Funding the Future

Starmer has to be next

Published: January 12, 2026, 9:18 pm

As I noted earlier this morning, Mandelson was bound to be sacked as US Ambassador very shortly. He went sooner than I expected, having just been sacked as I write.

Now, though, this from the Telegraph is pertinent:

Labour MP asks for inquiry into Lord Mandelson appointment process

A Labour MP has asked for an inquiry into the appointment process of Lord Mandelson.

Andy McDonald asked in the Commons: “Clearly the appointment process didn’t pick up these issues, that’s self-evident. So can we have an assurance that there will be an enquiry into why that wasn’t the case?”

Foreign minister Stephen Doughty replied: “Any candidates for ambassador positions are subject to routine extensive vetting and background checks as a matter of course.”

The decision for Lord Mandelson to resign was taken by the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary, Foreign minister Stephen Doughty confirmed.

Let me be blunt about this. It is impossible to believe that issues around Epstein were not reported when Mandelson was considered for this post.

There is no chance whatsoever that Starmer was not aware of the issues that have now become public, or that he should have been if he claims he was not.

So, how and why was it that Starmer appointed Mandelson as the UK ambassador to the USA?

Was it precisely because he knew Trump, through Epstein?

Was it also because, like Starmer, he has an inclination to Zionism?

Was it also because, like Starmer, he cannot see the harm in Trump's right-wing agenda?

Or was there something else, even deeper and more sinister?

The demand for an inquiry, and one that will report within weeks at most, should be supported by everyone. We have a prime minister who is so obviously out of his depth, or so obviously corrupt, that we need to know which it is.