

Foreword to the Second Edition

In the midst of the ongoing implosion of the Government and the Home Office over immigration and asylum in 2006, my mood today is as upbeat as it was some two years ago, on the resonantly bright and sunny morning of September 6, 2004. Later that day this book was due to be launched at the British Academy in London's Carlton House Terrace. David Davis, the shadow Home Secretary, who had consistently supported my position, had kindly agreed to attend and give a short speech — indeed, it was his suggestion to have a proper media launch. After months of vilification at the hands of the Home Office and the 'liberal' media, now at last was my chance to present the facts and to outline my reasons for blowing the whistle on the Government's immigration shenanigans.

Imagine my surprise then to receive a phone call from Davis's chief of staff telling me that he had pulled out at two hours' notice. Although he had a copy of the book for several weeks, the reason given was disagreement over some of the contents. It turned out, though, that he had been ambushed by a full-page diatribe in that day's Independent newspaper, by their literary editor, Boyd Tonkin, who claimed (on the basis of nothing whatsoever that I had actually written) that the book was a 'crude and inflammatory tract' and that Davis should have nothing to do with it.¹

Since then the Tories have flip-flopped on immigration, blowing this way and that in line with the views of Mr. Tonkin and his friends

[1] Davis also had some serious hiding to do from media enquiries about the report on immigration he had commissioned from Timothy Kirkhope, the Tory leader in the European Parliament. Kirkhope's chief recommendation was that nobody should be allowed to settle here unless they had a degree and earned over £20,000! Davis remained invisible for the following week.

at the Groucho Club. Here's an example of the latter: a delightful little piece of snobbery from a review in the magazine *Progress*:

The best thing about this book is that it saves you the cost of an evening in the pub. Just reading Moxon conjured up the filthy red carpet, the sticky counter, the smoky air and the swivel-eyed patron on the next stool, sharing his opinions. Mmm...

In fact public opinion has always been far to the right of my own views.² As Frank Field put it in his review of my book in the *Sunday Times*:

One issue stands out from canvassing core Labour voters over more than four decades. Many of our supporters hold social views well to the right of the Conservative party and offer opinions on asylum that the British National Party tries to reflect.

What the Tories have really been trying to do, especially under Cameron's form of Blairism lite, is to represent the 'liberal' views of the metropolitan elite (to use the phrase the dreaded Robert Kilroy-Silk famously made his own) – the predominant mindset in government, education and (much of) the media. But the media is a fickle creature – the position that earned me virulent scorn in 2004 is now more or less the received wisdom. In the afterword to the new edition of this book I outline the developments that have led to this sea-change in 'informed' opinion.

Much has happened since 2004, and I contemplated a completely new book, but the Government/Home Office meltdown witnessed in 2006 reveals this book to have been even more prescient than I had myself thought, regarding the depth and detail of what was wrong and the analysis of why we got into the mess and the dire consequences. My publisher persuaded me to provide a major up-date of the calamitous 2006 events and what led up to them, but otherwise to retain the original text – warts and all – so that the reader can see for himself the appalling duplicity of the political elite together with the inconsistency of the media that has given rise to what is truly the greatest political scandal of the decade.

The immigration debate came full circle on August 15, 2006, when one of the Government's own MPs told legal migrants to go home. The Asian Labour MP for Dewsbury, Shahid Malik, speaking on his regional BBC TV news, told British resident Muslims who don't like

[2] I lived happily for twenty years in the midst of a Muslim enclave in Leicester and stood as a Liberal Democrat council candidate with Asian running mates, having long been involved with inclusive community politics.

living here and think it's better in Muslim countries, 'it's better that you weren't in the country'. This met with an immediate reaction from the very moderate Asian Labour dignitary, Lord Ahmed of Rotherham, who (speaking on the same programme) described Malik's statement as 'BNP talk'.

In fact, such a policy would be extreme even for the British National Party. The BNP certainly advocates repatriation of legal migrants, but only voluntary repatriation and, at least in public, does not admonish migrants to return home. Malik said nothing about choice and was referring not so much to recent arrivals as second- and third-generation Asian Muslims – those from families long established here – which research by NOP/ Channel4 Dispatches only the previous week had revealed as those most likely to give passive or active support to Islamic fundamentalist terrorism.

Such a pronouncement, one might imagine, would be political suicide for any MP, let alone a Labour MP; but presumably because he was Asian himself, Malik thought he was protected. It will be lost on no-one that the Government has vilified as racist anyone who simply raised the immigration issue, let alone anyone making such incendiary comments. Me, for instance, when I outlined simple facts, not controversial proposals or rhetoric like this. Why is the one labelled 'racist' and the other merely as talking 'as if' racist? How do we know that Malik is not racist or 'xenophobic' re other Asian or Muslim groups other than the one he is a member of himself? We know that some of the worst bad feeling is between different Asian and different Muslim populations. I was falsely accused of racism for exposing an Eastern European immigration scam; the fact that East Europeans are white Caucasian – my own race – did not stop anyone jumping to a pejorative conclusion. So why is Malik exempt? Why is the law for the rest of us not the law for the political classes?

Well, it seems that Mr Malik himself believes that the political classes shouldn't be exempt; and especially not Labour MPs. Two years before he had slapped down a fellow Labour MP, Phil Woolas, who was trying to draw attention to another form of black-on-white racial violence (see pages 130-131, below). Malik said: 'The comments feed far-right organisations like the BNP who hijack the remarks... Mr Woolas has no basis for his view and is clearly out of line with Labour Party thinking.'

What a beautiful, ironic illustration of the ongoing hypocrisy over immigration in this country!

Sheffield, August 2006