



Transcript

Global Migration: The Challenges for the West's Political Leaders

Jack Dromey MP

Chair of the APPG on Migration

Don Flynn

Director, Migrant Rights Network

Matthew Goodwin

Associate Fellow, Europe, Chatham House

Frank Sharry

Executive Director, America's Voice

Chair: Baroness Falkner of Margravine

House of Lords

15 November 2011

The views expressed in this document are the sole responsibility of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the view of Chatham House, its staff, associates or Council. Chatham House is independent and owes no allegiance to any government or to any political body. It does not take institutional positions on policy issues. This document is issued on the understanding that if any extract is used, the author(s)/ speaker(s) and Chatham House should be credited, preferably with the date of the publication or details of the event. Where this document refers to or reports statements made by speakers at an event every effort has been made to provide a fair representation of their views and opinions, but the ultimate responsibility for accuracy lies with this document's author(s). The published text of speeches and presentations may differ from delivery.

Baroness Falkner:

Hello, good evening. I'm Kishwer Falkner and I'm going to be chairing tonight's discussion. I apologize for a slightly delayed start, but you'll see we have a vacant chair. We're waiting for Jack Dromey, who will be here with us very shortly, I hope. In the meantime, let me set out a few housekeeping rules and explain to you how we're going to go through this evening. Each panellist will speak for five to ten minutes, and I'd like to leave as much time as possible for your questions and answers, because I suspect that's where we'll really get to the grittier part of the evening. But you'll be pleased to know that we have a stellar cast today.

So on my left we have Frank Sharry, who's over from the United States for this meeting. He's founder and executive director of America's Voice, which is an organization that campaigns for immigration reform in the US, and he's served as executive director of the National Immigration Forum in America, which was a lobbying organization forum, if I might describe it as such, in Washington. Prior to that, he's worked around issues to do with Central American refugees and Vietnamese refugees to Indonesia. So, he's got a great span of the American debate, and I think we're very lucky to have that input tonight.

To my immediate right is Matthew Goodwin, who is an associate fellow here at Chatham House, so some of you may have encountered him before. He's an associate fellow in the Europe programme here and is a lecturer in the School of Politics and International Relations at Nottingham University. He's done quite a lot of research in the area, and has co-edited a book, *The New Extremism in 21st Century Britain*. So the moment you leave, go out and buy that straight away; he needs to boost his royalties. He's also – that was unprompted, he didn't ask me to say that – he's also written extensively for *The Guardian*, *The New Statesman*, and various other publications.

To my far right is Don Flynn, who is director of Migration Rights Network – sorry, Migrants' Rights Network. He leads the organization's strategic development, but more important than all his expertise in that, to me, he's a former immigration caseworker. So, boy, he will bring some real life perspectives to this debate today. He also is chair of the UK Race and Equality Network, and the Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants.

Now, alongside that stellar cast, you might wonder what I'm doing here, so just a word or two in terms of declaring my interest. I have no expertise on this whatsoever, other than, I suspect, I bring a bit of practical experience,

because I got off a plane here in the United Kingdom in 1976, as the classic economic migrant. There was a job going in the UK for the corporation for which I worked, and they said, 'why don't you go and live in London for two years', and how could one say no to that? But the two years, if you can calculate you'll see that they've become rather more extensive than that short period that I came here for.

I think my defining moment as an immigrant wanting to become a citizen came when I was naturalizing just up the road, to become a citizen of the United Kingdom after having spent some time here. I had the immigration lawyer alongside, I had to take – unlike most other Brits at the time, this was 1983 – I actually had to take an oath of allegiance 'to Her Majesty the Queen and her issue'. Those were the words. So I realized I was making a pretty long-term commitment; we had not only the Queen but her issue as well. And it suddenly struck me, as I turned around to my lawyer and said, 'this is slightly problematic, because I'm a republican'. Then I decided – he said a few sharp words to me, I was younger then – and I decided that I couldn't let pragmatism be the enemy of the pure. So I went promptly back into the room, took my oath of allegiance, and carried my British passport around with great pride ever since, and it's the only passport I hold. So I feel I'm actually pure.

But anyway, the final thing I want to say before we start, and I want to give the floor first to Frank, is that this discussion is on the record, so bear that in mind as we go through the evening. Frank, would you like to kick us off with the American perspective?

Frank Sharry:

Thank you, I'm glad to be here. Well, the immigration debate in America is highly polarized and increasingly partisan. This has not always been the case. A few years ago George W. Bush, who was, to be honest, not my kind of president, was actually quite progressive on the issue of immigration, and there was an attempt to pass a major overhaul of our immigration policy, a modernization called the Comprehensive Immigration Reform. But the law fell short, primarily due to a rebellion on the right wing, of opposition to anything that would grant legal status or visas to immigrants, particularly low-skilled immigrants from south of the border, from Mexico and Central America and Latin America.

Now, the reason the debate has become so polarized – there's obviously a number of political factors involved, but there are very starkly different views of diagnoses, if you will, of what's happening; why we have ongoing illegal

immigration into the United States, why we have 11 million unauthorized immigrants residing and settled in the United States. It's quite remarkable, America is a nation of immigrants, but more than a quarter of immigrants currently residing in the United States are there without papers. So this is the issue that sucks the oxygen out of the room, this is the dominant issue in the immigration debate: what do we do about ongoing illegal immigration, and what do we do about 11 million people in the United States?

Now, opponents of illegal immigration, and opponents of comprehensive immigration reform, their diagnosis is that what we have – to simplify it, as we Americans like to do – their diagnosis is, these are bad people who are breaking good laws. Therefore, the prescription is to enforce the laws aggressively, and to ramp up the laws so that they can be enforced more aggressively. Let's build a wall on the US-Mexico border, let's have interior enforcement policies aimed at arresting, detaining and deporting people, and let's have state laws, such as in Arizona and now the horrific example of Alabama, where an Arizona copycat law is going into effect, where literally the goal is to make life so miserable for particularly Hispanic families of mixed status that they're driven out of the state and presumably one day out of the country. The anti-immigrant or restrictionist force in the United States call this strategy 'attrition through enforcement', which we call mass deportation with a smiley face slapped on it. So it's a very aggressive attempt to say: bad people, get rid of them.

The other side of the debate says, wait a minute, these are for the most part good people... Hey, welcome! Please, come in.

[Jack Dromey MP enters the stage]

Jack Dromey:

I'm trying not to interrupt you.

Frank Sharry:

So the other side of the debate says, basically we're talking about mostly good people, who have come to the United States to work, to settle, the same way immigrants have for hundreds of years, the difference is that the law is out of step with reality. There is no line to get into. So this is the good people, bad law approach. Therefore the idea is to come up with a twenty-first century regulatory regime that regulates immigration so that it's orderly, but does so in a way that's both market-sensitive and humane. And that approach was really

adopted by many of us early. I was part of a US-Mexico commission in the late 1990s that fortuitously was made up of many people on the Mexico side that ended up going into the Vicente Fox administration, when he was the first legitimately democratically elected president of Mexico in 70 years. And he and George W. Bush – a Texan who seemed to get this issue, and wanted to make a different kind of mark in foreign policy – Fox and Bush said, let's come up with a big idea. We of course, as advocates and think tankers, came up with that big idea, which was to deal with an arc of migration. Let's deal with the idea that people in the United States who are otherwise law-abiding should be given a chance to obtain legal status and citizenship – let's make sure that we have more border security and border development, and let's make sure that we deal with the root causes of migration, so that over time we can reduce the pressures.

This big idea gained tremendous momentum for a few months. I was in the White House on 10 September 2001, talking about how the Bush-Fox strategy was going to go to the respective congresses along with an arms treaty. And then of course 9/11 literally blew up that process and it was dead. It came back legislatively in the mid-2000s. John McCain, a Republican, and Ted Kennedy, a Democrat, the idea was to do it legislatively – again, it fell short.

Since then, in the absence of a... what's happened is that good policy has fallen victim to polarized politics. There's been a rightward lurch in the United States. The Republican Party has gone from being genuinely split between kind of pro-business libertarians and anti-immigrant cultural conservatives and is now mostly an anti-immigrant party. This may have several political consequences in the upcoming election, with the Hispanic vote. Obama did fabulously well with them in 2008, and may do well again. But the point is, is that right now, the American people, who are desperate for some sort of solution that modernizes immigration, that combines controls and regulation with humanity and national interest and economic growth, some 70 percent or more of the American people support comprehensive reform, but our politics are so dysfunctional that at this point it's inconceivable that there will be that kind of political will or legislative breakthrough.

So as a result we're in a time for a very difficult, contentious debate, and it's going to be more of a political war and a cultural war than a policy debate. And it's going to require that political and cultural war to be resolved in favour of one side or the other before we actually have a definition of what kind of policy we're going to have in the future.

Baroness Falkner:

You stuck to time and what's more, you were even quicker. But you have, I'm sure, plenty of Q&A to come back on. Jack, would you like to set the scene for us in terms of the UK next?

Jack Dromey:

Fine, I'd be very happy to. First of all –

Falkner:

Can I introduce you?

Dromey

My apologies!

Falkner:

Well, Jack Dromey may not need an introduction, but I'll go through the motions as it is on the record. He shadows the Department for Communities and Local Government and is the chair of the all-party group in parliament on migration [sic]. He's also served as the deputy general secretary of the Transport and General Workers' Union, so I'm sure he'll have something to say to us about employment, issues around employment and immigration, as well. And he's been treasurer of the Labour Party. He also serves on the Labour Party's National Executive Committee, and has a host of other important things. But why don't we hear from you what your ideas are, particularly as chair of the APPG on Migration.

Jack Dromey:

Well thank you very much, chair. And can I start by apologizing for being late; I was at the funeral today of a towering figure in the Labour movement, Philip Gould, and for reasons that you'll understand, it was for me a sacred commitment. But I am sorry that I couldn't be here at the start, because I was fascinated by some of the things that Frank was saying just now and I look forward to the discussion.

If I can just start by saying this, is my father came from County Cork to this country to dig roads, and my mother came from Tipperary to train in a hospital as a nurse. I know how tough it was for them when they first arrived. I remember being 14 years of age when my father told me for the first time what it was like, unable to look me in the eyes but instead looking down at the floor, what it was like to try and find lodgings in Kilburn and Cricklewood, in northwest London, historically a great Irish area, with sometimes the proverbial signs of 'No Irish need knock at my door'. So, for me the starting point is this – that if you look back at the last hundred years and more, successive waves of migration that have built our country, our country is a stronger, better place as a consequence of those successive waves who've come to our shores. The migrants who came to Britain both helped to build our economy, enriched our society, contributed towards our remarkable and dynamic diversity. So I think we start, for me, with a celebration of migration and the role that migrants have played in our society.

Now having said that, you then need to be very hard-headed about managing migration, managing the consequences of migration, never making promises that you can't deliver, and then I would like to conclude by saying something about how we might start to refocus. And I agree with what Frank has said about the nature of the debate; it's become an increasingly difficult one, with a rightwards drift in this country in particular, but I have to say throughout most of continental Europe. Now, you have to manage migration, of course. Any country has the right to manage migration to their shores, and it's important that we have a policy that is fair, that works and inspires confidence. Today, just by the by, if you saw the fiasco before the Home Affairs Select Committee, there's a distinct lack of confidence in terms of how the UKBA works. But in terms of managing migration, I think that fundamentally the principles of the points-based system which we introduced in government were right. I wasn't a fan of every aspect of that, but it was a rational basis from which migration could be managed.

Managing then the consequences of migration: if it's true, and it is, that migration has been good for our country, it's also true that you have to address real fears and tensions associated with migration in the world of work, as the chair referred to. If I can give an example, I persuaded, back three years ago, the Equality and Human Rights Commission to conduct an inquiry into what's called the two-tier labour market in the food industry supply chain, focusing on the meat industry. And typically what you saw was that which you see in a number of industries that have depended on large numbers of migrants coming in is a two-tier labour market of declining

numbers of the directly employed overwhelmingly indigenous workers who've been here for generations, some of them incidentally themselves second- and third-[generation] migrants on better conditions of employment, and more and more agency workers on poorer conditions of employment exploiting therefore the newly arrived migrant agency workers and undercutting full-time workers, indigenous workers. And that, the evidence was absolutely clear, created division and damaged social cohesion. We had to deal in the union with some pretty ugly situations. When I remember, in one particular factory there was a pitched battle fight involving 150 people in a car park.

And so, it's necessary therefore that you address those tensions, ensuring equal treatment of all workers. I sought to do that in various industries and led the negotiations back in 2004 to introduce equal treatment of agency workers and the directly employed. I have to say it's a matter of regret that the regulation did not eventually come into effect until 2011 because there was a rearguard action fought by the CBI [Confederation of British Industry]. But that's a very practical example of the kind of tensions that can arise in the world of work with which you have to deal.

Then in terms of managing the consequences of migration, it's important that you both address the real pressures that there can be in hard-pressed communities on the one hand, and you make sure that no one is left behind on the other hand. Let me be clear what I mean by that. Address the tensions, on the one hand. If you look at that which has fed division in communities like Barking, it's been an acute problem of deprivation, but lack of available, affordable housing in particular. And so, on housing and the availability of housing that's key in terms of ensuring that you have adequate provision and that you don't have cut throat competition for a dwindling pool of affordable housing.

In terms of no one left behind, I can say this: in my own constituency of Erdington in Birmingham, we've got one particularly ward – Erdington is one of the 12 poorest constituencies in Britain – we've got a ward called Kingstanding ward, which is overwhelmingly poor white, of people who have absolutely been left behind, many of whom lost their jobs in the 1980s, and you've got second generation workless households. What typically has happened is that employers in Birmingham have tended to be more attracted, for example, by the dynamic incoming young Poles, and what there's not been is a sufficient emphasis by employers or by government, or the combination of the two, as to how you ensure that you have a ladder back into the mainstream in work, for those who are left behind. Because if you

don't address that, that too feeds tensions. So manage migration, manage the consequences of migration.

Can I just say this finally, is you never make promises you can't deliver. In the frankness of this Chatham House seminar, let me acknowledge one [such promise] on our government's behalf and one on behalf of what this government has done. One on our government's behalf: I agreed, in relation to Poland, for example, that we were right not to put some – as we could have done – time limits on the... before Poles could come to this country to work. We were right to do that, not least because actually at that time given the demands of the economy it was the right thing to do. On the other hand, we were crazy to say that but tens of thousands would come. And of course what you get is well in excess of half a million.

In terms of the mistake that this government is making, it's pursuing the utterly unachievable, the utterly unachievable – and that's to reduce net migration in this parliament to tens of thousands. Now, to be frank, there'd be as much chance of me growing a fresh head of Elvis Presley hair, you know, as achieving the unachievable. The problem is that the government have not only set themselves up to fail, but increasingly the screw is being turned in a way that is wrong and damaging. I could give you numerous examples. Let me just give you two.

Even in these Chatham House rules of tonight, I can't name the company, but believe you me, it is one of the world's blue chip companies, with whom I was with this morning, and in terms of their IT specialists, what they need to do is to have a dynamic two-way flow, but what they're finding increasingly difficult to do is to navigate their way through the system, including this demand for £40,000 per head. In essence what they're saying is this is creating increasing problems for our business here in Britain. And that was replicated at a seminar that the APPG had where you had leading figures for example from the City saying that there's evidence of companies already taking decisions to relocate, or not to locate, as a consequence of the problems that they're facing in being able to bring in high-skilled labour. Now we've made some progress – another time, another discussion – but there are still real problems. And the other example...

[inaudible comment]

Ok. Universities – I'll come back to that later on – student visas. Ok, thank you.

Baroness Falkner:

Matthew Goodwin.

Matthew Goodwin:

Good evening everybody. Thanks for having me. I'm a political scientist by background, so apologies to the sociologists and economists in the room. But I spent much of the past few months working on a Chatham House report on the rise of the radical right, of both the anti-immigrant and anti-Muslim parties across Europe, and looking at the underlying evidence on public opinion towards these issues.

There are really sort of three points that I wanted to make this evening concerning public concerns, the causes of those concerns, and also the consequences for our political system. And what struck me when we were working on the report, which is available in the corner or from the website, was that when you look at parties that are actively trying to mobilize the anxieties that the previous speakers have alluded to is that in many ways, radical right, far right parties in Europe have never had it so good. Levels of public concern over immigration are still at record levels. Levels of concern over this issue in the UK have now eclipsed those levels seen in countries such as France, Austria, and the Netherlands, all of which have very successful radical right parties. We've had a slew of new surveys and polls in recent months that tell us the same thing that surveys have told us over the last half century, which is, put bluntly, that voters are very concerned about immigration and they would like to see immigration reduced.

In essence, this issue has become what political scientists call a valence issue, which is an issue in which there's very little disagreement. Most voters would express concern over that issue. In fact only two months ago it was the second most important issue to voters behind the economy. It was more important to them than unemployment, just to put that into perspective. But as we sort of drill down and look at this concern in more depth, we can see that actually the picture is slightly more nuanced than 'everybody's concerned about immigration'. When we look at the source of that concern and where it's focused, it's focused on particular categories. Recent polling by the Migration Observatory would tell us that this concern is most pronounced when we're talking about low-skilled migrants and also asylum-seekers, which is interesting when we come to talk about consequences, particularly in terms of what the government can realistically do on those issues.

There's also quite an interesting top-down, bottom-up perspective to this concern – bottom-up in the sense that we know voters and ordinary citizens are concerned over this issue, but top-down in the sense that I can't recall any time really in British politics – but also increasingly in European politics – where we've had so many active political parties and social movements trying to mobilize those anxieties and concerns at the ballot box. And not just mobilize them in the sense that the NF [National Front] was mobilizing them in the 1970s – mobilize anxieties over immigration and rising diversity in a far more subtle, far more nuanced fashion, a way of presenting this opposition as a way of defending national traditions or liberal democracy or gender equality or the rise of [inaudible]. So a very nuanced and sophisticated, in some areas, argument.

So what's causing the concern? Really I just wanted to make one point, which we tried to push home in the report. When there's ever this debate over how to respond to public anxiety over immigration and rising diversity, it takes about ten seconds until somebody says, there's been a massive economic contribution that migrants and minority groups have made over the years to the national economy. That's absolutely true and I don't dispute it. The issue for voters, however, is that it isn't only economic grievances that are fuelling their anxieties over this issue. A lot of the evidence that's coming out of the Netherlands, Britain, and to a lesser extent perhaps the United States, is that what's also of concern, arguably of greater concern to voters, is the cultural impact of rising diversity, not only on things like national identity or values, but also on perceived ways of life. The simple reality is that many voters, particularly those with less resources, and typically those who've struggled amidst globalization, feel that their lives are under threat. And that isn't an only economic threat, and it doesn't only concern jobs and social housing, or tensions over regeneration grants.

The last issue is about consequences. There was something written today about a new poll by YouGov which again shed lots of light on the same sort of concerns that I've been talking about. The commentator mentioned that, well, we don't really need to worry because voting doesn't – sorry, immigration doesn't – actually have that much of an impact on voting behaviour, because when you ask people, to what extent are you concerned over this issue, typically they say, 'Well I'm really concerned about how it's affecting the country, but I'm not concerned about how it's affecting me or my neighbours, or me and my family'. That implies that voters don't think about these sociotropic concerns when they go to the ballot box, that they don't think about the impact on things like their national community and the country,

which is wrong. So I think that this concern over immigration shouldn't be dismissed on the basis that it doesn't have any electoral impact because I think it does, and I would sort of differ from some of my academic colleagues in that respect. I think it would potentially have a profound impact, depending on whether it was mobilized in a more sophisticated fashion.

Just coming to my concluding points, we now know, and we've known for quite a while, particularly since the 1980s, that citizens have far less trust today in the perceived ability of mainstream parties to deliver on immigration. Now obviously we can have a debate about what 'deliver' means, but if we look at the most recent poll that came out, it placed the Conservatives first, and then Labour, and then the BNP, when voters were asked 'who do you trust to manage immigration?' Surprisingly, the BNP came out at nine percent. But what struck me more, and this has been going on for about 10 years, is that 39 percent of voters said they didn't trust any political party to manage immigration. So between about a third and a fifth over the last decade have simply become fundamentally disconnected from our mainstream political parties on this particular issue, which raises a whole host of questions about, well, what potentially does that mean, what impact does it have on the political system, should we even really worry about that.

I think we should worry profoundly about that because of research by my colleague at Nottingham, Laura McLaren, who's looked at the impact of public attitudes towards immigration when they go unresolved over a period of time. What the study shows quite convincingly – it's coming out in the *British Journal of Political Science* – is that when public concerns over immigration aren't resolved over a long period of time, they don't only affect levels of trust in political parties, they affect levels of trust in the overall political system. That it has a more diffuse effect, that immigration is seen as almost something that can kick on to other issues, that can galvanize a sense of distrust, a loss of faith in the abilities of governments and mainstream parties to deliver on an issue that is of profound concern to citizens. So those are sort of some points I'll kick in, to hopefully galvanize some discussion.

Baroness Falkner:

Right. Don?

Don Flynn:

Ok, well thanks a lot. Yeah I mean the start line for tonight's meeting was quote 'Global Migration: The Challenges for the West's Political Leaders', and taking that as the starting point for myself I'd say that one of the biggest challenges is actually to recognize that migration is actually a global issue, it's an international issue. And in policy terms, that it actually has to be addressed in that way, that it is not, as it often appears to be in the context of a lot of domestic discussion, simply a law and order issue, about how do we take control over our own borders, how do we police the crossing of people, how do we keep track of people when they come into the country and how do we expel them when we think it's appropriate to do that.

Immigration is, I think – and I think this relates to something that, to the point that Jack has made – because I think we do something which is quite dangerous when we present it in those terms, and that is that we mislead people into thinking that we really are capable of maintaining the level of control which politicians really believe that they can do. That it is simply an issue of coming up with the bit of IT, the electronic gizmo, the biometrics or whatever that can solve this great technical problem. That we address all the silliness of our predecessors who were supposed to have taken their eyes off the ball, something that we will never do, and who have allowed them all in.

I think that this feeds directly into a lot of the concerns that my colleagues on the panel have been addressing, is that it raises expectations. That the popular perception of the way we manage migration is simply that there are not people who are strong-willed enough, that they have the power of the state to act on behalf of the British people, but they haven't done it. They're incompetent, they're foolish, and so on. It needs to be understood that immigration cannot be managed in that way, because we're not simply talking about the phenomenon of a British incompetence in managing migration. We can go right the way across Europe and look at every major country in Europe, and we've got Frank here telling us the example of the United States, we can look at the Asian countries, and we see it reproduced time and time again, the incapacity of sovereign states to manage migration when they do so exclusively from the perspective that they're simply asserting their own authority as sovereign governments over their own borders.

The challenge that I think does exist, the global challenge, is actually to relocate the debate about migration into a whole raft of other policies. Policies about, how do we make the global system of the economy actually work for the vast majority of the people, because we have failed to do that. The global economy, globalization has been a revolutionary force over the space of the

last two decades. It's shaken things up, it's brought governments down, it's transformed the nature of welfare states. But there is still a huge perception that it has left people behind, that while people have benefited from it, some people have been left behind.

And in that context, migration is actually part of the answer. Migration is part of the way in which we may take the fundamentals of living and working and having to cooperate and to do business, to do commerce and trade within international economies but [with] a redrawing of the balance of power. So that it is not only states, it is not only corporate interests that are calling the shots, but it is ordinary people, who are able to develop perspectives on movement so that when they do move they can move with a degree of confidence that their fundamental rights are going to be protected, they're not going to be exposed to danger, they're not going to be exposed to risk. And all of these issues are a part of the challenge that really has to be thrown down to the leaders, of how migration is going to have to work.

In doing this I think we also have to relate to the fact that there are lots of stakeholders. This is not simply an idealistic mission which has been taken on by a lot of dreamers in Chatham House or in other networks. One of the difficulties that governments face when they try to manage migration is because at every single point on the spectrum, their unchallenged authority is challenged by important stakeholders who have got an interest in making migration work – not stopping it, but actually ensuring that when it does take place, it meets the issues which are on their agenda. And it's fairly obvious who those are, a lot of them it's to do with business, it's also to do with the public services. Well, it's important to bear in mind I think that great public services like the health service, for example, it's almost inconceivable to imagine that that would be able to work with the level of efficiency that it has been working – it still is the most efficient mass provider of health services anywhere in the world. It happens because immigrants are integrated into that process; they work for the NHS, they produce goods, they produce value, they produce services for the NHS.

There are also a couple of other very big challenges as well – that is, and they relate to the issue of the way migration relates to the big issue of development. We know the significant contribution. Once we used to think that the story was a bad one, that migration meant brain drain, it actually detracted from the capacity of countries to escape from poverty and to plan a better future for themselves. We now know that the picture is much more complicated than that, that migration actually sets up relays, it sets up networks, it sets up opportunities in which people... welfare is [inaudible]

through these networks. Considerable sums are invested through remittances, somewhere in the region of \$400 billion during the course of 2010. In addition to that, migration, for lots of groups of migrants, is an experience of liberation. The fact that 49 percent of migrants are made up of women in the modern world today, that migration has contributed to the great, what they call the unfinished sexual revolution of the twentieth and twenty-first century which is a struggle for women for equality. And moving from one country to another as a migrant has been part of that.

There are other issues that we could add to this list – there's the question of climate change, of the environment. How do we build the resilience of people to confront and survive all of these challenges? Migration has a big role to play in those policies, and these are the sort of things that we have to think about.

Baroness Falkner:

Thank you Don. Well, we've got three quarters of an hour for Q&A. I'd like you to say who you are and your affiliation, and please remember to keep your question to the point, relatively brief if you don't mind, and also if you would specifically target your question to a particular speaker who said something that provoked a thought in you. Don't hold back from saying who it is you want to answer you, that way I won't get the whole panel and we'll be able to take more questions. The lady at the back, in the green.

Question 1:

I would like to ask a question about student migration. And I think one of the key points today was we're talking about people coming into this country, but we rarely talk about why we should try to encourage, you know, UK citizens to take up opportunities overseas, and try to cultivate highly skilled British workers for British industry to compete globally. For example, Jack, you mentioned how there has been some really poor areas where people are struggling, but my question is: do you think maybe we can try to cultivate students from those kind of quite poor areas to try to grab opportunities to enhance their skills so they can help their family and help the local business to compete?

Baroness Falkner:

Ok, Jack, do you want to take that one?

Jack Dromey:

Well, just two points very quickly, because it's my opportunity to raise the issue of the universities. First is, without repeating everything I've said earlier on, it is essential that we ensure that no one is left behind. It is essential. It's right in itself, but if you don't address that, then that feeds some of the tensions that you see, and dare I say it, in this particular ward in my own constituency. Secondly, as far as the universities are concerned, there's a simple reality – the universities here in Britain that students, overseas students, are absolutely essential, not just in a narrow sense in terms of income, but also more generally [sic]. So, for example, if you go in as I have done to the R&D facility in Birmingham University, it's a joint venture together with British Aerospace and Rolls Royce, making these, or developing these titanium parts, what you see is the 'League of Nations' who work there. There's one Welsh guy, one English guy, and the rest come from all over the world. And those people are essential in terms of the R&D work they're doing here, sort of high-end engineering work on the one hand. But on the other hand, absolutely overwhelmingly, they go back to their own countries and then they make an immense contribution towards the development of their own countries.

So I'd take the point that Don made – it's a two-way benefit, in terms of our universities, our economy here in Britain, and what that then contributes towards development in the countries from which they come.

Baroness Falkner:

That gentleman over there. And while you're waiting for the mic, let me add that one of the interesting polls that came out a few months ago was that immigration, which had not been a particularly significant issue among 16 to 25 year olds, has now become one, and they named that as one of their greatest concerns. I thought I'd just throw that in the air. Yes, sir.

Question 2:

David Croisedale-Appleby, I'm chair of Skills for Care and Development, which are sector skills councils. Now the question I'm going to direct if I may, madam chairwoman, primarily to Jack for the first response: that is that over the next 12 to 13 years, we will be looking for approximately 1.2 million additional care workers in this country. The current level – I'm talking about paid care workers – the current level is 1.55 million, which to contextualize it is 50 percent larger than the NHS. It's still smaller than the Chinese army and

the Indian railways, but fast catching up I think. My question really is this: should I plan on being able to meet that 1.2 million with the current conditions of migration limitation, or should I be looking to achieve something very different. This is against a background of almost a million 'NEETs' ['not in education, employment or training'] in this country, the young unemployed, and perhaps a perspective of the economy as both global and national that doesn't look too encouraging over that time period of 12 years.

Baroness Falkner:

Ok great. Why don't you start, and I'll bring in the other panellists?

Jack Dromey:

Fine. It's a fascinating question, and if you look at the demographic trends, as you have done, also in terms of rising demand for social care, incidentally, the potential of the Welcoming Dilemma settlement, looking to the future, there's going to be a vast demand for labour. At the last meeting of the All-Party Parliamentary Group, we focused on this very issue. The straight answer to your question is, first, of course you will look to recruitment here in Britain, including, I do think that the sector needs to look at a ladder of opportunity for those that have been left behind here in Britain as well as more generally. I think of course you should do that.

Secondly, you will draw to an extent upon the European Union. Although, you'll know, there are sometimes practical language problems there in terms of the people for whom they care. But thirdly, the frank reality is this: it is going to be mission impossible even if you did those things – you know, you have a progressive approach towards labour market recruitment here in Britain, and towards European Union labour – if you look at all the trends it will be mission impossible to meet the demand of the care sector unless you're able to recruit non-EU nationals. And a very good example, a whole number of them were there at that meeting, are the admirable Filipinos, who are the backbone of parts of the care sector. They come from a loving, caring culture. They're ideally suited to the work that they do.

So the final point I'd make, is that I think your sector is like other sectors of the economy, and I gave you the example earlier about some of the blue chip companies that are having increasing difficulties. Other than we are able to influence the current policy, then it will impact increasingly seriously on key sectors of the economy and yours is one.

Baroness Falkner:

Don did you want to come in on that?

Don Flynn:

Yeah, I mean, just very quickly. It's quite a personal question for me, for two reasons. One is that I'm not so far away from needing, I'm anticipating, home care services to an extent in the time frame that you're talking about. The other is that my dear elder sister still does put in shifts as a care worker at the moment and has been working in the industry for 20-odd years. And I think it's clear that there are a whole number of things which can be done with it in that industry which urgently need to be put into place in other situations. A lot of them Jack has already elaborated: it has to be made into a worthwhile career. The people who work within it need to be given the proper recognition and properly valued for what they're doing. It needs to be seen as a career, people need to be planned to progress for it.

You do all of these things, all of these essential things, and you're still going to be left with a gap. You are still not going to be able to recruit – and everything that we've been hearing about the way in which the industry has room. Just yesterday the news that the global authorities are simply not paying an economic rate for the people who are there, suggests that there is an economic model which needs to be put in place which is going to have to take advantage of labour resources from... which are of a diverse nature. So two elements are there: build up the profession and give it proper respect, give it the recognition that it actually needs, but also expect to recruit migrant workers for it as well.

Baroness Falkner:

Ok, we've got the gentleman here in the front.

Question 3:

My name's Greg Thompson, I'm from Unison, and I've got a question which I think is really for Matthew and Frank to answer. It seems to me that when you look at migration, it's become the go-to issue for right-wing parties across Europe and in particular in this country, and that has a sort of gravitational effect on the debates in this country. One of the problems is a lack of leadership from the other side in terms of saying some of the things that need

to be said about the value of migration and about the rights that migrants have, things that have been reflected by comments from the panel. I was wondering if Matthew had any ideas about how we could shift away from that heavy gravitational pull that is I think undermining a proper debate in this country. And I'm just interested having Frank here, what happened to Obama's commitment to regularization and where that's going, if it's going anywhere. Thanks.

Baroness Falkner:

Do you want to kick that off?

Matthew Goodwin:

Yeah, I mean that's a really good question, particularly given that these parties are delivering quite a potent message, which isn't only exclusionary and anti-immigrant and increasingly anti-Islam, it's also anti-establishment and playing on those undeliverable promises that Joe mentioned, particularly for example in this country, you know, the pledge to deliver something which is going to be difficult if not impossible to deliver. So in a way, I think there has been a degree of irresponsibility among particularly centre-right parties, who have found it very easy to play to those issues around law and order, diversity, and immigration. And the French elections next year, I suspect we may see that in play very loudly.

But I think there are options for mainstream parties. I suppose one perhaps provocative point that I would make is that up until now, a lot of mainstream parties across Europe have – at least overtly if not behind closed doors – adopted a strategy of exclusion towards these radical right, anti-immigrant parties, that says under no conditions will we either share a platform with you, or under no conditions will we accept you into the wider democratic polity, or will we engage with you on these issues. Which I don't think has been a strategy that's particularly worked out very well in any of the cases that we look at.

There is a different approach, and just to go back to the report, I think we outline five possible strategies. But one of those is about engagement, and honest engagement on this issue, and I always struggle when you look at these undeliverable promises around pledges to reduce numbers and so on – I struggle with the simple fact that not many parties in Europe today are actually being honest with voters about ethnic and cultural diversity on this

continent. And by honest I mean simply stating that this trend won't be reversed, it won't be stopped, this is going to happen and it's going to be very uncomfortable for people who feel left behind. Others on the panel will know the political implications of that honest discussion better than me, but I think there is something to be said about simply being honest to voters at this point about what's happening, and how it's going to continue to happen over coming years.

Baroness Falkner:

I think what Matt's being rather subtle about was that my party, the Liberal Democrats, going into the 2010 election, came up with the idea of having an amnesty for undocumented, illegal workers, and it went down in terms of popularity like a lead balloon. So I think there is... I would agree with Matt that there isn't enough honesty in the debate, but in democracy there are certain places that you don't necessarily want to go in the context of a general election campaign. I think I would say that that kind of really significant discussion has to happen not near an election but long in advance of it. Frankly, I would say, in the context of 2010, that that's the kind of discussion we ought to be having now, and then reach a bipartisan consensus hopefully across it, and then settle it hopefully going into 2015 so that nobody can particularly exploit it for political advantage. But anyway, how salient is this issue in the US, because I remember the amnesty pledge of George W. Bush and so on – tell us, Frank, how relevant this is?

Frank Sharry:

He was against the amnesty, he was just for a path to citizenship for those that didn't have papers. Very big difference, earned citizenship versus amnesty. It's important to understand the lexicon of American politics. In any case, let me first take the Obama question. He made big promises as a candidate, it did galvanize Hispanic and other immigrant voters, most of whom, many of whom were deeply disappointed that he hasn't followed through with anywhere near the assertiveness that he spoke as a candidate. That may have an impact in the 2012 election in terms of a depressed turnout. Hispanics are not going to vote for a Republican party that essentially says, 'we hate you'. Which, I think you'd attest, Jack, that's not a good electoral strategy.

So, 'you shouldn't be here' is essentially the Republican platform, so Obama will have the field open to him, but will those voters turn out, when so many of

them say, 'not only hasn't he done much for us on the economy, but he's deporting our family, the same people that he promised to legalize'. Which is also not a good strategy – don't deport loved ones of your voters.

So what do you do about it? I'll tell you, what Lady Falkner said is so right, we tried this desperately, to try to get sort of a multi-party approach to a problem-solving, a pragmatic, centrist approach, that would try to marginalize hotheads, particularly on the right but sometimes on the left as well, saying, let's see what we can do about solving this. It's not easy. It's not easy. But in America, the forces of partisan polarization pulled it apart. So now we're in a partisan war for some time.

So what do we do? You know, I used to be one of those bipartisan, 'let's solve the problem, let's all work together' – and now I'm a flame-thrower on the left, because I'm trying to mobilize the opposition to the right-wing, the organized right-wingers who are saying, 'let's get rid of these brown people'. And that's, to me, well we have a political scientist who can comment on this, but that's what we have to do. So the business community has gotten mobilized to fight for its interests, universities are mobilized to fight for their interests, the ethnic groups are mobilized to fight for their interests, the labour unions have gotten more engaged than ever before. And from my point of view, looking at it politically, I wish I could say, let's have a discussion about good policy on a bipartisan basis, but what we have is a political war, and until somebody gets the advantage it's going to be hard to achieve anything significant. I like our chances, even if in the short run it looks pretty bad.

Now, what we've got to do to our friends in the legislature who are brave enough like Jack to speak up, is to make sure that there's people in the centre who are backing them up. It can't just be rabble-rousers on the left, there have got to be people who say, you know what, he's got a pragmatic approach that's going to solve the problem, and we need to make sure that he's not out there on his own. So from our point of view what we talk about all the time is how do we mobilize and expand our base of support, how do we persuade sceptics, and how do we marginalize and define the opposition. That just comes straight from electoral campaigning tactics, and it's reached this issue because in America, we are not going to do right by this issue until the political sorting-out occurs.

Baroness Falkner:

I see a lot of hands now, so I'm going to start taking questions in groups. There's a lady at the back there, and a gentleman here, and after that, all the

rest of you put up your hands and we'll take them in twos and threes. Please try and be as specific as you can so that we can go through it more quickly. It was actually the lady back there, sorry. She's – yes, that's it.

Question 4:

I'm just wondering, you mentioned about the challenges for the west's political leaders in relation to voters and responding to voter anxieties about migration, but I also had a question in relation to the global watering down of the language of human rights, and the response to the recent influx of migrants from North Africa and also the agreements which have been developed and are ongoing between western states and southern countries with lesser human rights commitments perhaps, in relation to processing and intercepting migrants.

And perhaps the challenge for western political leaders [is] to lead by example and also in general, in the general watering down of the language of human rights and the implications that that will have for migrants across the world and particularly those that have suffered extreme exploitation or abuses of their rights.

Baroness Falkner:

Ok, that's – I think we've got that. The gentleman here.

Question 5:

Thank you. My comment, my question is particularly for Mr Sharry and Dr Goodwin. I'm a former intelligence analyst for Customs and Excise, and I've worked on border control projects in the ex-Soviet countries. Just before asking the question I'd quickly say that in the late 90s ahead of the EU presidency summit in Cardiff, our team did a report on the impacts of the expansion of the new EU states, and we did predict a much higher level of immigration than certain figures that were put to central government. Quite simply because of the attraction of the English language, they wanted to come and learn English, and therefore the figures were going to be like here.

My question for Mr Sharry and Dr Goodwin is based on my experience when I saw the fall of the Soviet dis-Union on a Soviet warship in Greece in 1983, when I noticed that every single rating was a Central Asian, and every single officer and petty officer was a European, and then switching to a democratic

country like America, a year later in 1984, when I was at the Alamo in San Antonio, I saw two societies with all the visitors, all the tourists very much WASPs, and the 6'2" blue uniforms walking around, and nobody went near the place from the Hispanic community. And I just wonder – my question is for the Dr and Mr Sharry – are the cultural differences manageable, without undue tension? Because it did seem to me we had two societies there, and maybe how far we're moving to that in Britain.

Baroness Falkner:

Matthew do you want to pick that one up, and then Frank, and then we'll come to the broader human rights question with Jack and Don.

Matthew Goodwin:

Yeah. First of all it sounds like you've had a fantastic life up until today.

Frank Sharry:

Can we have you back at the border agency to sort things out?

[Laughter]

Matthew Goodwin:

Very different from the university campus. Well I think just in terms of this cultural dimension that you're alluding to through the example, I mean, the reason I bring it up is because so much of the response to this debate is framed along economic lines, and I always feel it's not really true to the evidence. People like to say, you know, cultural concerns are a proxy for economic concerns, or underlying economic grievances. I'm really not convinced, I don't think that people would say to a pollster or survey administrator, 'I'm really concerned about jobs or housing but I'm going to say culture just to make that sound a little bit better'. I think it's actually the opposite, I think it's easy to say jobs or housing because everybody's talking about it but really I'm worried about the values that my Muslim neighbour has because I'm not sure he's completely committed to liberal democracy.

But I think there are things that can be done and I think that this is where we need to be much more firmly anchored in the evidence base, and we need to listen to disciplines like social psychology and we need to learn from the

experience of cases like Northern Ireland and South Africa that tell that under certain conditions – and we talk about this in the report – that under certain conditions when local and national government support forums of meaningful interaction between members of different communities, it can make a positive difference. And by that, I'm not talking about a sort of fluffy effort at having a one-world festival with a few samosas on the table, I mean actually seriously looking at how you can build bridges across different communities around things that they share in common. Which is something that the cohesion agenda in Britain has been trying to look at seriously – it's something that the commission on cohesion and integration was looking at seriously. Unfortunately it's now much more difficult to do, given that local councils and other bodies have much less funding. But it's something that 50 years of research tells us can make a positive difference. So that's one place where we can start.

Baroness Falkner:

Frank?

Frank Sharry:

Yeah, I certainly wouldn't comment on the debate in Britain. In the United States, I'm quite confident that integration – some call it assimilation, some call it multiculturalism although in America that's kind of a dirty word, it's kind of 'multy-culty', whereas in Canada multiculturalism is what we in the States would call integration and it works really well, so these words become different in different contexts – in the States, there's a report by Donald Myers from USC that just came out this week, and he actually projects what he thinks is going to happen in terms of assimilation. And If you just look at the key indicators in terms of intermarriage, and home ownership rates, and citizenship, and language acquisition, there's no question that there's going to be a tremendous process of integration.

Now, what I think some of the problem is, is that the host society tend to think 'well they'll all become like us', and this is where, again, we're not being honest. In fact, the host society changes too. I mean look at London; when I was here 30 years ago it looks nothing, and acts nothing like it does now [sic]. Thank goodness, from my point of view as an imperialistic American who likes lots of different restaurants, right? But nevertheless, I love the dynamism of London. And cucumber sandwiches were not tasty when I first came here in 1978. But the point is, is that it is a rough process. It is a difficult process.

But in fact for me, that is what gives the dynamism to the metropolitan areas. I mean, sometimes as an American I watch the debate about Britain and migration and I think, oh my god, they're arguing about the fact that London and Britain is one of the most popular destinations in the world! What a global asset! In a shrinking world and they're all saying – oh my god they all want to come here. And I understand why, I understand the populist reaction, I understand the cultural fears. And I think the professor's right, I think there's a tremendous amount of unacknowledged and implicit bias that underlies these economic answers that really are cultural in nature.

But again, from my – and this is a very American, optimistic, young nation point of view – you know, when I look at the diversity within my own family, it takes two or three generations before... I mean right now there are all these projects about the Hispanics and the Asians and the African-Americans, and whites, and 'In 2050, who's going to have what percentage?' In 2050, all the categories are going to change. My girl's going to secondary school now, and most of the kids are mixed race. What does that mean in 30 years, 30 or 40 years?

So, I don't know, I love the process, and I think that I'm one of those whites who does, and that's why I live in big cities and I'm comfortable with migration. And the concern are not people like me, it's whites who live in poor white areas who feel left out, and that's the real concern. And that's, for them, it is a combination of culture and politics and economics, of elites that don't care and seem to be giving something to others that are disadvantaged, and I think that that's where the real danger is. And that's, my last point on this is that it comes down often, particularly in early stages of debates like in Britain, like in America still, to leadership. You can exploit it as a leader, or you can try to provide leadership. And that's why your leaders who have the guts to stand up need to be supported, and the leaders who stand up to exploit need to be denounced. Because it legitimizes a debate that I think is, that can get easily out of control if it's not countered.

Baroness Falkner:

Ok, before I come to Jack and Don very briefly on the human rights one, I want the panel to hold a thought in their head, in thinking about the American debate versus the continental European debate and the UK debate. And that is: to what extent do we think that the welfare state and the pull of having an easier time of it if you're a new arrival here makes – and the issue's to do with fairness – have in any sense impacted our debate, whereas the sink or swim

approach of a new arrival in the United States. But let's go to Jack briefly on the human rights question that came from the lady.

Jack Dromey:

Well, really I, since you asked the question you made the point, and I don't say that in a critical way because I absolutely agree with what you say. Just two very quick points, I mean first of all we've got a long and honourable tradition in Britain of asylum for those who come to our shores from desperately difficult circumstances. Secondly, likewise, although in not quite as strong a tradition as I would like to see in terms of celebration of human rights in the countries from which these people have come.

So there is, at the moment, human rights, and people talk about human rights often in the political discourse, and there's too many people who spit, particularly in the Conservative Party, unashamedly. As somebody who was on the National Council for Civil Liberties for ten years and as chairman for a year, a champion of our international values on human rights, it's something I think we should be strongly committed to.

Final point comes back to what Frank said, throughout so much of this, whether it's on the economy, whether it's diversity, whether it's in human rights – is leadership. Is leadership. And there is a depressing trend underway as I described it earlier on. I'm pleased to say that the new leadership of our party has not joined in that, but there will be a debate at the next stages about how we stake out our ground in 2012 and 2013. I think I've made it clear what I will be arguing for. Can I just say this, by the way, not often this is said, but I agree with Nick. That the, actually, to...

Falkner:

I have the t-shirt.

[Laughter]

Dromey:

Yeah, in fairness to Nick and the Liberal Democrat Party, I think there's been often, again, very good leadership given. Now I only wish it could persuade your Conservative compatriots.

Baroness Falkner:

Don.

Don Flynn:

I mean, following up directly on that, and I think in answer to the question about the fate of human rights in the public discourse, I mean if you look at actually what happened is in reference to leadership back to the days of the election is that Nick Clegg's message of an amnesty was not received in a hostile way by public opinion. He went right away through the first debate getting plaudits for it. He was acknowledged as being the winner. And it was at that point that Gordon Brown and David Cameron decided to come down on him like a ton of bricks. They effectively worked in alliance with the tabloids in order to say, you know, the ordinary voter has not taken into account what is being said here, that this is dangerous extremism, that this is letting criminals in and giving them a passport, and so on and so forth. And that is reproduced time and time again, right up into the second debate and into the third debate.

That's the answer to the question. What opportunity does a progressive position on immigration or on human rights, because we've seen exactly the same process underway with human rights as well, when we've had a decade – well, just a few years after the Human Rights Act came into force, we saw the politicians and the government rounding on their, even on their own creation and rubbishing it to a huge, great extent. So why do you expect it to be popular with ordinary public opinion in those circumstances? It seems to be absolutely no surprise whatsoever that the public is on a downer about it because almost uniformly the leaders of the political parties are on a downer about it. And that is what we've got to change.

Jack Dromey:

Let me just add quickly that there was a Labour immigration minister, in the run up to the 2010 election, that told lies about his Liberal Democrat opponent, to try and win a tight election, fuelling tensions in his community by demonizing Muslims and the alleged links between the Muslim community and the Liberal Democrat candidate. I make that point because I think we were absolutely right after the election, when he ended up in difficulties, to make it abundantly clear that we would never, ever tolerate behaviour of that kind.

Baroness Falkner:

Ok, we've got a gentleman here, and the gentleman there. And the gentleman in the green shirt. I'm going to see how we get on. If colleagues are perhaps really brief, then we could have another round after that. Please be brief in your questions as well.

Question 6:

Thank you very much. My name is Peter Lloyd. I'm affiliated to the Manifesto Club, which has recently written a report called 'Students Under Watch', on the effects of the points-based immigration system, and the immigration cap on academic life and on teaching students, students coming into the UK. I want to pursue the honesty point by asking you your view on two pieces of collateral damage that are caused by the way politicians I'd say behave on this, and they are from either side of the argument.

So the first one is they're not being honest on the impact, the damaging impact on business, and on academics, and on the student industry, for want of a better word, in other words just plain damage to the UK that's got nothing to do with numbers or pressure on social services, completely dishonest situation that, you can see that in this report. Second point is, on the other side, there's very little talk about certain cities which have suffered from immigration. I mean, Peterborough is one example I know of. And so because they want to ignore discussing it, the pressure on services that comes into those areas tend to be pushed under the carpet and so there is resentment. So I want to know what the panel thinks about how you can tackle that, and get a better honesty about the damage to the country, but also the risks to the country from some of those impacts.

Baroness Falkner:

Ok, and the gentleman over there.

Question 7:

Yeah, in this debate – I'm the director of British Future, which is a new organization, which will be addressing these issues and we launch in the new year – in this discussion about more honesty, I think there's quite an important tension between the idea that people want a sort of democratic right to make decisions, as Jack said, and the sense that they're being offered a

level of control by governments that governments don't have. But I assume they can't, politicians can't say, well, we don't have any control. So it's an issue of what sort of promise of control you can make. Obviously we've got the UKBA debate you know harming this government when it was in play, when it was in opposition, and then coming down the tracks we've got another big numbers debate, so I'd just be interested to know what the panel think a government that isn't anti-immigration in the sense that it wants 100,000 net migrants in every year is now getting a lot of public media pressure to, you know, balance immigration, have nought net, keep the population under 70 million. Do they think that's support for what they're trying to do or do they actually draw a line and start to face that down?

Baroness Falkner:

Ok and the third question was here. If you could bring the mic over there.

Question 8:

I'm Rob McNeil, I'm from the Migration Observatory at Oxford University. My question is about media, which is something we haven't really addressed here in any great detail. Matthew referenced a report recently which sort of dealt with the fact that public opinion consistently tracks against immigration. I was very conscious of the fact that one of the things we do by reiterating this point, that sort of 60 percent or 70 percent of people consistently say they're opposed to immigration, is that we feed the media an opportunity to sell their newspapers or whatever it may be to an audience which is, they are aware is opposed to immigration. And as a result of that you end up in a situation where there's a ratcheting of the sort of language and the sort of discussions about migration. Is there anything that you think can be done to change the terms of the media debate? Which obviously then will hopefully have an impact on the sort of quality of the discussion in the country as a whole.

Baroness Falkner:

Jack, why don't you deal with the impact on business and whether we can be, whether we're being disingenuous and not admitting what will happen there. And Don, could you touch on the, what happens when you have cities where there's a drain, an impact on services that people provide and therefore people lose out, the winners and losers argument, in the context of the Peterborough example. Sunder Katwala's question, on more honesty, why

don't we all take—why don't the whole panel take that. And the media was specifically addressed to you, Matthew. So Jack, lead off for us.

Jack Dromey:

Alright, after this round, my second apology tonight, because I've got to be back in the House shortly after seven thirty. Can I link together what you said, from the Manifesto Club, and what Sunder said, is that, my view is that in terms of refocusing the debate, one key element of that is that you focus on those areas where it is so patently obvious that the government's policies are damaging and are likely to be increasingly damaging. The universities, and the ability to recruit for example high-end skills, there's no question of it, are two very powerful areas, because you have potential – well I've seen it, we've been working on it – coalitions of support, broadly based coalitions of support that you can range behind an argument which says this is crazy, this is crazy.

But it then feeds in, Sunder, to what you said. You know the interesting thing is that when you have these discussions around universities, the economy, and potential damage to both, when two or more are gathered together, I mean other than the fruitcake fringe of the Conservative Party, when two or more are gathered together, I mean actually from the business mainstream of the Conservative Party or some of those who've got, one way or another, academic interests. There is actually a growing view which says, well hang on a second, where is this all going? But the problem is, there is an inexorable momentum now underway that is very, very difficult to argue against.

And of course it will be fed by the media. I mean at its most obscene, *The Daily Express*, I'll never forget that headline back in *The Daily Express* four years ago which, I kid thee not, was that tramps, foreign tramps, migrant tramps are coming over to Britain and displacing good British tramps, sleeping in shop doorways overnight. You couldn't make it up, you couldn't make it up. So, a combination therefore of leadership but also, I actually think, that in terms of trying to start changing the nature of the debate, if what you're able to do is focus on areas where there is broad support around what is patently obvious, in our best, our national interest, I think that will be an essential element of what we want to do at the next stages.

Baroness Falkner:

Don?

Don Flynn:

Yeah, on the congestion effects of migration in terms of – Peterborough, and Slough are the examples that are always quoted – pressure on services and so on, I think the thing to be looked at there is that it actually cuts both ways. For a decade the economy of Cambridgeshire was actually moved onto a higher stage of development because of the way a whole raft of industries around food processing and agricultural production allowed the modernization of supply chains where the fields, the storage, the pack houses delivered goods to the supermarkets, where everything was being sold at, three for the price of two, two for one, and so on and so forth. That was driven by the availability of migrant workers who were coming in prepared to work in those industries, to supplement the labour forces that were already present. They played a role, one of the big things that they did was that they allowed the resident, the British workers to actually migrate upwards. They were moved from being field workers or process workers to being the supervisors of all these processors, while the migrant workers moved into their slots. Similarly, if you look at Slough and all those towns around the M4 corridor, you similarly see that migrants played a dynamic role in supporting their economies for a long period of time.

The problem with congestion is that we operate a system in which the benefits of migration are very quickly expressed in terms of tax revenues, and tax revenues are all collected nationally, in the centre of government. And the mechanism for redistributing it back to the schools, the health services, the transport systems, and the housing systems in Slough, and in Peterborough, is very, very, very poor. A lot of these problems, so-called insoluble problems of congestion in these areas, could easily be much better solved if we had a system in which we could identify where the pressures are building up and rapidly get the money in there in order to deal with these problems.

Baroness Falkner:

Matthew.

Matthew Goodwin:

Do you want me to come in on the media point? Yeah, if you're worried about the impact of the excellent reports that you guys are doing – I love the reports that you've been doing – if you're worried about the impact, don't issue press releases, I don't know.

But obviously, on a serious note, I mean obviously keep doing it, but what's striking is we spent about four years looking at far right voters, and looking at their profiles and characteristics, and we found consistently over time, they read one of three newspapers, and I'll let you guess what those newspapers are. And I always bring this stat up, and then there's inevitably a journalist in the room who says, ah, well what's the direction of causality? Are they choosing *The Daily Mail*, *The Sun*, or *The Daily Express* because they reflect the voters' views, or are these papers actually shaping the voters' views?

Well for the first time we now have some pretty convincing evidence coming out of the US, actually, in political science, that the media has a powerful and very significant effect on framing immigration. Now, everyone's probably thinking 'duh, of course', but political scientists like to take their time to prove these points. But what they find, and this taps into the point about communities that are experiencing change, and I'm always struck when I go to places like Rotherham, and Burnley, and Oldham, just the pressures that those communities are under, and particularly the local authorities. But what this research shows, research by guys like Dan Hopkins, is that when you have communities that are experiencing very rapid change – and it's about the pace of change, not just the numbers of immigrants or the number of minority, the size of the minority community, it's pace of change – when they're going through very quick change and that coincides with either a political elite or a media elite heightening the salience of immigration, so talking very loudly about it, bashing those lazy, those resource-taking immigrants or migrants – then, hostility goes up. It's a relationship between the demographic change, and the process of that, and whether the media or the political elites make that salient. It's good, reliable, experimental work.

And I think that raises questions like, ok, what do we do about it? Because again, I mean this is a question for people like Joe, how do you go about regulating, would you want to regulate the media on an issue like immigration, how – do you get them in a room and say, guys, be more responsible? I don't think that's going to work. Yeah, absolutely I think it's something that has to be looked at, because it's always the elephant in the room, even the studies on attitudes towards immigration very seldom look at media.

Baroness Falkner:

And of course it's even more difficult to regulate social media where a lot of this is now happening. But Frank, do you want to come up with some concluding thoughts?

Frank Sharry:

Yes, so much to say. I wanted to respond to Sunder's question, because this question of numbers and framing from the opponents of immigration, particularly I think in the UK context through Migration Watch, there's the notion that we're going to have an arbitrary number and that's going to be the goal post, and the press, the popular press that is behind it. What do you do? I think what you do is you get organized, and you respond, and you start to create an alternative narrative. I mean, Don's group does that in terms of its 'rights not repression', a very important voice in the debate. The Observatory's doing it in saying, let's have facts rather than distortions that aren't methodologically sound – that's a huge contribution. Sunder's new organization has the opportunity to I think create a space in the debate for a much more pragmatic problem-solving approach to these complicated issues. But I think the problem with distortions in democracy is more democracy. Not outlawing the press. I don't think that works very well, does it Jack?

Jack Dromey:

No.

Frank Sharry:

Yeah, I'm sure you guys would like to occasionally.

Jack Dromey:

Daily Express?

Frank Sharry:

When they overstep! To me, the question, as an advocate when I look at the debate is like, wait a minute, the goal posts are numbers? We have the same thing in the United States – it's like, what? To me, the angst that comes out in the poll that the Observatory did is as much about, 'who's minding the store, and when are they going to get it right?' So, I just think it's not as sexy, this idea of having efficient government that can operate effectively, it's going to take time, but that's actually what I hear the public saying. It's not, 'what number', and that's why I think the government made a huge mistake talking about net migration, and they were going to reduce it, because all they're going to have is headlines saying that they lied too. Breaking more of the

trust, feeding the narrative that they were trying to squelch or pander to or exploit.

So I actually think that it's incumbent on the groups to get organized, to speak up, to engage the debate, to get more aggressive. I know this sounds like American politics, but look, we started a whole organization in the United States dedicated to volume and velocity in engaging the media because we were sitting on the sidelines complaining while the other side was framing and defining the debate. Now we're competing in a way that is much more aggressive, and at least we have a shot now. And then it gives these guys a better chance because there's more space for them to operate.

Baroness Falkner:

Ok, well my apologies to those of you I couldn't call. We promised you a stellar panel: Jack Dromey, Frank Sharry, Don Flynn, and Matthew Goodwin. Please bring your hands together for a round of applause. Thank you very much.