

Funding the Future

Article URL

Published: January 12, 2026, 7:20 pm

I [had this comment made on the blog today](#), and it is typical of many others, most of which do not see the light of day. On this occasion, I have decided to reply.

The commentator, who claims to have the name B Clarence, but whose email address might suggest otherwise, started by saying:

Richard, prepare to be astonished – i am the grandchild of immigrants and i fully support flying england flags!

My grandparents were post war immigrants, i am proudly english. Why does this astonish you? Oh yes i am white, my grandparents are from eastern europe, so you are making your assumption by the colour of someone's skin.

I am completely baffled by the conclusion to these two paragraphs.

I cannot find what assumption this person is referring to. I admit that, based on observation, those flying flags do appear to be white, but what I have said is that they appear to be racist. I have never said that racism is a characteristic reserved for white people alone, because I know full well that it is not. Skin colour does not come into that suggestion, then.

And, what I have also made clear, because it is obviously true, based on my experience, is that white people can be racist about white people. So, I find it baffling that allegations about prejudice based on the colour of skin came into B Clarence's argument. It is simply not present in what I say.

B Clarence continued by saying:

Is this how you make your assumptions that inform your output when you out observing the world, as you claim to be an expert in.

It is exceptionally difficult to provide a response to this comment because the assumption I am accused of making has not been made.

In that case, let me move on to the next part of the comment, in which they said:

People are sick of not being listened to and having their will continually opposed from those above who will not listen, and the wise men, like you, seeking to tell them that they know best, and that any opposing view will be smeared as fascism. The people don't get listened to at the ballot box, you have to expect a reaction eventually. I would suggest that flying flags is benign.

Once again, I'm completely baffled by this observation. I have written for years about how a neoliberal elite, backed up by a mythical form of economics, the study and promotion of which has been paid for by people who wish to skew the benefit of the world economy in the favour of a tiny number of people, is the cause of the oppression of the vast majority of people in the UK, and in many other countries around the world.

I am not promoting this abuse. I am opposing it.

Whilst doing so, I have listened to people.

I know that they feel oppressed.

I know that they have good reason to feel oppressed.

I sympathise entirely with their anger.

I have dedicated countless hours to formulating responses to the economic policies that oppress them, seeking policy solutions that benefit ordinary people and reduce the elite's power over them.

What is more, I have gone out of my way to argue that people whom I do not necessarily agree with should have more influence over politics in the UK because I support the introduction of proportional representation precisely so that people's voices will be heard, whether I agree with them or not.

So, once more, I am totally confused by being told I do the exact opposite of what I am actually seeking to achieve. I'm a campaigner to reform the economy precisely so that those who have been mistreated by it, most particularly over the last 15 years, get an appropriate share of what they deserve from the value that they create within this country, and yet I am being told that I have done the exact opposite. I genuinely struggle to work out why.

Finally, B Clarence says:

For a man of the people, you really ought to go out and meet some people, not selectively, and listen rather than lecture. It may improve your dire output.

So, contrary to the claim just made that I am supposedly a part of the oppressing elite, I am now recognised as a man of the people. There might be some irony or even

sarcasm in there. What I do know is that there is a contradiction and only one of the statements is correct, which is the second: I am indeed only interested in the majority of people. But, apparently, I do not listen to those people even though I speak to a great many of them, very often and realise that people's anger is with:

- * Low incomes
- * Poor job prospects
- * Young people who feel abandoned by an economy that is indifferent to them, even when they have done everything that has been asked of them
- * Excessive costs of housing
- * Food price inflation
- * Excessive interest rates
- * Unfair taxes
- * Poor government services, from Health, to education, to justice, to social care and a great deal more
- * The indifference of political elites
- * Electoral systems that do not represent people
- * And more.

I have argued for reform on all of these issues, so what have I not listened to?

I can only come down to one thing, and that is I have not listened to demands from racists. What else have I got wrong? I can't see what it is based on this comment. Can anyone explain?