

# Will Starmer survive? Don't rule it out

Published: May 13, 2026, 7:24 am

---

The Labour Party leadership question is very hard to avoid. The news is dominated by it. The government is being incapacitated by it. We have the farce of the King's Speech being presented today by a government that may not exist by the end of the week. And all the while, Starmer clings on, like a limpet desperate for its own survival, whatever the cost to anyone else.

I have [already posted](#) two polls on this blog this morning, seeking your opinion on the question of the day, which is whether Keir Starmer will survive and who will replace him if he goes.

Those questions are, of course, relevant, but there are deeper questions to ask, which may be just as important, and they are why is he clinging on, why is Wes Streeting refusing to raise a challenge against him, and what the consequences might be if no one succeeds in eventually challenging Starmer for the premiership.

Is there a possibility, in other words, that despite the fact that he is obviously a failed prime minister in the eyes of many in the Labour Party and in the wider country, and his continued presence in Number 10 seemingly guarantees right now that Labour will perform disastrously at the next general election, that he will stay in office?

To answer that question, we need to stand back a little. As everyone now knows, Starmer became leader of the Labour Party six years ago in a deeply underhanded fashion, claiming to be the genuine successor to Jeremy Corbyn and offering ten pledges to the Labour Party membership, which suggested he would lead a genuinely left-wing government.

He then not only reneged on all those pledges but expelled very large numbers of those who had joined the party because of Jeremy Corbyn. At the same time, a campaign began to take complete control of the candidate selection process in Labour, whilst purging the officers of many local constituency Labour parties to ensure that Starmer's apparent will was done.

The consequence was that we ended up with the well-to-the-right-of-centre, completely gutted Labour Party [that I have, this week](#), described as the party of bankers, not workers, and which is utterly disinterested in all those causes that once characterised everything that Labour stood for, from working people and their rights, to the protection of all those with the misfortune to not have an income through no fault of their own through the provision of a social safety net, and the provision of essential services ensuring quality of life including universal free education and universal free healthcare.

So, Labour is not what it used to be. But there is one misrepresentation in this narrative that I need to correct. My suggestion, so far, has been that this was achieved through Keir Starmer's agenda, and I am far from alone in thinking that Keir Starmer had no such agenda.

Morgan McSweeney had an agenda, and we now know that Peter Mandelson was the person who appeared to pull the strings there.

We know that Labour Together had an agenda, and we know that Peter Mandelson pulled the strings there as well, with Josh Simons appearing to be as much his agent as Morgan McSweeney ever was.

Four things characterised that agenda. They were, and are:

- \* Support for the interests of the City of London.
- \* Support for the interests of the wealthy sponsors of Labour.
- \* The promotion of Zionism, opposition to which was interpreted as antisemitism.
- \* A visceral hatred of anything left of centre.

The playbook that permitted the promotion of these themes came straight from the far-left infiltration of Labour in the 1980s. Their entryism was copied. They, of course, ran up against Kinnock and Mandelson at that time, and now Mandelson has used the lessons learned then to achieve his goal of the recreation of Labour as a right-wing, pro-Zionist political party with the objective of removing the chance of left-wing representation from those desiring it in the UK Parliament, assuming the perpetuation of a two-party-dominated political system in the UK.

You can quibble with this analysis. You can say that a deeper interpretation is required. But what I suggest is that you cannot argue that this did not happen, because it appears that Mandelson and McSweeney chose Starmer as their convenient front man for the campaign that they sought to promote, and nothing has changed ever since. He is still there, and the agenda is still in place. As far as they are concerned, nothing has changed.

Other things have, of course, though. The two-party political system on which they

based their assumption of Labour power is collapsing all around them, because whilst they won the battle within Labour, by defeating through alienation the hearts and minds of those who had thought something altogether better was possible, they ignored another possibility: that the people might decide to take their votes elsewhere, as they have most obviously done. That was a major miscalculation on their part.

They made one other miscalculation, and that was that they presumed that the nodding donkeys whom they nominated as Parliamentary Labour Party candidates in the 2024 election would forever remain loyal to those who had given them their ticket to Westminster. Some of them do, however, now realise that what they have been presented with is a short-term, one-way ticket to their next employment, the chance of securing which might actually be harmed by their having been an MP. As a result, some of them have been willing to challenge Starmer and the hierarchy of power that put them in place, although very obviously not enough as yet, because Starmer is still there.

So, why is he still there?

Firstly, because the Starmer machine has been able to block the return of Andy Burnham, who, in truth, is an alternative face for Labour only a little more attractive to the country at large than Starmer has been, because he too is part of the Blair inheritance that was, again, in large part created by Mandelson.

And then there is Wes Streeting, who may only have arrived in Parliament in 2015, but is a very obvious creation from the same mould, so deeply does he share the views of the Mandelson axis, to the extent that working out what Streeting might think on any issue is as difficult as the same exercise ever is with Keir Starmer. The only role that Wes Streeting has in this fiasco is as a replacement for Starmer to perpetuate the Mandelson-McSweeney plan; but precisely because he is the continuity candidate, he cannot be seen as the person who will trigger the leadership election, and for that reason has not done so. He, like Starmer, has learned to read between the lines and do what is expected of him.

Why else is there no leadership election? Angela Rayner knows she has no chance at present, and probably not ever. She has deeply tarnished her brand.

Ed Miliband has, as yet, not reached the point of desperation with Starmer where he is willing to put himself forward in opposition to the Mandelson camp and go for a job which he is genuinely reluctant to do, but of which he is capable.

As far as I can see, there is no one else in play. The result is an impasse, and for now that is exactly what the Mandelson and McSweeney camp will be happy with. No one knows how to be rid of Starmer as yet, and within Labour and the country as a whole, given the impediment that obviously exists to Andy Burnham getting a run at the Labour leadership, this suits them very well.

Do not doubt that they will also engineer a campaign to prevent Burnham from returning to Parliament. And then they will sit back and rely on Macmillan's old adage that "Events, dear boy, events" will deliver, and sufficient of them will ensue that Starmer survives his term until 2029, by when they think they will have incapacitated the Greens through a programme of deliberate vilification, and against all the odds Labour will be re-elected.

Their inspiration for thinking so is, rather oddly, to be found in Scotland. Two years ago, good money would have said that there was no chance that John Swinney would now be First Minister of the Scottish Government, but he is, and with a commanding lead over all other parties. People can be persuaded of the status quo, after all, and what matters to the Mandelson-McSweeney alliance, and their powerful backers, is that the status quo built around the four pillars I have outlined be maintained.

In that case, their instruction to Starmer is to sit this out, which is precisely what he is doing; because so far it looks as though the Parliamentary Labour Party that they created does not have the courage to replace him, and they think that the threat from Burnham, who is not so far removed from their objectives in any event, can be contained.

What is the result? It is that these people will impose upon this country a government that no one wants, led by a prime minister who is universally loathed, but whose survival will, they think, permit a return to office of a Labour Party that is fundamentally pro-finance and pro-Zionist in 2029, against all the odds, because by then they will, they think, have had the opportunity to discredit both the Greens and Reform, and no one now takes the Conservatives seriously.

All of this is, of course, speculation, but the whole of politics is speculation, and it seems to me to be supported by what we know about what has happened in the last six years, what is happening now, and what is apparent from the agenda, such as it is, that Starmer has advanced whilst in office and which has been supported by key lobby groups such as Labour Together.

That the situation I am describing represents an attempt to destroy democracy in the UK is of no concern to those promoting this agenda. They have no concern for democracy or the will of the people of this country. All that they are worried about is that their view prevails. That, by proxy, is all Starmer is worrying about as well.

We do, as a result, need to worry. The indifference and cowardice of the Parliamentary Labour Party may yet deliver them just what Mandelson and McSweeney want, which is a very bleak future for us all.