Hi Winston,

I enjoyed reading your prospectus. It is potentially a very interesting topic that seems to demand greater attention. Most of my comments are questions that popped up when reading through the prospectus. I think there are several assumptions embedded within your logic that may be true but are worth thinking about and stating explicitly.

Tyler

- It would be helpful to first develop a clear definition for “anti-immigrant party”.
  - Is it any party that adopts a position against immigration (e.g., left-wing parties driven by labor interests)?
  - Or does it need to be a right-wing party?
  - Does the party need to focus on immigration as the most salient issue?

- How do anti-immigrant parties think about other political issues? You seem to assume their stance on immigration is fixed exogenously, but they are willing to pivot on other issues as needed for electoral success. Is there any evidence for this assumption?
  - What about the natural alternative, where all policy positions (including immigration) come from the same underlying ideological position?

- I don’t understand the logic on low vs. high employment economies.
  - You say in low unemployment countries, anti-immigrant parties lack sufficient numbers of working class voters and thus have to reach across the aisle to moderates. But somehow this makes them more likely to adopt a conservative position on redistribution? How does a conservative party adopting a more conservative position help them capture moderate votes?

- How is your theory different than this, somewhat simpler explanation: all political groups, including anti-immigrant parties, face electoral pressures to converge to the median voter’s position? So in states with a large welfare state, they support social welfare support, and in states with a small welfare state, they’re fiscal conservatives.
  - In other words, is this story specific to anti-immigrant parties? If so, how?

- Perhaps I missed it, but I don’t understand how candidate wealth is a credible signal of economic platform (Bloomberg? Soros?).

- I like the case study on the rise of the SVP. Reading through it does generate the impression that your theory leans heavily on this specific case. I would just remain flexible when you branch out to other countries and parties.