

# Funding the Future

Article URL

Published: January 12, 2026, 5:40 pm

---

I have published this video this morning. In it, I note that Keir Starmer received gifts of more than £18,000 to polish his image in the run-up to the election - including £2,485 on glasses.

Really? Does this mean he's a man who is more interested in style than substance?

And does it mean he's also a man willing to be in hock to his donors?

None of this feels good about a new prime minister.

<https://youtu.be/PXOY8wOFjWk?si=VZw7cZiBckgbwga6>

The audio version of this video is here:

[https://www.podbean.com/player-v2/?i=htik3-165ccfb-pb&from=pb6admin&share=1&download=1&rtl=0&fonts=Arial&skin=c73a3a&font-color=&logo\\_link=episode\\_page&btn-skin=1b1b1b](https://www.podbean.com/player-v2/?i=htik3-165ccfb-pb&from=pb6admin&share=1&download=1&rtl=0&fonts=Arial&skin=c73a3a&font-color=&logo_link=episode_page&btn-skin=1b1b1b)

The transcript is:

---

*How much should Keir Starmer spend on glasses?*

*That does sound like a rather odd question, except for the fact that apparently, he spent £2,485 on glasses in the period running up to the election.*

*Does that matter? Well, yes. Not because we're discussing his vanity, but because those glasses were donated for his benefit by a Labour peer who was previously the chair of ASOS, the clothing retailer.*

*Worse than that, Starmer was donated £16,200 worth of clothing by the same man. So, Starmer's image has been created as a result of corporate donations. You might say, it wasn't corporate donations, it was because this person was a Labour peer. And he's entitled to give money to Starmer. But is he? Is that right?*

*Is this appropriate? I mean, let's just go back to those glasses. How much can you spend on glasses? I know a little bit about glasses. I've worn them for 50-odd years. And they aren't simple, these things. In fact, these are trifocals, and they have to have anti-glare because I'm sitting surrounded by, well, three lights to get this image that you're seeing.*

*So, this not a very straightforward pair of glasses, of which I got two, when I bought them, because they offered me that option, and they came in at £300.*

*So he's got a lot of pairs of glasses, I can only presume. And that's again to create an image.*

*Now I'm not very worried if Starmer is a vain man. We know that Sunak has been. He's been spending over £3,000 apparently on suits, and even so, he still can't afford the last two inches of the trouser leg.*

*I'm more worried about Starmer accepting gifts. Now that's not hypocritical, that's not criticising the left for the sake of it. I think we can safely presume that Sunak could afford to pay for his own suits. But Starmer took corporate gifts to do that. Corporate or personal, I don't care which. Because in either case, he is now, in my opinion, in hock to somebody who's given him, well, nearly £20,000 to create an image, a style.*

*And I'm not interested in image and style very much. A little bit. Because, yes, I admit, I've been told to wear this colour shirt for the purposes of making videos, because I look better.*

*And, look, Starmer also happens to wear dark shirts, because apparently they suit him better too. And I can understand he wants a decent pair of glasses.*

*But, eighteen plus thousand pounds we're now talking about in total for this image?*

*No, I want a man of substance as Prime Minister. And I'm not totally convinced we're going to get one.*

*But worse than that, I do think we might be getting a man who's willing to be in hock to corporate donors for the benefit of this. And I don't care who gives him that much money, corporate or personal, I believe he should be free of such influences. And that's what really matters here.*