are better defined as moderate. The findings of this study emphasize the potentially critical role of these large moderate communities in countering radicalization. The specific case of the United Kingdom provides useful insight into this notion.

A closer look: the United Kingdom

The problem of radicalization concerns Western Europe as a whole, and its study can thus be placed within this context. However, the EU-15 represents a set of countries, each with its own particular history, culture, and political climate. Such factors collectively determine the way in which political and ideological problems manifest in a particular country; it is therefore valuable to examine the individual nation as a complement to the whole of Western Europe. Amongst nations of the modern EU, the United Kingdom stands out as an intriguing case study. What is most perplexing is an apparent contradiction in this country: the UK has strived (more than its neighboring nations) to tame antagonistic sentiment against Muslims, and to maintain a relatively liberal air when it comes to immigrants (Fetzer & Soper 2003). Yet official studies and intelligence agencies alike cite the UK as the European hub of terrorist recruitment (Taarnby 2005, Leiken 2005). This peculiar situation demands further attention and inquiry.

5 A demonstrative example of this notion can be found herein, in the case study of the UK.
In the spring of 2006, the Pew Global Attitudes Project completed an extensive survey concerning Islamic extremism involving thousands of respondents and four major European nations and several predominantly Muslim nations. The study exposes the UK as a notable outlier in comparison to Spain, France, and Germany—three nations who have been pegged as terrorist recruiting grounds (Leiken 2005). Findings from two essential questions employed by the survey are most alarming. The first, cited as “Are you very concerned about the rise of Islamic extremism in your country?” revealed 42% agreement amongst the general population in Great Britain and 43% amongst the nation’s Muslim population. The latter figure is twice that of Spain, and nearly twice that in France and Germany (a particularly interesting finding, as it is reported by the Muslim population itself versus the ‘general’ UK population). Moreover, these concerns amongst the general population increased by 8% between 2005 and 2006, while France experienced a 2% increase, Germany a 5% increase, and Spain a 7% decrease in that same period. The 2005 London bombings certainly are factor in these results; however, they are still quite dramatic in comparison to these other European nations, whose close proximity forces them to confront the shock of such terror events as well. The results of the second question of the Pew survey are equally interesting. In asking the Muslim population whether they consider themselves a national citizen first or a Muslim first, 81% of British Muslims responded they consider themselves as Muslim first and foremost, compared to 46% in France, 69% in Spain, and 66% in Germany. The findings of such a question have enormous implications, as the topic directly touches on issues of the individual identity. Further, amongst these EU nations, the largest number of British Muslims saw a struggle between fundamentalists and moderates in their country (Pew
These collective results depict the UK as a both concerning and distinctive case. The director of the Pew Research Center, Andrew Kohut, explains most simply: “British Muslims were the most radicalized” (BBC 2006).

Troubling evidence of radicalization extends significantly beyond the Pew research survey. The following excerpts are limited yet representative:

- “A confidential study conducted by the British government leaked to The Daily Telegraph in May 2004 found that there are up to 10,000 ‘active’ supporters of Al Qaeda in the UK” (Taarnby 2005).
- “France is the key recruiting grounds for Jihadists going to Chechnya, while the UK has retained its position as the nerve centre of militant Islamism…Most of the European cells are autonomous with links to other terrorists across Europe. An example of this transnational phenomenon and the interconnectedness of the various cells is the case of the Ricin plot discovered in London in January 2003” (Taarnby 2005).
- The UK accounts for only 12% of Europe’s total Muslims, but fully 20% of their European-based mujahideen (Leiken & Brooke 2006).

The 2005 July 7 and 21 London bombings propelled all such concerns across Europe into legitimate fears, and made clear that terrorism, and correspondingly radicalization, is by no means something that can be fought from afar, but is rather a problem embedded in the streets of London.

In order to reflect on such findings, one must accordingly reflect on the relevant history of the UK. Though the issue of immigration and the Muslim radicalization is now
deeply integrated into the political sphere, it is a quite recent phenomenon. The reconstruction of the post-WWII era created unprecedented demands for labor, ushering in waves of migrants from former British colonies. Some estimates place this figure at approximately 10,000 immigrants per year arriving through the 1950’s (Baxter 2006). Coleman notes that these migration flows, contrary to other European nations, were less numerous, entirely unorganized, and in some cases unexpected (Coleman 1995). As previously mentioned, the UK differed from its European counterparts in offering such immigrants the status of ‘British subject’ and citizenship through the 1914 British Nationality and Aliens Act. This in itself expanded the concept of national identity, an effect whose reach was only seen several years later. Weak economic waves and thus lessened demands for labor brought stricter immigration controls; this revealed a gap in understanding between the government and immigrant workers– the former viewing immigration as a temporary satisfaction of demand, and the latter as a permanent situation. The resulting series of family reunification policies in the early 1970’s (and increased asylum immigration from the Middle East) brought a new sense of permanence to the Muslim immigrant population in the UK (Baxter 2006). Baxter notes a concurrent trend of ‘cultural encapsulation,’ wherein groups within the Muslim community remained distinctly [and purposely] separated from the larger society.

The presence of a substantial immigrant community inevitably brings with it a degree of politicization of that presence. Events such as the 1989 Rushdie Affair [the publication of the ‘anti-Muslim’ *The Satanic Verses* by a man of Muslim heritage], served to make this far more pronounced (Baxter 2006). In raising the voice of the Muslim community, the affair raised the issue of integration; how, to what degree, and
whether one should reconcile a Muslim identity and religion with the Western, British society. This central question served to substantially divide the Muslim community itself (Vertovec 2002). Debate of this issue, of course, continues today within both the national and immigrant communities.

A quite fundamental yet significant effect of Muslim immigration on the UK has been the need to address the state of this population through law and representation. This concerns both the ways in which these communities are dealt with by the British government, and the political mobilization achieved unilaterally by these communities. Perhaps the most traceable development of an official Muslim presence has been through mosques, associations, and Muslim schools, appearing most rapidly during the family reunification period. In fact, the number of mosques alone grew from 13 in 1963 to 338 by 1985 (Vertovec 2002). Though many Muslim organizations fell short of achieving a strong national presence, the Muslim Council of Britain, initiated in 1997, represented a unification of numerous Muslim institutions, and a collective effort to improve the standing of the Muslim community in the UK (Vertovec 2002). Preceding this organization were several others, each calling attention to the need of a productive voice for the community. Among these was the United Kingdom Action Committee on Islamic Affairs, who in 1993 sent a memorandum on reform of Muslims and the law to the British secretary of state (Vertovec 2002). This act alone, however limited its results may have been, represents the existence of a somewhat cohesive Muslim population that recognizes the importance and opportunity of integration into the political sphere. Vertovec articulates, “Well before the Rushdie Affair, Muslim communities in Britain had become increasingly organized and articulate in their calls…for the recognition of
minority rights, fair treatment, and political representation in a variety of public arenas.” These demands have been at the very least acknowledged, as seen through British accommodation of such issues as separate Muslim cemeteries, prayer facilities in the workplace, public calls to prayer, and the like (Vertovec 2002). This accommodation, though seemingly natural, stands in quite stark contrast to the situations found in other European nations.

Soper and Fetzer point out an exemplary contrast between the UK and France, who today has the largest Muslim population in the EU. A most important distinction comes with the issue of the separation of Church and state. Britain, contrary to France’s fervent adhesion to the concept of *laicité*, functions largely through the obviously religious Church of England. This would seem to impede the integration of those of Muslim faith into British society; however, it has actually allowed for a far greater degree of religious freedom. A recent example is that of the now well-known hijab, or headscarf issue. While the French government moved quickly to ban its wear in public schools, promoting the idea of separation of Church and state, the UK quickly permitted it, given the adhesion to school uniform colors (Soper & Fetzer 2003). This choice represents at once an acknowledged religiously oriented government, and openness to religious expression of other kinds. The alternative—general suppression of religious and cultural tendencies—can lead only to further and more irreparable cleavages between immigrant and host societies. The authors note, “Britain’s church-state model has been an important institutional and ideological resource for Muslim activists and has opened up opportunities for Muslim political mobilization.” Indeed, this environment allows both
the possibility of nurturing the individual identity within British society, and then establishing a cohesive and positive group identity.

Given this relatively progressive situation in the UK, how can its current reputation as a hotbed for extremist recruitment be explained? A parallel and essential question is how does a nation balance openness with religious practices, and a strict form of monitoring and curbing extremism? The response can be endlessly debated and is undoubtedly complex, yet it seems the answer is paradoxical. Government flexibility has likely allowed for a relatively significant political presence and representation of the Muslim population. However, this same flexibility has simultaneously been a source of freedom for extremist groups to blossom and recruit. We thus find a more generally moderate and healthy general Muslim community, and more radicalized and thriving, albeit small, extreme factions. Indeed, as Taarnby notes, “Islamic terrorist organizations still consider London as the launching pad for enlisting new recruits. This conviction is supported by a thorough understanding of immigration laws, adherence to the individual’s right to privacy, and the constraints and limitation of the British security services.” Though the degree of such general freedom has certainly changed substantially since the events of 9/11 and July 2005, it long allowed for radical roots to be planted in the grounds of London. The findings of this study, that a smaller Muslim community is more affected by anti-immigrant sentiment, further support this notion. Though the often-used term “Londonistan” would suggest otherwise, the United Kingdom in fact is only 2.5% Muslim, compared to France’s approximately 8% and the Netherlands’ 5.4%.
If this is indeed the present case in the United Kingdom, enormous weight falls on the role of the large and moderate Muslim community in the nation. A vital and central question thus emerges: can moderates help to quell the more radical and potentially dangerous forms of Islam? Perhaps the UK is where we see the most heightened and obvious manifestation of this central question in Europe today. Taarnby supports the presence of a certain conflict between the two, “In spite of certain specific setbacks in the recruitment effort… the Salafist congregations have become increasingly popular in Oldham, Bradford, Birmingham and Manchester. The battle between radical, conservative and moderate British Muslims for control of the mosques is ongoing.”

This unnerving conflict places the UK, as well as other European nations, in an exceedingly difficult situation. The government is faced with the necessary realization that the strength and cohesion of the general and moderate communities is a central element in curbing radicalization. The occurrence of the July 7 and 21 London bombings would seem to suggest that these moderate communities do not yet have substantial power to counter such extremism. Yet what is most important is that their relative influence and power could prove to be a defining factor in the future of radicalization and terror.

**Further implications: from radicalization to large-scale terror**

As Western Europe becomes more antagonistic towards its immigrant populations, and as right wing leaders perpetuate and build on these concerns, the chasm between Europe and its Muslims grows increasingly wide. It is quite evident that a general mood of hostility towards immigrants breeds deeper barriers in communication and general unpleasantness. However, when this sentiment pushes beyond this level to
help drive its immigrant populations into radicalization, vast implications abound. It is important to stress once again that Western Europe’s ‘immigrants’ are not solely non-nationals, but in reality generations of Muslim youths holding European citizenship. It is precisely this group that draws the most concern from intelligence agencies across the EU, as being most vulnerable to radicalization and recruitment efforts (Leiken 2005). Their command of European languages, technology, and general familiarity with customs has implications beyond Western Europe, as all of these factors facilitate infiltration into the United States.

Leiken and Brooke’s comprehensive 2005 study stresses this further, in addition to the potential convergence between immigration and terrorism: of the The Nixon Center’s matrix of 373 terrorists residing in Western Europe and North America, eighty-seven percent are immigrants; moreover, its composition reveals more French nationals than nationals of Pakistan and Yemen combined, and more Britons than Sudanese, Emiratis, Lebanese, or Libyans (Leiken & Brooke 2006).

Findings from Ethan Bueno de Mesquita’s study entitled “The Quality of Terror” shed light on the gravity of these implications. The author constructs a model of interaction between a terrorist organization, a government, and potential terrorist volunteers. Though his focus is not one of immigration or small-scale violence, Ethan BDM’s work yields results that are both relevant to and have implications on the study of anti-immigrant sentiment and radicalization. The model in “The Quality of Terror” is built on the findings that individuals with poor education and low ability are most likely to volunteer to join a terrorist organization, yet the organization screens and recruits according to quality. BDM presents, most generally, empirical results wherein low
economic opportunity is positively correlated with terrorism, and actual terrorist operatives are not at all lacking in education. The author astutely notes that the existence of screening procedures by terrorist organizations changes the necessary method of analysis of who is a willing candidate for terrorist acts.

It is the existence of these screening procedures that is most relevant here. BDM claims that the terrorist organization has specific preferences regarding its recruits, and seeks out only those with better education and ability (which includes familiarity with and the ability to adapt easily to different cultural contexts). This assumption is consistent, as he notes, with both Maleckova’s and Berrebi’s 2003 works on socioeconomic backgrounds of terrorists. This screening means that terrorist organizations do not only prefer, but also seek out and select very specific qualities. Among these are education, skill, and perhaps most importantly, language proficiency, citizenship, and familiarity with Western customs. The latter three characteristics precisely describe the second and third generation Muslim immigrants residing in Western Europe today. These youths, though largely shown to identify with Islam over their respective European environments, possess European citizenship, relative proficiency in European languages, and have grown up exposed to Western European customs (Leiken 2005, Pew 2006). If this same pool of immigrants (or even a limited portion of them), is indeed being pushed toward radicalization within the hubs of EU nations, then they comprise a group of ideal candidates for terrorist cells. The potentially disastrous implications of this are self-evident.
Conclusion

This study has sought to examine the trend of radicalization in Western Europe, specifically through evaluating its correlation with anti-immigrant sentiment in those EU nations. In using EUMC and Eurobarometer survey data on sentiment, and RAND-MIPT data on terror incidents, a positive and significant correlation between anti-immigrant sentiment and radicalization was found. An additional intriguing finding showed that as the proportion of Muslims in the population decreases, the correlation becomes stronger and more significant; likewise, as the percent Muslim increases, this relationship decreases in strength and significance. Such results shed light on the concept of radicalization itself, and highlight the role of the nation–of the public, of the government, and of the general environment–in driving or slowing this trend. Out of the secondary finding emerges the importance of the large moderate Muslim communities in Western Europe, and suggests that perhaps it is they who largely hold the key to countering radicalization.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Incidents/population</th>
<th>Fatalities/population</th>
<th>Injuries/population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compound measure of anti-immigrant sentiment</td>
<td><strong>5.576</strong></td>
<td>2.69 e-07</td>
<td>1.20E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-statistic</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% population of Islamic faith</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>3.86 e-08</td>
<td>1.46E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-statistic</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction between anti-immigrant sentiment and % Muslim in a population</td>
<td><strong>-0.576</strong>*</td>
<td>-3.85E-08</td>
<td>-2.03E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-statistic</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage unemployed in total labor force</td>
<td><strong>0.475</strong>*</td>
<td>4.02E-08</td>
<td>1.98E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-statistic</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare spending as a percentage of GDP</td>
<td><strong>-0.092</strong></td>
<td>-4.60E-08</td>
<td>-1.96E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-statistic</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td><strong>-3.318</strong></td>
<td>7.10E-07</td>
<td>2.96E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-statistic</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td><strong>0.52</strong></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust t statistics in parentheses
* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%
TABLE 2 (A)
Marginal effects of changes in percent Muslim on the strength of the effect of anti-immigrant sentiment on the proportion of incidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Muslim</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>t-statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.713</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.425</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>4.292</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.137</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.849</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.273</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.698</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.468</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.122</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.547</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 (B)

**Marginal effects of changes in percent Muslim on the strength of the effect of anti-immigrant sentiment on the proportion of incidents**
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