

Is Keir Starmer a worse Prime Minister than Liz Truss?

<https://www.taxresearch.org.uk/Blog/2025/01/25/is-keir-starmer-a-worse-prime-minister-than-liz-truss/>

Published: January 12, 2026, 8:12 pm

Labour is sinking so fast in my estimation that I now think it could already be worse than the government of Liz Truss, and could be very much worse soon.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rJBCfPWklbA?si=o8MMN03rtQ7rana0>

This is the audio version:

https://www.podbean.com/player-v2/?i=k5g4w-17c6702-pb&from=pb6admin&share=1&download=1&rtl=0&fonts=Arial&skin=c73a3a&font-color=&logo_link=episode_page&btn-skin=ff6d00

And this is the transcript:

Is Keir Starmer a worse Prime Minister than Liz Truss?

I think there's a risk that he is already, and if he isn't, that he will be soon.

Saying so, I also make clear that I think that he is worse already than the four other Tory Prime Ministers who preceded him.

Why am I suggesting this? It's because, unlike those Tory Prime Ministers - and I include Liz Truss in that number - who delivered pretty much what we expected, bad as it was, Starmer is delivering things which are terrible and we didn't expect them. That's worse,

therefore, in my book, than actually living up to the expectation of being bad. Because he is not only being bad, but he's massively disappointing us whilst being so.

Let me use some examples. Over the next few days, it seems very clear that Starmer will confirm that three London airports will be expanded. Heathrow is going to get another runway as is Gatwick and the facilities at Luton are going to be expanded as well. This is terrible for green policy.

Rachel Reeves has made it clear in response to these suggestions that growth trumps green policy. Everything that we thought Labour stood for when it came to the environment because it had people like Ed Miliband in its ranks has been abandoned.

The narrative that they created only four or so years ago about investing £28 billion a year into the green economy to deliver a Green New Deal and guarantee net zero has disappeared. It's not on their agenda anymore.

We're delivering airports instead.

The only thing that matters to them is growth. They say so time and time again.

But growth, as we know, is indifferent as to who gets it.

Growth doesn't care about inequality.

Growth doesn't care about climate change.

Growth doesn't care that there are those who are left behind when a few are enriched.

And Labour doesn't seem to care either.

It's obvious from its own policies that it doesn't care. Let's just look at what it's done to the former chair of the Competition and Markets Authority. The last chair has been sacked because he wasn't pro-growth enough. But saying that, let's remember what the Competition and Markets Authority was meant to do. It is there to protect us from corporate abuse when companies create monopolies.

Reeves was not happy that the Chair of that Authority was willing to deliver on the brief he had been given in accordance with the mandate that his authority had been set up to deliver. She sacked that chair and has replaced him with a person from Amazon. And if you want an example of somebody who threatens through use of monopoly power, then Amazon is it. She doesn't care.

And we've got the same problem happening elsewhere. When Rachel Reeves talks about being tough, what she means is she wants to deliver austerity. Now we know she's refusing to increase taxes on the rich, and in that sense, Labour is very much like what Liz Truss was, heavily biased when it comes to taxation in favour of the rich.

But what we know is that the narrative is now moving very sharply towards there being austerity and that is going to penalise the poor.

Labour's clue should be in its name. Labour is about working people. It's about those who were left behind. It should be about the oppressed. It should be about those who care. But Labour doesn't do that anymore. What is being made so clear is that, actually, Labour is only on the side of capital.

And again, this became apparent when Labour intervened and has tried to issue an instruction to the Supreme Court, the highest court in the land in the UK, in the hearing that it is undertaking on the claims being made by motorists against banks for the mis-selling of car loans.

Those motorists are claiming compensation because they were charged excessive interest rates because information was not disclosed to them, to which they had a right. Rachel Reeves would, you would have thought, be on the side of the motorist, the individual, the voter, the person who might return her to office in 2029. But she isn't. She's come in on the side of the banks. She's asking to make representations to the court to say 'Please don't find, for the motorists, however good their claim might be, because the threat to the banking sector is too great, and we can't afford that, and therefore we'd rather have growth and leave the banks in place and leave these motorists without the compensation that they are owing.' She is actually working against the best interests of the people of this country, and in favour of the hierarchy of wealth.

That isn't what Labour should be doing. It is what Liz Truss did. And if Labour does deliver austerity in March, as I expect, then I have little doubt at all that she will become worse than Liz Truss, because she actually is going to deliver what Liz Truss failed to do - an economy totally biased to the interests of wealth.

How did we get to a point where Labour is so corrupted, has so lost touch with its core values, is so out of touch with the people of this country who put it into office, that it is actually positively working against the best interests of most people in this country?

I wish I knew the answer to that question. I can only put it down to corruption.

Political corruption.

Intellectual corruption.

And plain straightforward alignment of the personal interests of those who are in office with those who have wealth, which is, in my opinion, corruption even if no money has changed hands.

This is a terrible state to be in, and it's the state the UK is now in.