

Nigel needs more MPs

Published: January 12, 2026, 9:49 pm

I made some extra videos yesterday in reaction to the election. This was one of the. In it, I argue that I cannot want more MPs for the Greens and not argue for more MPs for Reform. Both have been sold massively short by first-past-the-post. Labour, meanwhile, is enjoying what look like decidedly ill-deserved gains. How long can this corrupt system last, most especially if we are to hold fascism at bay?

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FWLItVQo__Y

The transcript is:

Strange as it may sound, I want Nigel Farage to have more MPs.

My heart sank when I saw the exit poll from the election at 10 o'clock on Thursday night and it suggested that Reform might have, as I recall it, 13 MPs. It turned out that they only got four. But let's be clear why I think Reform should have more MPs.

Every one of those MPs took over a million votes to elect. That is grossly unfair.

When you look at the data for Labour, it took just 23,405 votes on average to return a Labour MP. That is a complete indication of the injustice that is built within our electoral system.

Who else suffered? Look, the Greens did, obviously. How many votes did it take to get a Green MP in? Well, better than it did last time: only 481,000 to elect a Green MP. It was over 800,000 when Caroline Lucas was the sole member of Parliament for the Greens. So, slightly better for them, but others lost out too.

The Alliance Party for example in Northern Ireland took over 113,000 votes to get a

single person elected and Sinn Féin only 28,509. So, this isn't a problem that just exists in England, Wales and Scotland.

The reason for this is obvious. It is the first-past-the-post electoral system.

The consequence of this is not so obvious, but I think it's incredibly important. I'm upset there aren't more Green MPs. I cannot, in the circumstances, be upset that there are not more Reform MPs.

And I actually think there should be more of both. One, because I think the Greens will actually hold this Labour government to account with regard to climate change. And that is so important.

But, secondly, if people in this country want to be represented by Reform, they should be.

I can't stand Reform. I don't hide the fact that I don't like them and what they stand for. But some people do, and in a democracy, their opinion should be heard. What is more, it will be healthy if it is heard, precisely because then they will look so foolish, so out of step with reality, putting forward ideas that are so repugnant that they may have to be held to account for them.

But if they aren't heard, if they are ignored, we'll end up with the situation that Macron has created in France where, because the right wing were not heard, they have now stormed into the centre of French politics. And I don't want that to happen here with Reform.

I want them to be heard and look stupid, but not silenced and then gatecrash the whole show. Only proportional representation can deliver this.

Every party but Labour in this parliament could benefit from proportional representation except, rather oddly, its longest-term supporters, which are the Liberal Democrats, who happened to get almost exactly the proportion of seats that they also won amongst votes, but they happen to have learned to game the system particularly well.

For everybody else but Labour, there would be a win, and there would be a win for the people of this country.

And as a result, there wouldn't have been a 59 percent turnout at this general election; a dire result showing that the actual winner was "none of the above".

I don't believe we can carry forward as a democracy with this system. It's time it changed. And if that means more seats for Nigel Farage, so be it. Let's expose him for what he is. But let's have the representation for the people who also really do need to be heard.