

Funding the Future

Article URL

Published: January 12, 2026, 7:18 pm

The video that I published this morning of my suggested alternative speech that Keir Starmer should have made at the Labour Party conference is unusually long.

We have never before made a video that is more than 45 minutes long, and I suspect that its length will reduce the number of people who watch it. If so, I admit that this will be a shame because I doubt that I have ever so comprehensively pulled together a range of my ideas in such a coherent way. For that reason, I think that some people might prefer to listen to the audio rather than watch the video. You could put your headphones on whilst doing something else or listen to this on a car journey as a consequence. I hope that the result will be interesting.

That being said, I thought it worth explaining how this came about to provide an insight into the work involved.

As I have already related, I was on holiday in Wales last week, and for me, one of the unfortunate side effects of being on holiday is that after a few days, ideas for new projects bounce around in my head. The idea for this video was one of those. I thought of it last Friday.

I noted some of the ideas shortly before driving home on Saturday, including the five words around which the presentation is organised.

On Sunday, I took part in the Scottish Currency Group's conference, including making an online presentation, and it wasn't until about 4.30 that afternoon that I had a chance to really think about this idea again. Doing so, I went for a walk on my own and, whilst on a 90-minute progression around Ely, dictated the first two-thirds of the content into my phone, pretty much as it is in the video. I then edited that during the evening whilst watching a stunning performance of Mozart's Requiem Mass that is available on the BBC iPlayer. This includes modern dance, and I would strongly recommend it.

Having done that, I realised that references to funding had been omitted from most of that part of the draft, and so on Tuesday morning, I returned the text and dictated the final third of the script whilst on another walk. This was then edited and checked, and on Wednesday morning, Thomas and I sat down to record, actually splitting that

recording into four separate sections simply because breaks for water and then coffee were required along the way.

Making the recording we had to decide whether I would read from paper, or a teleprompter. The trouble with the second option is making them work - they really aren't that good at a price we can afford as yet. We went for paper. When it is obvious it is being read, I see no problem with that, but would welcome feedback.

We then bounced around ideas on the video thumbnail and for the logo that is implicit within it.

Whilst I then checked the script for errors (of which there were inevitably a few), Thomas got on with merging the videos together, applying studio sound to it to make sure that we got the best possible audio, and all the other tricks that he seems to know.

It was not until yesterday evening that this video was, as a consequence, ready to upload for publication this morning.

Whilst Thomas focused on doing that, and because this video is longer than usual, I decided that a PDF version of the transcript was also appropriate. This added to the workload because rather than use the version of the text from which I spoke, I decided to use the version as it was recorded, and there are slight differences. I also polished the punctuation after recording for the purposes of putting the transcript on the blog, so using that as the PDF made sense. The result is a text of more than 6,000 words, equivalent to a fair-sized chapter in a book.

As is apparent from the above, there are obviously gaps in the schedule that I describe: quite a lot of other work has also been done this week.

So the question is, why do this? I think that there are three obvious reasons.

The first is to demonstrate that it would have been possible for Keir Starmer to have delivered a compelling narrative outlining change that I think would appeal to the people of this country if that had been his desire. I can only presume that it was not.

Secondly, because I have been very critical of Labour, I wanted to show that my criticism came out of frustration because I knew that it's possible to do better than what it is doing at present.

And, perhaps most obviously, I wanted to bring together a whole range of the ideas that I have been talking about in a way that creates a cohesive policy for change that does, to some degree, update where the Green New Deal Group was many years ago now.

I do not, of course, pretend that something produced in the limited time period that I dedicated to this is the final word on anything, including my own thinking, but I hope that the ideas can stimulate debate. If so, the effort has been worthwhile, and that is

precisely why the YouTube channel that I now have exists.